

**RFI BSEE 1a
Pebble Project EIS**

Request for Information

Title/Subject:	Cook Inlet Natural Gas Pipeline: Installation Methodology
Requestor:	Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE)
Date Transmitted:	3/27/2020
Recipient:	Pebble Limited Partnership
Response Requested by:	4/4/2020
Rationale:	BSEE needs construction information for the Alternative 2/3 natural gas pipeline in Cook Inlet. BSEE specifically needs to know which sections would be buried or laid on the seafloor and the dredging technology that would be used (e.g., clam shell dredge; suction dredge; jetting) to analyze the impact of authorizing a natural gas pipeline right-of-way. Additionally, BSEE needs explanation for any portions of subsea pipeline in Cook Inlet that would not be buried.
Describe the Information Requested and Level of Detail:	We request the following: description of the dredging technology for installing the pipeline and all equipment (e.g., vessels, dredge equipment) necessary to accomplish burying the natural gas pipeline, as well as a rationale for the unburied portion of the pipeline.

Recipient Response Form

Date Received from USACE:	Click here to enter text.
Response from Recipient (Describe Information Requested to the Level of Detail Requested; Provide Attachments as Needed):	<p>The two tables included below show:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The burial depths and associated impact corridor width resulting from the temporary placement of spoils. 2) The trenching equipment associated with the pipeline construction. <p>Information on the types of trenching equipment and support vessels is unchanged from that provided in RFI BSEE1 and the Draft Biological Assessment documents.</p> <p>No sections of the Alternative 2/3 pipeline are proposed to remain unburied. A single section of the Alternative 1 pipeline from KP98 to KP116 is proposed not to be buried. This portion of the pipeline is located in area with an average water depth of 200 feet on a flat, dense seabed that does not require any excavation to stabilize the pipeline or prevent spanning. Little ship traffic occurs in that area, limiting concerns regarding third party risk to the pipeline. The metocean analysis showed that the heavy wall pipeline was stable on the seabed surface under anticipated current and tidal conditions. Therefore, to reduce seabed impacts associated with construction a decision was made to propose not burying that portion of the pipeline.</p>

Attachments:	
Date Returned to USACE:	Click here to enter text.

AECOM Intake Form

Date Response was Received:	4/3/2020
Received by:	AECOM
Describe any Follow-up Related to this RFI:	Click here to enter text.