

USACE Media Teleconference 7-26-18

John Budnik - USACE

Tom Findter - USACE

Shane McCoy - USACE

Becky Bohrer - Associated Press

Stephen Lee - Bloomberg Environment

Tim Sohn - Outside Magazine

Tim Bradner - Alaska Legislative Digest

Margie Bauman - Fisherman News

Jill Burke Bloomberg - Environment

Mariah Oxford - Pebble Watch

David Hazle - Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA)

John Budnik: Alright good morning, everybody. Thanks for joining us for July's media availability session here with the Army Corps of Engineers. The Purpose of today's teleconference is to give a general status update on where the Corps is in EIS process with regards to the Pebble project. My name is John Budnik, I am a public affairs specialist in the public affairs office for Corps of Engineers Alaska district. Sitting next to me is Mr. Shane McCoy, the program manager for the Pebble EIS. We have allotted one hour for the session, with Shane delivering some opening remarks and then we will turn over to you for questions. We are getting in a rhythm with you guys and we have a lot of returning cast characters here and we do have some new comers, but just a reminder and courtesy we ask you to please place your phone on mute and if you can hold your question until after Shane's initial statement and as we go through the roll call and go through the roster to ask questions, if you can state your name in affiliation for the group that would be helpful. So full disclosure, we are recording this conversation so we can provide the transcript at a later time. Before we get started I just want take a roll call for attendance and this is just in order I received the RSVP. Is Becky Bohrer with the Associated Press on the line?

Becky Bohrer: Yes.

John Budnik: Hi Becky.

Becky Bohrer: Hello

John Budnik: Is Stephen Lee, Bloomberg Environment?

Stephen Lee: I am here, John. Hi.

John Budnik: Hi, Steve. Is Tim Sohn, Outside Magazine?

Tim Sohn: Yeah, I am here. Thanks.

John Budnik: Good morning, Tim.

Tim Sohn: Morning.

John Budnik: Tim Bradner?

Tim Bradner: Yeah, I am here.

John Budnik: Tim just very quick, who are you writing for?

Tim Bradner: Alaska Legislative Digest

John Budnik: Perfect. Thank you, welcome. Is Margie Bauman, Fisherman News on the line?

Margie Bauman: I am here. Thank you.

John Budnik: Good morning.

Margie Bauman: Good morning

John Budnik: Is Jill Burke, Bloomberg Environment?

Jill Burke: Hi, I am here.

John Budnik: Good morning, Jill.

Jill Burke: Morning.

John Budnik: Is Mariah Oxford, Pebble Watch?

Mariah Oxford: I am here too, thanks.

John Budnik: Good morning, Mariah. Is Art Hughes, Alaska Native News? No Art and then also we do have Mr. David Hasle. Is David Hasle on the line?

David Hasle: I am here.

John Budnik: David would like to just give a quick introduction of who you are as you are not member of the media, but you are filling in for Kim West who joined us in the last call? Can you just please give us a brief introduction of yourself?

David Hasle: Yes. I am an Operation Supervisor with PHMSA.

John Budnik: Perfect, thank you. Alright, without further ado I am going to turn it over to Shane to give you guys a general status update of EIS process. Shane.

Shane McCoy: Good morning and thank you again for participating in this a recurring media round table. I hope it's as beneficial you as it is to us. As you are aware the current status of the development of the EIS, Environmental Impact Statement Analysis, is that we are drafting the chapters. Chapter 1, 2, 3, and 4; the public scoping comment period is closed as you are aware on the 29th of June. We are currently going through the comments that we received and identifying issues and alternatives that were provided to us during that period. Other than that I do not have any additional statement prepared.

John Budnik: Alright. This is all for you guys. We are going through the roster again to just start asking questions. So first up is Becky Bohrer with the Associated Press.

Becky Bohrer: Thank you very much. I apologize I was not on the last call the last time you had this, so this question may have come up previously, but the Governor at the very close of the comment period has sent a letter to the Corps in which he requested that the Corps suspend the EIS process. Is the Corps in any way taking that request seriously or is that something the Corps does not have the ability to do even if it wanted to?

Shane McCoy: Thank you Becky. That is a good question. That's a question that we have received repeatedly. We take all the requests, whether from the Governor or otherwise here seriously, however the request based on the economic analysis isn't a request we can grant at this time with regard to suspending the review. Statutorily we have a requirement to continue our environmental analysis; the requirement for the economic analysis is not part of the required information to continue.

Becky Bohrer: So to be clear, it is on the basis where you mentioned at the minimum having an economic analysis, if I am hearing you correctly, because that's not required, the entire request to suspend is considered out of balance?

Shane McCoy: It's not permissible to suspend the review per our regulation.

John Budnik: Ok, thank you Becky. Next, Stephen.

Stephen Lee: Hey, guys. I just wonder, Shane, if you could provide a little bit more detail on where the thing stands, you had mentioned you were going through the comments...I think we talked about this last time. Is there anything that has come up in the comments that is particularly noteworthy or maybe surprising. What are you guys seeing?

Shane McCoy: You know...good morning by the way. So far what we were receiving and what we are analyzing there is nothing that is a surprise. A lot of the issues have been discussed publically for a long time prior to the application submittal, but there are a lot of comments to go through right now. Currently, I believe there are about 175 thousand comments we received, but the issues are pretty well vocalize in the public and had been for sometimes.

Stephen Lee: Ok, thank you.

Shane McCoy: Sure.

John Budnik: Thank you Stephen. Tim Sohn?

Tim Sohn: Yeah, thanks guys and good morning. Shane, I have a different question, but just to follow-up on that. The 175 thousand comments you referenced versus the number that are publically available on the Pebble project EIS website, can you explain of the discrepancy there?

Shane McCoy: It is just a technical moment. We will get them loaded as soon as we can. I understand that currently the number on the public website isn't 175, but understand also that we received a large number of form letters right at the closed comment period so it is taking just a minute to get everything load it.

Tim Sohn: Ok. But the 175 thousand number you believe is the accurate number for the total comments submitted?

Shane McCoy: I do.

Tim Sohn: Ok, great. We already covered the Governor letter, so the other question I wanted to ask was in terms of your interaction with the folks from Pebble during this process, have you issued any, since the last call, any subsequent request for further information and what is their level of inability to respond to this request has been?

Shane McCoy: Certainly. We are in a continuing data gap analysis so to speak as we develop the draft chapter. We have submitted additional request for information and they had provided the information or provided timeline for providing that information to us in timely manner, as we have requested.

Tim Sohn: Ok. Are you able to identify any of those data gaps before that or no?

Shane McCoy: There are a whole breadth of them and we will be posting the request for information on the public website as well. I understand that not all of them are available currently, but it is continuously moving.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you.

Tim Sohn: Thanks.

John Budnik: Tim Bradner.

Tim Bradner: Hi, thanks. I'd like to return to the economic analysis question. Shane, isn't some of the Corps required to, by the regulation, to at some point screen the alternatives and do a comparison analysis. I think the word that I heard in the regs is Technical and Economic Feasibility of Alternatives? Don't you at some point have to do that?

Shane McCoy: We will be re-screening the alternatives based on NEPA requirements as well as when we get to the record of the decision based on the 404(b) 1 analysis and the public interest analysis review.

Tim Bradner: Ok, but at some point don't you have work in some of the economic and the technical feasibility in your screening.

Shane McCoy: So the criteria for 404(b) 1 analysis all comes down to costs, logistics and technology so economic feasibility is not part of that the requirement.

Tim Bradner: Ok, I am sorry Shane. Can you say that again?

Shane McCoy: So an alternative is considered to be available to the applicant, but we have to take the consideration costs, logistics, and the existing technology.

Tim Bradner: Ok.

Shane McCoy: That's by definition what practicability is, the least environmentally damaging and practicable alternative under the 404(b) 1 guideline.

Tim Bradner: So it is sort of the economic analysis?

Shane McCoy: It is more of comparative than the economic analysis. It's what's relative to the industry.

Tim Bradner: Ok. Some costs and other factors are considered into it. Sort of following question, are you going to be asking Pebble for any cost information?

Shane McCoy: Well...we are still in the development of alternatives, so as we identify alternatives it is incoming upon the process to determine whether or not it is practicable under the 404(b) 1 guideline and reasonable under NEPA.

Tim Bradner: I am sorry, say again Shane?

Shane McCoy: So NEPA has a different standard for alternatives; it is a "reasonable" standard. It doesn't take into consideration costs, logistics, and technology. But when we come to the decision making process, as opposed to NEPA which is disclosure and information gathering process, then we will apply costs, logistics, and technology to alternative.

Tim Bradner: Ok. I am sorry...just need to clarify, but that's the ROD, at the final step after the need analysis.

Shane McCoy: That is correct. That is the Record of Decision.

Tim Bradner: Ok.

Shane McCoy: Ok. I guess...I am getting a prompt here. I guess to clarify this. There is the distinctive difference between NEPA and the decision making process for the Corps. NEPA is a Federal requirement to take in consideration the proposed action, the affected environment, the environmental consequences, and the range of alternatives. It is used by the Federal decision makers to inform their decisions, at which point the Corps will enter into making the decision more substantive. NEPA does not end-up in the decision. It is an information disclosure document. So yes, you are correct. At the end of NEPA, we would start our substantive, deliberative decision making and apply

the public interest review factors and of course 404(b) 1 guideline.

Tim Bradner: Ok. Thank you.

Shane McCoy: Sure.

John Budnik: Thank you, Tim. Moving along, next is Margie Bauman.

Margie Bauman: Yes, thank you. I'd like to know if this whole EIS process requires the Pebble Partnership at some point to prove that they have the financial resources in the event that you ok the permits and if something should happen to cause extreme destruction to environmental resources, that they can show that they have the financial and other resources to clean it up.

Shane McCoy: Thank you. Good morning, Margie. So just make sure I understand, are you asking...? (Margie starts talking)

Margie Bauman: In other words ...I am assuming that part of this EIS process is to look at all the possibilities of things that could go right and could go wrong and if certain things were to go wrong, they could be in the multimillion dollar category to clean-up. Does the Pebble Limited Partnership have to prove that they have the financial resources, the money, and the other means to clean-up, should there be an accident of some sort?

Shane McCoy: So the Corps of Engineers does not require bonding, if that's what you are asking? It sounds like bonding for closure and reclamation. The State would.

Margie Bauman: No, but they should be able to show that they could. I mean, what happens if you permit them and then unintentionally a serious environmental accident occurs? Who is responsible for cleaning it up? Isn't that one of the questions you need to ask in EIS process?

Shane McCoy: So I understand what you are saying. So the applicant would be responsible. They have to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of all the permits issues whether the Federal requirement or the State requirement is. But the applicant would be required to remediate.

Margie Bauman: Well when you say they have to be required to remediate. Is that still out? I mean, should something like this occur, what guidelines are there for how they would have to remediate? Would they have to clean-up something in 3 months, 10 years, or what? How's this all spelled out? It would seem like the EIS process should have some very specific guidelines for this. For example, you know if they were in the process of developing their infrastructure, if there was a serious spill into a waterway that happened to be habitat for Salmon and was a very large spill of things that are very detrimental to the environment. How much time would they be given time to clean it up? Are they having any guideline of that? Do they have an unlimited time period? I am just curious about how the EIS process does or does not spell that out. Not just for Pebble, but you know for anybody doing this sort of thing.

Shane McCoy: So Margie, the EIS process is an analysis. It doesn't have a requirement associated with what you're asking; if they were in non-compliance with terms and conditions of our permit then they have become in compliance. So in what you're asking is really outside of our purview and that is not in our regulatory authority.

Margie Bauman: Ok. Well...let me ask another question then. How long is this whole process going to go on? It seems like you were diligently trying to find all the gaps in required additional information? How long do you expect this process to go on? Do you have any kind of deadline at this point?

Shane McCoy: There is a schedule. There is no deadline, per say. So if they could provide all the information that we require, the draft EIS is scheduled to be published and made available for public for comment right around the first of the year.

Margie Bauman: Ok. Thank you.

John Budnik: Thank you, Margie. Next up is Jill.

Jill Burke: Hi, thank you. I don't have a question at this time.

John Budnik: Ok, thank you. Mariah.

Mariah Oxford: Hi, good morning. I am just wondering about your timeline for the scoping report and your timeline for getting all these comments loaded and when we could be able to download the comments as a batch?

Shane McCoy: I'll have to get back to you when are the comments are going to get loaded, but with regards the scoping report... The scoping report is scheduled to be made available to the public at the end of next month.

Mariah Oxford: Ok. Just a follow-up, did you receive comments from all the cooperating agencies?

Shane McCoy: We did.

Mariah Oxford: Is there a way that we could see those easily without having to sort through what you have online.

Shane McCoy: I will have to get back to you on that as well, I am sorry.

Mariah Oxford: Ok.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you. That concludes the first round of questions before we go into round 2, are there any late comers to the call? Alright, thank you. Alright, I guess we kick back to you Becky.

Becky Bohrer: Thanks. Shane actually I just wanted to go back to the question that I asked earlier. When you mentioned that it is not permissible to suspend the review per regulation. Does that mean in any regard, so effectively once the Corps commits to the EIS it sees it through regardless; with no means you could suspend it?

Shane McCoy: The reason we would discontinue the analysis would be at the request to the applicant or if the applicant needed additional time to gather information which we required. We give a reasonable amount of time per regulation, generally not to exceed 30 days, however if the applicant provides this information, when they might be getting us, or they will be getting us the information we will continue the analysis until such time they don't provide that information.

Becky Bohrer: And to go back to what Tim was asking, when you had mentioned some of the criteria like cost, technology, and logistics, when you say cost, what is it you are looking at? Is it for the actual cost to do the work versus whether Pebble has the financial resources to do the work? I just want to better understand what you meant when you talked about the cost piece of that?

Shane McCoy: Sure. So we would consider an alternative available as long as the cost isn't prohibitive. What I mean by that is not necessarily the applicant's ability to finance that, but rather based on the industry standard.

Becky Bohrer: Ok.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Becky. Stephen.

Stephen Lee: Let me re-phrase this: have you guys heard anything from Pebble? Have they communicated to you that they may be reaching a point where they would like to put this on pause or step-back, just in light of their financial situation?

Shane McCoy: Good question, but no. We heard nothing from Pebble with regards to any indication that they may request a suspension of the review.

Stephen Lee: Ok. If I could just follow-up, I know I asked you guys this before and I assume the answer is going to be the same, but...to what extent, do you take into account or even just to think about Pebble's financial status, whether it is part of the formal process that you are going to go through now or even just informally? I mean I am sure you are aware of it. Do you have any thoughts going on at the Corps that you could share with us?

Shane McCoy: No. We don't really have any opinion in their financial status. We presumed that they have the resource available to continue the process until such time that they tell us they don't.

Stephen Lee: Ok. Alright than, thank you.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Stephen. Tim Sohn.

Tim Sohn: Yeah, thanks. I guess I go back briefly to something that we did talk about from the last call, but I am curious whether Pebble has submitted any further changes or you anticipate any further changes to the mining plan and more generally, with this sort of project and process, whether multiple rounds of changes to their plan from their side could be expected, or whether the round that they submitted in May should just about do it?

Shane McCoy: They have not yet submitted any additional changes at this point, but it is kind of an iterative process. What I mean by that is we are required in mitigation sequence to review the applicants how they avoided impacts to water in the US, how they minimize impacts water in the US. So during of the process of the analysis would not be unlikely that there are changes to the proposal.

Tim Sohn: Ok. So you anticipate that there could in fact be further changes coming...I am confused whether you mean changes from their side or just that you will work through the further alternative as you analyze it.

Shane McCoy: Could you please re-iterate that question or re-phrase it? I am not sure what exactly you're asking?

Tim Sohn: I was asking whether you anticipated further changes from their side and my understanding of your response is that you were talking about the alternatives that you would work through in response to their plan, rather than further changes from them.

Shane McCoy: Well, it is kind like a dialogue. You know again as the scoping identified the issues obviously the applicant will be aware of those. Again the Corps neither a proponent in or an opponent. So we always have to ask the hard questions how did you avoid, how did you minimize. So the applicant would have to respond to those. So it is a dialogue between the agencies and the applicant.

Tim Sohn: Ok. Thank you.

John Budnik: Ok, thank you Tim. Tim Bradner.

Tim Bradner: No further question at this point.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you. Back to you Margie.

Margie Bauman: Yeah, thank you. On the scoping report, that you are hoping to have available next month, how are we going to get access to that?

Shane McCoy: It will be made publically available on the project website pebbleprojecteis.com and if you are not aware there was a really preliminary draft scoping report made available on that site already.

Margie Bauman: Ok. Another thing, I need here. Can we get Shane's full name and the spelling please and his title?

Shane McCoy: Yes, absolutely. My name is Shane McCoy (Shane Spells his Name), I am a program manager for United States Army Corps of Engineers Alaska District.

Margie Bauman: Ok. Do you have a phone number where you can be reached and an email, please?

John Budnik: Any contact, any information that you need is best through our Public Affairs office. So I am a good point of contact for that.

Margie Bauman: Ok. Already, you seemed optimistic about getting the draft EIS out

around January, 1st. What is the timeline after that? Once the draft EIS comes out is there a 30 days or 60 days or sometime for additional comments? Do you have a tentative date to the final EIS, please?

Shane McCoy: Sure. Per regulation, we are required to go out for no less than 45 days for public comment. However, the Corps has determined that this will go out for no less than 90 days for public comment.

Margie Bauman: Ok.

Shane McCoy: That being said again, the schedule that we're operating under right now would have record of decision in 2020.

Margie Bauman: Ok, but no specific month or date in 2020?

Shane McCoy: I don't have it off the top of my head. But it is really some of the driven by the amount of comments that we will receive of course.

Margie Bauman: I assume that you are expecting quite a few.

Shane McCoy: We are.

Margie Bauman: You got 175 thousand already for the draft. Yeah, thank you very much.

Shane McCoy: For clarity, we got 175 thousand for the scoping period.

Margie Bauman: Thank you.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Margie. Jill.

Jill Burke: I don't have any question at this time.

John Budnik: Ok, thank you. Back to you Mariah.

Jill Burke: Thanks.

Mariah Oxford: Hi, there. I want to ask you a question that I sent to you yesterday. I am not sure if you have this information yet, but...have you been able to determine how many of the comments that you received in scoping were signed form letters or petition? Like the percentage.

Shane McCoy: I do not have that in my...readily available. I can inquire and find that out. My understanding is...I don't have that, I don't want make a number up.

Mariah Oxford: And is there been any determination yet of how many were substantive and how many un-substantive or is that still under way?

Shane McCoy: That's still in development or under analysis.

Mariah Oxford: But will that kind of number be included in the scoping report?

Shane McCoy: Absolutely will be. The scoping report will have comments based on topic, as well as there were some petitions that were also sent in that we will acknowledge and ready for you.

Mariah Oxford: Ok. Thanks. I did also notice on your Pebble project EIS site. You have the document library which included the data reviewed for draft EIS category. Since you are actively working on EIS, I look from time to time and I noticed it is regularly updated up until June 21st so I wondered if there no new document that they're reviewing or why it's been four weeks since they've been posting anything new.

Shane McCoy: I anticipate additional RFIs to go up this week some of the RFIs that we been asked they're have been many more documents that being reviewed and I will make it a point to get the website more up to date.

Mariah Oxford: So is that a Corps responsibility or is the third party contractor that does that?

Shane McCoy: They are almost synonymous. The third party works for us, but I will task them to do so.

Mariah Oxford: Ok, great thank you.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Mariah. That concludes round two of questions, any late comers on the call? If not, we will go through the list again see what additional question out there. Back to you Becky.

Becky Bohrer: Thanks. Just on the timeline, has anything happened at this point to suggest that the timeline that was set initially will slip... I guess that depends on the timeline that Pebble has set out by which they expect to get information back to you, or do you feel that you're pretty much firmly on track to finish the schedule set out at start of this process?

Shane McCoy: Right now, there is nothing to indicate that the timeline will slip.

Becky Bohrer: One other question, has Corps formally responded to the Governor by letter? If so is it possible to get a copy of that letter?

Shane McCoy: We did not respond by letter. The Colonel and the Chief of Regulatory had a conversation explaining our process and the requirement under statute is similar to what we discussed here.

Becky Bohrer: A conversation with the Governor directly or Chief of Staff or Commissioner? Can you please be more specific?

Shane McCoy: It was with the Governor. Governor Walker.

Becky Bohrer: Thank you.

Shane McCoy: Absolutely. For your own edification, the Colonel is the District Engineer. He has all the authority under the Clean Water Act to make the decisions. So

for the clarity, he is the decision maker and responsible.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Becky. Back to you Stephen.

Stephen Lee: Yeah, I am just curious about these 175 thousand comments, we know that in Federal rule making when you have a notice in comment process one of frustrations that is often voiced is that advocates send in tens of thousands of comments and then they often feel as if those comments are not taken seriously. My understanding is that your process is a little bit different. I mean how persuasive is it to have tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of comments that oppose the mine. How do you sort of balance, even if they are largely forms letters let say, but you just got so many of them. How does that influence your thinking? How do you weight that?

Shane McCoy: So our analysis is for the discharge of dredge and fill materials and the associated impacts to the aquatic resources as well as to the navigational, and the public's free right to navigation. So numerically it is notable, but really what we are asking for folks is to help inform our substitute discussion. Again is to the impact to aquatic resources and navigations.

Stephen Lee: Ok. So what you are saying is that you are looking for comments that go specifically to this somewhat technical issue. Is that accurate?

Shane McCoy: Yes.

Stephen Lee: Ok. If you got tens of thousands of comments...let say they are form letters...let say they were all substantive, how influential that would be in your thinking?

Shane McCoy: Well...if form letter with substantive comment if the same comment it would addressed as a single comment.

Stephen Lee: Ok, so the fact that you had thousands of them and that is not any more persuasive than if just get one.

Shane McCoy: Correct.

Stephen Lee: Ok, thank you.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Stephen. Back to you Tim Sohn.

Tim Sohn: Great, thanks. I would like to follow-up quickly on the scoping report and the preliminary scoping report. So given the volume of comments and other information that you're sorting through... I am curious, no. 1. Whether the final scoping report will in many ways resemble closely to the preliminary scoping report and I am also curious whether there is some danger in issuing the preliminary scoping report before even the end of the scoping report period and certainly before you going through the bulk of the comments?

Shane McCoy: The format of the final scoping report is very similar to the preliminary. With regards to danger of issuing the preliminary scoping report, it was really our intent to be as transparent as possible and keep the public informed of the process. So really

a lot of the comments or a lot of the topics were addressed in the preliminary were very similar to what is likely to be in final report.

Tim Sohn: Ok. One more question, but not really a follow-up and will be the last one for me. Circling back to what was asked previously about what would cause the EIS to be either suspended or withdrawn. I am little more curious on what specific sort of timeline? You mentioned that if they were unable to respond to the specific request for further information but they had the timeline to doing so that you might continue the EIS while waiting for them to respond. What's the limit of that grace period? Say there is a request out there and they keep saying that they are going to respond and never end-up doing it. What is your time limit to them on sort of thing? Where the suspensions actually happen?

Shane McCoy: That's case by case and there is no bright line on that. It would have to be a decision made internally at that point, but there is no bright line on that.

Tim Sohn: Ok. But you keep going if there is a request for information that was not fulfilled? You would need a reasonable cause to believe that they are capable for fulling the request. If there came a situation where believed they were stalling you and incapable of fulfilling a request. Could you then suspend the EIS?

Shane McCoy: That would be a decision made at that time.

Tim Sohn: Ok. That's all I got.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Tim. Tim Bradner, any further questions?

Tim Bradner: No further question.

John Budnik: Ok. Back to you Margie.

Margie Bauman: Yes, thank you. A new book came out recently called Bristol Bay Alaska Natural Resources of the Aquatic and Terrestrial Ecosystems and it is 600 pages, the book that was paid for by Bristol Bay Partnership. I believe and hope that the information included in there would be use for consideration on whether this mining project should or should not continue and is a collection of data on all these resources in Bristol Bay. I wonder if the Corps had a copy of that and whether that was being use as say a resource or a comment toward the analyzing of everything for the EIS.

Shane McCoy: Can give me the name of the book again, please Margie?

Margie Bauman: Yes, it is called Bristol Bay Alaska Natural Resources of the Aquatic and Terrestrial Ecosystems. It was edited by Carol Ann Woody and published by J. Ross Publishing. I got a copy right in front of me and I did a book review on it. It is very extensive. It tells all about the vegetation in the watersheds, Flora and Fauna in the watershed, the Impacts of all the wildlife in the watershed, the Marine, invertebrate, Salmon resources, birds, just about everything that lives and breathes and moves around in the watershed. The contributing authors have an extraordinary amount of background in their work there. It just seems like that would be a resource of the Corps

Engineers would want to be looking at and consideration of the EIS. But I was wondering if you had seen this book?

Shane McCoy: I have to get back to you on whether or not the third party contractor is aware.

Margie Bauman: Who is the third party contractor again?

Shane McCoy: It is AECOM. But sounds like a fantastic resource though.

Margie Bauman: Who is the third party contractor?

Shane McCoy: AECOM.

Margie Bauman: Could spell that?

Shane McCoy: Yup. It's all the capital letters (Shane is spelling this out).

Margie Bauman: Who is that?

Shane McCoy: They are a national organization. The group that we were working with has folks working all of over the country, but they also have an office here in Anchorage as well.

Margie Bauman: Well yeah it is pretty detailed book on just about everything. It tells everything about all these creatures from their required habitat, food habit, their ability to survive, mortality, etc. and the last two chapters in there section 6 of the book non-biological resources of Bristol Bay. They talked about the north Aleutian basin, oil and gas potential and they talked about mineral resources of Bristol Bay watershed and their environmental characteristic and then renewable the energy resources. So it seems like the people that worked on these chapters are scientists. They don't have a dog in the fight so to speak. They were asked to contribute their scientific information based on great experience in their respective field. Each chapter has its owned summary in there, but they very detailed. That just seems like that would be something you would be wanting be consider as a resource in your EIS scoping.

Shane McCoy: Thank you.

John Budnik: Certainly appreciate it.

Margie Bauman: So you haven't heard about it.

Shane McCoy: I vaguely remember, but I believe got brought up during scoping when the comments within the scoping. Again, I have to check with my third party contractor to make sure.

Margie Bauman: Ok, thank you.

John Budnik: Thank you Margie. Moving along, Jill.

Jill Burke: I am still here and I don't have any question. Thank you very much.

John Budnik: Thank you Jill. Back to you Mariah.

Mariah Oxford: Thanks. I want to follow-up on Margie bringing up this book edited by Carol Ann Woody. I know that when you are looking through the scientific information while drafting the EIS you have to make sure that it is valid. So I am wondering what factors determine the solidity of the scientific data what you're looking at?

Shane McCoy: Well we have a very large suite of both the interdisciplinary teams directly reporting to AECOM as well as we have a suite of cooperating agencies to help inform that discussion...experts in their fields.

Mariah Oxford: Ok so with this example of 600 pages of information that needs to be reviewed in order to draft prepared by the end of year. You would have a team of people looking at it, sitting around on the table talking whether or not a particular chapter that was valid?

Shane McCoy: Well, they would be using the scientific data to inform their analysis and I am not going to suspect anything, but they are again a whole suite of folks including State agencies that they are helping inform our analysis.

Mariah Oxford: Ok, thanks. Could you quickly let us know who those cooperating agencies are?

Shane McCoy: Yes, certainly. United States Coastguard is one, Department of Interior Bureau Safety and Environmental Enforcement is another, Advisory Council on Historic Properties, the United States EPA, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, State of Alaska, and the associate's agencies within, The Lake and Pen Bureau, Trion Tribal Council, and Nondalton Tribal Council.

Mariah Oxford: Ok, thank you.

Shane McCoy: I am sorry. In addition, the National Park Services joined as well.

Mariah Oxford: Ok.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you Mariah.

Shane McCoy: I am sorry as well as PHMSA.

Somebody is asking what is the acronym stand for?

Shane McCoy: David, what is PHMSA stand for?

David Hazle: We are an administration with Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.

Shane McCoy: Thank you, David.

John Budnik: Alright, good question there. I think we got time and see if more questions out there. Back to you Becky.

Becky Bohrer: This is would be the last question for me. When you mentioned the District Engineer spoke with Governor Walker, is that Michael Brooks?

Shane McCoy: It is, Colonel Brooks.

Becky Bohrer: Thank you so much.

John Budnik: Thank you Becky. Back to you Stephen.

Stephen Lee: Nothing else, thanks guys.

John Budnik: Thank you Stephen. Tim Sohn.

Tim Sohn: No, I am all set. Thanks John. Thanks Shane.

John Budnik: Thank you.

Shane McCoy: Thank you. Tim Bradner.

Tim Bradner: Nothing for me. Thank you.

John Budnik: Thank you. Margie.

Margie Bauman: One last question. You mentioned one of the cooperating agencies is the Advisory Council on Historic Properties, would their interest be specifically on whether any of the activities that would permitted might have an adverse impact on historic properties?

Shane McCoy: That is correct.

Margie Bauman: Ok, thank you.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you. Margie. Jill back to you.

Jill Burke: No question for me. Thanks.

John Budnik: Ok, thank you. Mariah.

Mariah Oxford: Thanks. I don't have further question today.

John Budnik: Ok. Well, I think we pretty much exhausted with everyone questions. I just leave out to the open for any last question before we part of this month teleconference.

Tim Sohn: Sorry John, I do have one more.

John Budnik: Sure. Who is this?

Tim Sohn: Tim Sohn.

John Budnik: Yeah, sure. Go head Tim.

Tim Sohn: Circling all the way back to Becky's first question, the Governor's letter that

request for suspension has no effect, for the reason that Shane elaborated on? I am curious, who has the authority to suspend this? Would the Colonel District Engineer if you would say stop right now? Who has the authority to actually suspend it If the Governor does not.

Shane McCoy: It would be the District Engineer, but would have to be with regards to the regulation why we would suspend it.

Tim Sohn: Right. Ok if the reason was a rise within the regulation for proper rational to suspend this. It would be his decision.

Shane McCoy: Correct.

Tim Sohn: Alright, thanks.

John Budnik: Alright, thank you folks. Alright, I think we exhausted everyone questions there. Once again we really appreciate joining us today we hope you find this teleconference valuable. There are a lot of good discussions that came out from todays. Hopefully you have a great understanding with the Corps EIS process and our continuing path forward. If can be any further assistance, please do contact the Public Affairs office and myself is a good point of contact toward any inquiry that may arise and please do stay tuned for the next teleconference in the next month.

Shane McCoy: And this is Shane. As a closing note I would like to thank everyone who provided a line of inquiry prior to this. It is very help for me. Again, thank you for participating today.

****End of Call****