

Call number: 02-00-61B CD 2

TransAlaska Pipeline Hearings, August 29-30, 1969, Patty Gym-University of Alaska

Summary created by: Jacob Metoxen

Date(s) of creation of summary: 4/1/2013, 4/26/13

Notes: Originals on 7 inch reel. Master copy CD.

A man is discussing the Manhattan Project and the concern of transportation to the East Coast. He says the TAPS is essential regardless of the success or failure of the Manhattan Project. The pipeline system is economically viable without regard to alternative modes of transportation. He discusses Pipeline Technologists Incorporated, a leading pipeline engineering consulting firm with extensive experience in the subarctic environment was engaged to make an on the ground reconnaissance of a proposed route and figure out the technological feasibility of the pipeline. The work was done in the late summer and fall of 1968 and it culminated in a favorable 3 volume report. Volume one is relevant to this proceeding and is included as exhibit one to his presentation. The companies now including British Petroleum immediately proceeded to develop a project staff to continue to feasibility work and provide a nucleus for the design staff. The post prestigious personnel was assigned to the project and the decision to construct the pipeline was announced in February 1969. From the beginning of the investigation it has been obvious that the physical environment was and is the paramount design parameter for the pipeline. This had led to the adoption of a simple design technology. Design a structure to cause the least disturbance to the environment. Although simply stated, this philosophy has presented problems in its implementation. The problems have been accepted. He says advice has been sought from recognized experts in arctic construction. Dr. Harold Payton, formerly with the University of Alaska, has provided basic arctic knowledge from which the design criterion for the arctic pipeline was developed. The exhibit two, prepared by Dr. Payton, outlines the basis for the design criteria. Additionally, they contacted the arctic environmental engineering laboratory of the University of Alaska to perform certain research to augment the work. Basically the proper design of a pipeline in arctic condition dictates identification and location of soils that will remain stable when thawed. He says they engaged the services of Ralph Mallaccio [sp] of R&M engineering and geological consultants to supervise a proposed route to determine the best pipeline route based on soil stability. Analysis of the data by R&M led them to recommend a route along the Sagavanirktok River through a high pass in the Brooks Range and down the Dietrich River Valley along the initially projected route to Valdez. The route selected presents soil conditions that should allow burials except for 40-50 miles. Exhibit four is a series of aerial photographs taken at intervals along an entire route as well as some miscellaneous photographs of a pipeline right away of facilities of the Cook Inlet constructed years ago. Dames and Moore, seismic consultants, also provided assistance. Submarine soils and marine currents were also taken into note. Dames and Moore performed seismic research for an area between Yukon and Valdez and this information is submitted as exhibit five. Optimal locations for pumping station sites are discussed. The recording stops at 8:00.

The recording resumes at 8:20. Mr. Tussing is discussing the Department of the Interior. He says the demand for environmental stipulation arises from the fact that the companies have no incentive to minimize external costs. By internalizing the external costs by means of a schedule of fees or fines, the companies would be given an incentive to pay attention to environmental effects and to allocate their expenditures on environmental protection appropriately to the resource values and risks involved. It seems that a tentative but workable set of criteria for assessing the cost of environmental damage could be drawn up by a team in two months. He says he has one final observation: it is important that a substantial corridor on either side of the pipeline somehow be withdrawn from entry of the public land laws including the Homestead Act and public mining laws. It seems that state selection and management offer the only possibility of protection of lands after the end of the temporary withdraw for Native protests. He believes state laws are more pertinent than national laws in preserving the value of Alaska's lands. Mr. Mesh asks the panel if they have any questions. Dr. Glasgow says that he believes the man made reference to the fact that it didn't seem prudent to spend 1 million to save 50 thousand dollar resources. Dr. Glasgow says that most of the natural resources involved are renewable. Dr. Glasgow asks how the speaker would arrive at a figure of a renewable resource and compare to a case that the man is sighting. The man says in the case of any resource whether it is renew or exhaustible the damage...[Dr. Glasgow trails off] he says if the resource was never expected to be a commercial resource one has to be pretty arbitrary about setting a price. Dr. Glasgow says what he is saying is once you require an investment to protect a resource you have put a price on it. He thinks you have to offer to companies the expenditure of protecting the resource or paying the government and the people of the United States a price to protect the resource. He says the evaluation of all of these things is no individual commercial resource but just the fact that the area the pipeline traverses is now a very beautiful wilderness or semi wilderness area. The existence of pipeline does change that, particularly a pipeline road that will permit public access to an area. The panel members ask if the man considers the resources renewable and if managed properly will they be here forever. The speaker says he's talking about a permanent resource, not a renewable one. He says he couldn't speak of the prospective damage of the caribou. Mr. Mesh asks Mr. Tussing if he has a statement he would like to introduce. Mr. Tussing says he has written copy along with three appendixes. This is exhibit 32.

A fifteen minute recess is taken at 16:30 of the recording.

The recording resumes at 16:35. The next witness is professor Charles Konigsberg, Alaska Methodist University, Anchorage, Alaska. He teaches political science and he thinks it should be called political ecology. Konigsberg brought his family to Alaska in anticipation of a life hopefully devoid of many of the ills from other states and American society. He says a delay in the TAPS project would benefit everyone. He does know that he is qualified as to his own conscious and it is to that that he must speak. He says it is extraordinarily difficult to change views and patterns of behavior. He says people must be consulted directly and the decision should be theirs to make. He suggests that a primary reason to think and act in such a revolutionary situation is that we insist on using words and concepts other than what's going on. He says no one has the right to change our environment without our consent. He says we need a natural environment and wilderness. The wilderness is our most precious resource. He says he disagrees with Professor Tussing that the wilderness should be talked about in economic terms. He

would rather retain mystery in wilderness. He says the TAPS project is of enormous consequence to people everywhere. New drugs and chemicals are discussed. The message to Mr. Konigsberg is clear, if you are uncertain don't do it. He says if there are costs involved in a delay then let's pay them. Mr. Konigsberg is a retired Air Force Colonel and Command Pilot. The only approach that can begin to save us is the planning that he has touched on in his speech. He says for Americans, Alaska is truly the last chance.

At 29:05, Sharon M. Cissna of Anchorage, Alaska is introduced as the next witness. She would like to request reading portions of statements from two people who schedule to speak at the hearing but were unable to be present. Mr. Mesch asks her if she can keep the whole presentation within 15 minutes. She says she will try her very hardest. The first statement is by Helen Nienhueser. Mrs. Nienhueser says she is in favor of the proposed BLM governing construction of the pipeline. Mrs. Nienhueser says there is no rush to get the oil out except for the ones who stand to profit from the oil. She does not feel that the federal government should turn over the project to the state of Alaska. She mentions the disaster of the Hickel Highway. The first statement just read is marked as exhibit 33. The second statement read by Ms. Cissna is from Dr. Richard T. Myren. Mr. Myren says he wishes the presentation would be made part of the hearings of the department of the interior for consideration of granting permits for arctic oil. Mr. Myren says oil is threatening the existence of the arctic. Is it right to permit the loss of one at the expense of another? He opposed the granting of oil pipeline permits. He says that the stored oil should be saved when foreign oil sources are gone. If the demographers are right then such continued population growth cannot go unchecked. There is the addition of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere and the increase that must be checked. Some believe that the use of fire and combustion of fuels will reduce the amount of oxygen available for life. The denial for future generations forever through better alternatives is perhaps the greatest sin we can commit. Mr. Myren's statement is marked as exhibit 34. Mrs. Cissna will now present her testimony. She is a citizen and resident and taxpayer of the state of Alaska. She is a resident of Anchorage, Alaska, a secretary in the petroleum industry, a member of hiking and climbing groups, and a member of nature preservation groups. She belongs to the under 30 generation. This group will dominate the decision making in the coming decades. She says many words have been heard who will not have to live in the mess that they may allow to proceed. She says people have been gathered by the BLM of the Interior Department to comment regarding the stipulations for the construction of the proposed pipeline. The stipulation reflects a false feeling that we are ready for construction. She says not only are the stipulations premature no matter how fine they may be, she wishes to halt the destruction of the North Slope of Alaska. There has been an alluring quality about virgin country. People in Alaska have been moved by exporting industries that promise riches and the development of Alaska. The few experiences that Alaska has had should have taught an essential lesson required for the preservation of the very qualities Alaska has chosen to live with. She says the state of Alaska doesn't have one state park. The potential has been oil land. She says the native has been cheated by the state and federal government. She finds it difficult with the present rush to expect the contractor or taps officials to stop cold should a problem arise which would damage or harm the ecology. She says she is not alone in her generation in her cry for the necessity of control. She says a halt must be made to ensure safety for future generations. She says she would like to submit her statement within the 15 days deadline.

The next witness is Eban Hopson, executive director of Arctic Slope Native Association at 45:30 of the recording. There is no response from Mr. Hopson. The next witness is Daniel Osborne, Alaska Alpine Club.

Mr. Osborne says he comes to ask for the scenic protection of the Alaskan country that the pipeline will traverse, especially the Richardson Highway area. The Alaska Alpine Club proposes that a scenic corridor be established along the Richardson highway from Donnelly Dome to Paxson. The TAPS Company has established the Isabel Pass route as an area for pipe construction. They contain open tundra, tall spruce forests, wild rivers, high scenic mountains, and glaciers. This can all be viewed by tourists in Alaska from their car windshield. This area and many of the areas in Alaska are now unimproved by man. He says it is fruitless to keep the oil in the ground because we are a car orientated society. He asks to keep the visible pollution away from the roads. As an individual he has been observing the state and state government for quite a while. He was horrified by the pollution of Fairbanks and went to the State Office of Environment Services. The man informed Mr. Osborne that he was the only man in charge of environmental services north of Glenn Allen. He said he had no control of any of the development. The man complained of being the only man patrolling everything above of Glenn Allen and the state refused to give him the manpower and money. He says the Chena smells. The state government of Alaska has asked permission of the federal government to be sole person in charge of the pipeline.

The next witness is Gerald Ganopole, consulting geologist from Anchorage, Alaska. For the past 21 years he has worked for the oil industry. For the past 10 years he has lived in Anchorage and had the opportunities to explore many parts of Alaska. He spent a good deal of time in the Brooks Range and North Slope. He has found that Alaska has the magnificence, the abundance, and variety of the natural scene. He says Alaska is now faced with the gigantic oil field in a unique and fragile area in Alaska, the arctic tundra. Most of the forests of cedar of Lebanon were chopped down to create an arid desert. Because of the lack of government regulation, vast herds of buffaloes were exterminated in a few years. With no government regulations, a pipeline could create physical hazards that would cross 100 percent of the width of Alaska. He says he can only recommend that the pipeline be built in a way that the visual effects are negligible. He says he is unable to determine if their total effect will produce and guarantee a safe passageway. The stipulations should be an enforceable method of achieving an unobtrusive pipeline. With science and technology, man has reached the stars; sociologically man has failed to step out of the cave. Mr. Ganopole's statement is exhibit 35.

The next witness is Donald R. Bruce, Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce. He is president of the Greater Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce. He has a testimony representing over 500 businesses in the area. He has been shocked to hear all of the testimony stating how stupid Alaskans are and they can't take care of themselves. The discovery of oil in commercial oil in Prudhoe Bay in July 1968 has been the motivating factor in changes of interior and arctic Alaska. The basic economy has been affected. Alaska has become the focal point of a national controversy over the conservation of natural resources. These are the problems of growth. He doesn't think there can be any serious disagreement with a concept that such industrial development and sound conservation practices are compatible. What is debatable are the rules to which we proceed to accomplish the end desire. It is his purpose to stress the action

based on a common sense approach. He does object to the conservation of the areas affected by activities and forthcoming construction of a pipeline to serve the area. On the contrary he applauds such efforts. What he does object to is the reluctance of the Department of the Interior to expedite action in issuing permits to allow construction of the pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez. In this connection he cannot urge too strongly that in setting up the guidelines to which development of the arctic regions will be carried out, full use of the expertise of the many Alaskans be made. Full use of the knowledge available combined with modern technology and equipment makes it possible to develop with minimal disturbance of the northern environment. We have a healthy respect for the permafrost and fully appreciate the necessity of preserving the covering tundra. Hundreds of miles of roads have been built across the lands. A railroad has been built 440 miles into the interior from Tidewater. Landing strips have dotted the area, all without permanently damaging what is now emotionally referred to as the "delicate ecology of this land in which we live." We can and will build a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez and open the world's greatest known oil reserves and used for the enjoyment of the people of our nation and of the world. An all-weather road can and will be built from Fairbanks to Prudhoe Bay. We can and we will build an extension of the Alaska railroad from Fairbanks to the same areas. We can and we will build a feeder of auxiliary air fields. All of this we can do and will do in the best possible spirit of conservation. No one can be more concerned in the preservation of the natural environment in which we live and work than those of us that have made the great land what it is today. He asks to be granted the opportunity to share the knowledge they have gained. Time is of the essence and the relatively few hundred acres involved in the TAPS have been studied time and time again. He suggests that what is needed is positive action through the construction of a pipeline. Mr. Bruce's statement is marked as exhibit number 36.

The next witness is Mike Dalton from Fairbanks, Alaska. Cathleen Mike Dalton begins her statement at 1:05:55. She is a resident of Fairbanks and also a reporter for the farthest north newspaper the Daily News Monitor. She says people appreciate the real interest and concern and she thanks the panel for hearing testimony. Her personal feelings on the subject do not matter. She came here to filter out fact from fantasy. Too much heresy and unfounded fact has been printed about Alaska. Truth has also been published. She'd like to read her prepared statement and make one comment. Recent testimony read by Sharon Cissna of Anchorage from Helen Millhousen demonstrates what she is talking about. She described the disastrous effect of the Hickel Highway. Another person has referred to this project as a hideous slash across the country. In her work with the farthest northern serving newspaper in the United States (which covers an area bigger than Texas), she tries to deal in facts only. She's lived in Alaska for 20 years, including 5 years in the North Slope. She has flown over the North Slope too many times to count. She has driven and ridden snow machines. She even dog sledged over it. She doesn't pretend to be an expert in any field but she has been around for a while. Back to what she came to talk about...fact. Too much opinion is born on heresy. She is going to give a specific example. This was an irresponsible piece of reporting and possibly is the cause of some of the comments like disastrous effect of the Hickel Highway and hideous slash. This concerns the winter road from Livengood to Sagone [?] of the slope. A large Alaskan newspaper described a winter road as 400 miles of water filled ditch. Many people reading that article believed what they read but it simply wasn't true. How many people don't know that was true. The winter road from Livengood followed an important trail that many men in the

room have used for freight handling. The Bettles airport was built by Lytle and Green in the mid-40s. From the Yukon it followed the same trail from Bettles. That winter trail has been available for 65 years and it has not been a water filled ditch. North of Bettles the trail intersected the John River and followed the John up to the Anaktuvuk village and subsequently hit the head water of the Anaktuvuk Rivers and subsequently followed the river downstream to a point in Umiat. From Umiat from Sagwon it crossed the tundra that tundra was frozen and it wasn't excavated. It was bladed from the top but it wasn't excavated. The John River and the Anaktuvuk River naturally are water filled in the summer months. In the winter they are frozen ice, they could not have been disturbed by the passage of winter trucks because ice disturbs itself. More than half of that winter trail follows the frozen rivers and follows another 196 miles of already established trails that had not been turned into water filled ditches. She hopes the panel considers what she said in her final decision. Secretary Train is thanked for coming and she hopes he will return and there will be another productive dialog when everyone in the state of Alaska get interested in reestablishing over 5 million acres of forest lands that were destroyed in the summer. She names many animals that need to be helped. Her statement is marked as exhibit number 37.

The next witness is Dan Swift from Tanana Yukon Chapter of the Alaskan Conservation Society at 1:13:35. His name is Daniel W. Swift. He is president of the Tanana Yukon Chapter of the Alaskan Conservation Society based in the Fairbanks area. He would first like to comment on some of the side implications of the pipeline. The pipeline route was selected on minimal cost and environmental disturbance. Along with the pipeline comes a road. Given the present plans for the pipeline this road will follow a different route than from the Hickel Highway. He says also heard is that there is a development of plans for a railroad. The railroad probably will not want to be laid out along the route of the pipeline because the pipeline is projected to go over Dietrich Pass which is considerably higher than the Anaktuvuk Pass route. The point is that people are pushing ahead for the pipeline development and railroad and no planning is really being done. The pipeline routing has not been laid out with any of the other longer considerations in mind. Railroads and highway more provide effects than just getting supplies from one place to another. The highways also attract recreation, hunting, mineral exploration. The point is that these factors must also be considered. In addition, along the Hickel highway route is talk to gates to the Arctic National Park. Such a park must have a road access but should not be bisected by settlement or the scars of commercial development or mining activity. The point is that the pipeline is not part of a comprehensive transportation network and it should be. The pipeline should be delayed or the planning should be accelerated so there is a comprehensive plan for the development of the area. As for the stipulations, they are very comprehensive. The BLM has been doing an excellent job. The Alaska Water Lab and Geological Survey and Department of Fish and Game have contributed to a fine document. The recording ends.