

**Federal/State Proposed
Oil and Gas Lease Sale
(Sale BF)**

Public Hearings

Barrow I

1979

ALASKA OCS OFFICE
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

JUN 19 3 41 PM '79

PUBLIC HEARING

FEDERAL/STATE BEAUFORT SEA PROPOSED OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE

Hearing held on June 4, 1979, at the North Slope Borough Assembly Room, Barrow, Alaska regarding Joint Federal/State Beaufort Sea proposed oil and gas lease sale. The hearing commenced at 7:45 p.m. and adjourned at 4:00 a.m., June 5, 1979.

The attached is a verbatim transcript of said hearing.

P A N E L M E M B E R S

MR. HENRY NOLDAN, Chairman U. S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Washington, D.C.

MR. HOYLE HAMILTON Oil and Gas Commission
Anchorage, Alaska

MR. DAVE PAGE U. S. Department of the Interior
Office of Energy and Minerals
Washington, D.C.

MS LENNIE BOSTON Department of Natural Resources
Office of the Commissioner
Juneau, Alaska

TOM COOK Department of Natural Resources
Anchorage, Alaska

JERRY GILLILEND Special Assistant to Secretary
of Interior
Anchorage, Alaska

INTERPRETER

MS MOLLY PETERSON

P A R T I C I P A N T S

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3	EBEN HOPSON	8
4	BRIAN MACLEAN (Representing Mayor Nate Olemaun	14
5	SUZANNE WELLER	17
6	ELISE PATKOTAK	21
7	ALAN A. ALLEN	27
8	CHRIS MCDERMOTT	39
9	RONALD BROWER	43
10	JOHN CARNAHAN	47
11	EMILY WILSON (Representing Raymond Paneak)	52
12	FLOSSIE HOPSON	53
13	MOLLY PETERSON	62
14	EDITH NASHOALOOK (Representing Mary Ann Warden)	64
15	DANIEL LEAVITT	66
16	RAYMOND NEOKOK	68
17	CARL M. HILD	72
18	DALE BROWER STOTTS	75
19	MARTHA STACKHOUSE	79
20	DON LONG	81
21	LORRIE KINGIK	90
22	ROGER SILOOK	82
23	ROSMAN PEETOOK	91
24	TERRY TAGAROOK	84
25	JOSEPH NOONGWOOK	84

1	<u>PARTICIPANTS (Continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
2	AMOS AGNOSOGA	84
3	PAT HUGO	86
4	ALFRED LEAVITT	92
5	FLORENCE AHMAOGOK	87
6	THOMAS NUSUNGINYA	90
7	ANNIE BROWER	92
8	WILLIAM F. BROWN	93
9	MORGAN SOLOMAN	95
10	LISA VONSEGAZER	97
11	JOASH TUKLE	98
12	EDITH NASHOALOOK	99
13	ARNOLD BROWER, SR.	101
14	MIKE JEFFERY	104
15	GEORGE AHMOOGAK	123
16	DAVID BENTON	125
17	ROBERT TILDEN	131
18	MAE RINA HANK	144
19	NUVUK KUNUK	146
20	BOB WORL	146
21	GEORGE EDWARDSON	165
22	RIGGS, PETER	169
23		
24		
25		

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 HENRY NOLDAN, Chairman presiding: I'd like to start the
3 hearing now. My name is Henry Noldan. I'm from the Department
4 of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management in Washington, D.C.
5 I've been asked to chair the hearing this evening. At this
6 time, I'd like to introduce the other panel members. The Gentleman
7 on my left, perhaps you know, is Tom Cook representing the State
8 of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources. Next to Tom is
9 Jerry Gilliland, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior
10 here in Alaska. Next to Jerry is Hoyle Hamilton, from the State
11 of Alaska, Oil and Gas Commission. Next to Hoyle is David Page,
12 Department of the Interior, Energy and Minerals. He also is
13 from Washington, D.C. And finally, the lady on the left is
14 Lennie Boston, Special Assistant to the Commissioner of Natural
15 Resources from here in Alaska. We have come to the North Slope
16 to hear what you have to say about the proposed sale in the
17 Beaufort Sea and the EIS which the BLM and the State have prepared.
18 No decision has yet been made about whether the State and the
19 Federal Government will go ahead with the sale. We all know
20 that in a few months, the Governor and the Secretary of the
21 Interior will have to make up their minds and decide, one way
22 or the other, as to whether there should be a sale. The reason
23 we are hear is because we want to make you a part of making
24 that decision by testifying here tonight; and we will make sure
25 that that information that you give us will get to the Governor

1 and get to the Secretary of Interior before they make up their
2 minds on the sale decision. Here is how we will hold this hearing.
3 Anyone who wants to testify can do so. By the way, I do have
4 a list of those already that have signed up, but I'm sure that
5 there will be others that would like to testify and once I run
6 through this list of names, I probably will ask you to stand,
7 if you would, and come forward and testify. If you testify
8 in English, please give us your name first, perhaps you could
9 spell it for us too. Everything you say will go directly into
10 the record. If you would like to testify in Inupiat, everything
11 you say will still go into the record, but it will take a bit
12 of extra work on our part. Here's how we will handle the Inupiat
13 testimony. You will get up and tell us your name, then you
14 will say what you have to say in Inupiat. We will not interrupt
15 you while you are talking. We will record everything you say
16 and make sure it goes into the record. After we go back to
17 Anchorage, we will have a translator, and perhaps you know Molly,
18 and others will work on the translation and translate it into
19 English for our use. We will also use your testimony when we
20 rewrite the EIS. As you know, it's only a Draft Environmental
21 Impact Statement now, and we must correct that draft and make
22 a final statement out of it, with the help of your testimony.
23 Your testimony here tonight, obviously, is very important to
24 us and it will help us improve this EIS. And, of course, as
25 I said earlier, it will help us bring that information to the

1 decision makers and that will be the Governor and the Secretary
2 of Interior. It will certainly help us decide what to do in
3 the Beaufort Sea. At the conclusion of the presentation of
4 each of the testimony, the members of the hearing panel may
5 ask you some questions and the reason we do that is just to
6 clarify your testimony so that we understand it better as it
7 goes into the record. We are here to listen to you as a hearings
8 panel and that's all we're here for. We're really not here
9 to get into lengthy discussions with anyone here. Our job is
10 to get all the testimony we can from you people, individually,
11 so that it can go into the record and be used in our offices
12 in Washington and in Juneau. We may ask you to watch your time,
13 but I'm sure that will be no problem for us. And at that, I
14 will conclude the statement and ask Molly to summarize what
15 I just said in Inupiat and following that, I will ask two of
16 the members of the panel to describe the map you see back here,
17 which is the outline of the proposed sale area. That may help
18 all of us in understanding the area that we're talking about.
19 Thank you. Molly?

20 INTERPRETER: (Inupiat)

21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Molly. At this time, I'll ask Robert
22 Brock, who represents BLM's OCS office in Anchorage, to describe
23 the map and he will be assisted by Tom Cook, from the State.

24 TOM COOK: Do you want me to identify it here on this map?

25 (Mr. Cook is indicating a large wall map of State of
Alaska.)

1 CHAIRMAN: Fine.

2 TOM COOK: The sale area under consideration extends on
3 the east from the Staines River or Canning River, westward past
4 Prudhoe Bay to the Return Islands and approximately in this
5 area right here, just west of Prudhoe Bay. It would be a distance
6 along the coastline from here to here.

7 BOB BROCK: So, on this map, this is the far east portion
8 of the sale area and this is the far west portion which Tom
9 pointed out. It would be right to the west of Prudhoe Bay.
10 The area you see colored in blue is the State, uncontested State
11 owned property. That is all State owned. And the area that's
12 in yellow, this fringe along this side, is all the uncontested
13 Federal area. The area in red is the area that both the Federal
14 Government and the State believe they own and it will probably
15 take a Court decision to actually determine the ownership, but
16 it's all in the sale area. The Barrier Islands, you can't see
17 them from back there, but they're right down the center of this
18 blue area. So that means the State owns three miles on both
19 sides and that's the area you see. From here out is seaward
20 of the Barrier Islands. This is the area inbetween the Barrier
21 Islands and the shoreline. Each one, just to give you an idea,
22 from this point right there to this point right here is approximately
23 three miles. So it gives you an idea of what..the size of the
24 map is. It's about one hundred miles from here to here and
25 it goes off shore from the Barrier Islands at the very maximum,

1 six miles is out to the very points of these areas. That's seaward
2 of the Barrier Islands.

3 DON LONG: Sir, I have a question. The statement that you
4 just made, uh, is it going to be interpreted? Or the questions
5 to you will be interpreted in Eskimo, you know, we didn't quite
6 get that.

7 INTERPRETER: (Inupiat)

8 BOB BROCK: Okay?

9 INTERPRETER: You want me to explain...

10 BOB BROCK: Yeah, explain what I just said here.

11 INTERPRETER: (Inupiat)

12 BOB BROCK: The far western point, Flaxman Island's right
13 here. This is the Simpson Lagoon area which was omitted from
14 the sale area, the proposed sale area, prior to the time the
15 tracts were selected. You might just add that so...

16 INTERPRETER: (Inupiat)

17 BOB BROCK: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN: At this time, I will begin calling the names
19 of those that have signed up to testify. First, Eben Hopson,
20 North Slope Borough. Please.

21 EBEN HOPSON: I thought you were going to read the list
22 down.

23 CHAIRMAN: No.

24 EBEN HOPSON: Okay. Mr. Chairman, let me explain for a
25 moment. The cotton ball on my eye glasses, I'm still nursing

1 a surgical wound, just last week done on my eye. That's why
2 I'm protecting it from the weight of my eyeglasses. Anyway...
3 I have a very short testimony I will read and uh, I know that
4 everybody else is going to want some time to present their own
5 testimony. Good evening, Mr. Chairman. As Mayor of the North
6 Slope Borough, I welcome you here tonight to conduct these final
7 public hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
8 on the Beaufort Sea sale. Responding to the State's off shore
9 lease sale schedule circulated last fall, the Borough asked
10 that the joint sale be delayed or cancelled. There is nothing
11 in the Draft EIS before you to cause us to change our stand.
12 In fact, we regard the EIS to be inadequate; to be yet another
13 reason to delay the sale. I am personally against any Arctic
14 off shore operations at this time because they are technically
15 premature, economically unnecessary. The joint sale schedule
16 is not in the National interest. The sale is, in fact, against
17 the best interests of Alaska and the United States. Since the
18 organization of the North Slope in 1972, I have had to struggle
19 to defend our home rule government from the unrelenting political
20 and legal attacks of the Prudhoe Bay oil and gas operators.
21 At the same time, we have worked to gain the political respect
22 of the oil industry, the State of Alaska, and the Federal Govern-
23 ment, and win their cooperation with our work to protect our
24 homeland from environmental harm and damage. When I became
25 Mayor, I swore to uphold the laws of the State of Alaska, and

1 I have taken my oath of office seriously. I have tried to balance
2 the needs of our Prudhoe Bay taxpayers with the rights of our
3 citizens. I have bent over backwards to be fair, open, and
4 honest with all parties concerned with the entire question of
5 Arctic off shore leasing and operations. We acknowledge this
6 question to be of important National interest. My staff and
7 I have gone to great lengths to learn about off shore oil and
8 gas operations here and elsewhere throughout the world. We
9 have provided political and professional leadership to Alaska's
10 Coastal Management Program, and we are in process of developing
11 our own District Coastal Management Plan and legal regime. We
12 have conducted a National and International public education
13 program to bring world attention to the risks of Arctic off
14 shore operations. We have cooperated closely with the Federal
15 Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment Program to
16 which we have given monetary, professional and political support.
17 I even secured my party's Congressional nomination in 1976 to
18 use the campaign to promote Arctic off shore environmental safety.
19 In short, we have gone out of our way to cooperate with the State
20 and Federal preparations for the joint sale. But how has the
21 State of Alaska and the Federal Government responded to all
22 these questions? Number one, in 1976 the Corps of engineers
23 issued a permit for Union Oil's East Harrison Bay wildcat after
24 we asked them not to do so. Number two, 1976 the State Department
25 of Natural Resources and the Corp of engineers bypassed the

1 Borough and the villages completely to issue a permit for Exxon's
2 Duck Island wildcat. Number three, in 1977 the U. S. Department
3 of Commerce disclosed a quiet conspiracy to use unsubstantiated
4 allegations of over hunting to manipulate the International
5 Whaling Commission to ban our Bowhead Whaling. Blaming the
6 Nixon Administration, Commerce then joined the State Department
7 and the Justice Department against the Interior Department to
8 defend international jurisdiction over our whaling before the
9 U. S. Supreme Court. Number four, in 1978, the Department of
10 Commerce issued subsistence Bowhead regulations without using
11 due process afforded to us by the Marine Mammal Protection Act
12 and Endangered Species Act. Number five, in 1978, disregarding
13 all agreements to keep the Point Thompson area from the joint
14 lease sale; ignoring all the advice of the Borough and the Arctic
15 environmental scientists; and with no previous public notice
16 or discussion, Governor Hammond announced the State's Point
17 Thompson sale as a political strategy of his 1978 re-election
18 campaign, an incredible breach of good faith. Number six, earlier
19 this year, the Commissioner of Natural Resources and other State
20 employees were discovered cooperating with Sohio-BP lobbyists
21 in Juneau to draft legislation suspending our Borough's planning
22 and zoning authority at Prudhoe Bay and the joint sale area
23 off shore. Throughout all this harrassment, we have kept our
24 patience; but we have lost much of the faith and trust we originally
25 brought to our cooperation with the Beaufort Sea Environmental

1 Impact Statement. Mr. Chairman, these take place at a time
2 when our Nation's leaders now speak openly of possible nationali-
3 zation of what has become a badly distrusted American oil and
4 gas industry. The President and the Congress are having a dif-
5 ficult time agreeing on a coherent National Energy Policy, largely
6 because of this lack of public confidence in the industry. But
7 however imperfect and distrusted it may be, our existing National
8 Energy Policy includes the National Coastal Zone Management
9 Program. Yet, the Department of the Interior wants to conduct
10 the Beaufort Sea sale before a reliable Arctic Coastal Management
11 Program is in place. As we understand it, Congress enacted
12 the Coastal Zone Management Act to establish equitable and demo-
13 cratic means through which to prepare for Federal off shore
14 oil and gas leasing and operations. Therefore, the North Slope
15 Borough will no longer cooperate with the Beaufort Sea sale
16 preparations other than through the procedures of the Coastal
17 Zone Management Program. I'd like to repeat that last sentence.
18 Therefore, the North Slope Borough will not longer cooperate
19 with the Beaufort Sea sale preparations other than through the
20 procedures of the Coastal Zone Management Program. We will
21 oppose, all the way to the Supreme Court, any attempt to lease
22 before our Arctic Coastal Zone Management regime is in place.
23 For where trust is lacking, due process must be carefully observed.
24 In the past we have worked to hold the joint sale to within
25 the Barrier Islands. No more. We will now oppose all off shore

1 leasing on either side of the Barrier Islands not consistent
2 with our Coastal Zone Management Regulations. Finally, I feel
3 the EIS is deficient by not detailing an important alternative
4 to off shore leasing at this time, Arctic on shore field con-
5 solidation. The oil and gas industry's money would be better
6 spent to develop and consolidate our Arctic on shore reserves
7 on NPR-A and eastward to include any oil under the Arctic National
8 Wildlife Range. This alternative would yield oil and gas needed
9 today, while giving us time to plan safe Arctic off shore oper-
10 ations tomorrow. With your permission, I would like to submit
11 a copy of my recent testimony about this option before the Com-
12 mittee Hearings of our State Legislature. Please include it
13 in the record of these hearings. I think you have copies. I
14 gave it March 31, that was presented to the Committee at the
15 Legislature. Thank you Mr. Chairman, for holding these hearings
16 in Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and here in Barrow. Decisions made now
17 regarding the joint sale will cause serious impact upon our
18 community for generations to come. I hope and pray that Govern-
19 ment will make the right decision. Mr. Chairman, that's the
20 extent of my testimony and I request that both, that I just
21 delivered, at the one delivered to the Joint Committee of the
22 Legislature, dated March 31, be included as part of the record
23 of these hearings.

24 (Both above mentioned documents are included
25 in Attachment.)

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Eben. We have that in the record.

1 EBEN HOPSON: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Are there any questions
3 from the panel? (No response) Thank you very much, Eben. Nate
4 Olemaun, City of Barrow?

5 BRIAN MACLEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. City Mayor Olemaun
6 has asked me to extend his apologies for not being able to be
7 here in person this evening to present his testimony. He was
8 unable to make proper flight connections that would have allowed
9 him to be present this evening.

10 CHAIRMAN: And your name, Sir?

11 BRIAN MACLEAN: I'm Brian MacLean. I was getting to that
12 in just a second.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

14 BRIAN MACLEAN: Mayor Olemaun has asked me to read into
15 the record, his prepared statement. For your record, I'm Brian
16 MacLean. I'm City Manager for the City of Barrow. The testimony
17 I'm about to present is the prepared statement of City Mayor,
18 Nate Olemaun. Please bear that in mind. As an Official, elected
19 to represent my community, I welcome this opportunity to speak
20 on behalf of my people. I feel that my views are representative
21 of my community as a whole. We have grave concerns about the
22 effect the oil development activities will have on our environment.
23 Our culture is closely tied to and in tune with the cyclic sequence
24 of nature. To disrupt or change nature's cycle is to alter
25 the foundations of our cultural heritage. We realize that we

1 are presently in a state of constant change. It is our cultural
2 heritage that gives us strength, pride and guidance during these
3 days of Inupiat development. We realize the need for the develop-
4 ment of the natural resource industry here on the North Slope
5 and we realize the benefits that we receive from this development.
6 The City of Barrow has gone on record before and will again
7 state for the record, that we are not opposed to the rational
8 and orderly development extraction of our natural resources;
9 however, we are opposed to resource development when it threatens
10 the very existence of our cultural being. In the case at hand,
11 we feel that the present levels of technology are not sufficient
12 enough to guarantee that the environment and wildlife resources
13 we depend on for cultural and physical survival will be unaltered
14 or undamaged to a degree that will ensure our continued mutually
15 beneficial relationship between the Inupiat people and their
16 environment. What is particularly disturbing is that off the
17 record, oil companies agree with us. In reviewing the Environmental
18 Impact Statement for the proposed lease area, I must admit that
19 I found it difficult reading at times. I will leave to those
20 more learned than I to expound on the discrepancies of the report
21 and to point out how the present levels of technology can offer
22 us no assurance of an accident pre development, extraction,
23 transportation of oil and gas. In many instances, our respected
24 elders shared with us their vast experience and observations,
25 just as many times the scientific community and oil industry

1 officials refused to accept their expertise. An expertise gained
2 not only from a lifetime of experience and interaction with
3 the Arctic environment, but also from an inbred closeness with
4 the forces of nature that dates back not hundreds of years,
5 but thousands of years. True, many of the Inupiat experts may
6 not be able to explain precise mathematical formulas or equations
7 on why nature acts in a certain way, but when our Inupiat experts
8 talk, we listen. When it comes to deciding between the credibility
9 of a learned scientist that's based his information on data
10 gathered mostly in the last fifteen to twenty-five years, or
11 that of a learned Arctic Inupiat expert who bases his judgement
12 not only upon his lifetime of experience but upon the countless
13 lifetimes of experience of his ancestors. I will choose the
14 Inupiat expert over the scientific expert every time. When
15 an Inupiat expert says something will happen, it's just a matter
16 of time until it comes to pass. In closing, I would like to
17 say once again, that the Inupiat people depend upon their environ-
18 ment and wildlife resources for their cultural and physical
19 survival. It would only take one accident to disrupt the sensitive
20 balance we have achieved with nature through countless years
21 and generations. We believe, contrary to the testimony of some
22 oil company officials, that present levels of technology are
23 not sufficient to guarantee that our environment and cultural
24 heritage won't be seriously damaged beyond salvation. We want
25 to co-exist equally with the resource industry, not be over

1 shadowed by it. It has been our experience that the greatest
2 good for the greatest number is often given as an excuse for
3 allowing progress to continue at the expense of a few. If such
4 must happen in this case, we would urge that our voice be heard
5 and the damage be as minimal as possible. We believe that the
6 following recommendations, if followed, will help dampen the
7 adverse effects of oil development at this time. Number one,
8 oil development activities must be limited to the Barrier Islands
9 only. Number two, oil development activities must be prohibited
10 in the river delta regions. Number three, no oil development
11 activities should occur in places or at times that might disturb
12 the wildlife resources that we depend on for our survival. Number
13 four, that the advice and wisdom of our Inupiat elders be fol-
14 lowed when reconning with the forces and powers of nature. And
15 that concludes Mayor Olemaun's testimony. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Brian and would you please
17 thank Nate for his testimony?

18 BRIAN MACLEAN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN: Tim Bradner, Sohio-BP?

20 TIM BRADNER: Sir, I would like to defer my testimony until
21 later to give others an opportunity to give theirs.

22 CHAIRMAN: All right. Suzanne Weller, Trustees for Alaska?

23 SUZANNE WELLER: Good evening. My name is Suzanne Weller
24 and I'm testifying tonight on behalf of Trustees for Alaska,
25 a non profit organization dedicated to advise management of

1 Alaska's unique natural and cultural resources. It is our position
2 that the Beaufort Sea lease sale should be delayed; not for
3 a specific period of time, but until we receive adequate assurances
4 that the North Slope environment and the people who depend on
5 that environment will be adequately protected. Our written
6 comments will address many more of the reasons why we advocate
7 the delay, but I want to talk about two of these here. Namely,
8 the Borough Coastal Zone Management Plan and the National Environ-
9 mental Policy Act requirement that environmental impact be in-
10 vestigated and ascertained before a decision is made. First,
11 the North Slope Borough Coastal Management Plan. The same govern-
12 ments which may comit themselves to this lease sale in December
13 comitted themselves to a strong Coastal Management Program a
14 few years ago. However, in the rush to conduct this sale on
15 schedule, Coastal Zone Management seems to have been forgotten.
16 The North Slope Borough, however, has not forgotten about its
17 duty to plan for the future of its coastal resources. Rather
18 than ignoring Coastal Zone Management, as the Federal and Govern-
19 ments seem to do in this case, the Borough has speeded up its
20 planning efforts and concentrated them on the first area expected
21 to be developed, the Beaufort Sea. Borough consultants issues
22 a draft Coastal Zone Management Plan for the Prudhoe Bay area
23 this fall and a hearing on implementing ordinances was held
24 this afternoon in this building. The Borough's plan is expected
25 to be submitted to the State for approval this fall. But it

1 won't be approved and implemented until after December. The
2 Borough has speeded up its planning process in an effort to
3 meet a December deadline but considerable controversy remains
4 regarding the proposed program. A delay in the sale would allow
5 the Borough to refine its plan, consult further with representatives
6 of the diverse interests involved and would reduce some uncertainties
7 regarding the effects of the program on oil and gas operations
8 in the Beaufort Sea. As the EIS itself noted on page 381, the
9 Borough plan, quote, "is expected to establish concise and uniform
10 standards for land and water use in the Prudhoe Bay area." End
11 quote. And the result of delaying the sale until the plan is
12 in place would be provision of, quote, "better planning guidelines
13 to both industry and Federal Government." The Draft EIS, with
14 its one half page discussion of the delay alternatives, makes
15 out an impressive case for waiting for the Borough plan. We
16 hope the Federal and State Governments will heed their own advice
17 as well as suggestions made by interested groups and by the
18 people of the Borough and delay the sale until the Borough plan
19 is completed, approved and fully implemented. I just wanted
20 to talk for a minute about NEPA's requirements, too. The first
21 thing that struck me when I read through the Beaufort Sea EIS
22 was the number of unanswered questions it contains. But we
23 appreciate the author's candor in exposing data gaps, but their
24 disclosure of the areas which remain unknown is not enough to
25 meet NEPA's requirements. The Beaufort Sea is an area where

1 crucial information has been and can be prepared if the invest-
2 ment is made in time and in money. Even the most simple questions
3 are without answers than a DEIS. What a bowhead migration routes?
4 Do bowheads feed in the area? If they do feed what do they
5 eat? Where do they calf? The National Marine Fisheries in
6 August stated that available information was insufficient to
7 determine whether the bowhead would be affected by oil and gas
8 activities in the Beaufort Sea, and set out data that must be
9 built before a decision on the sale. However, the EIS had page
10 eighty-four admits that, "Not all this information will be available
11 to the secretary where the final decision making". Additional
12 areas where answer are missing are winter biological areas.
13 Exploratory drilling in expected to be confined to the winter,
14 but only one season of winter biological studies has been conducted.
15 Since scientists are finding out that there is alot more activities
16 in the winter than they expected, it's expecially important
17 to take time to learn more about the organisms who live in the
18 Beaufort Sea in the winter. Some of the other areas where existing
19 information is incomplete are ice gouging, under ice water flow,
20 fish over wintering areas, and effective oil spills on rain
21 organisms. The need for this information is apparent. For
22 example, how does one bury a pipeline to a jet sufficient to
23 withstand an ice scouring when the deaths of such scouring is
24 not known. We are pleased that BLM has acknowledged these and
25 other data gaps. But identification of what we don't know is

1 not enough to meet the requirements of NEPA. As a new counselor
2 on enviromental quality regulations point out, in case of such as
3 enviromental defense fund be hardened have held, information
4 essential to a recent decision must be obtained and presented
5 in the EIS before a decision is made. Much of this crucial
6 information will be missing in December. If there is one case
7 in which an EIS should be beyond your approach, it's a Beaufort
8 Sea lease sale. This is a pioneering sale which makes severely
9 impact the Arctic Eco system, threatening and endangering species
10 that's significant when reducing local food supplies. An investment
11 and more time and more dollars could produce and EIS and a decision
12 which is socially and enviromentally sound. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Suzanne. Any questions from
14 the panel?

15 TOM COOK: No questions.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Doctor Jahn Exxon? (no response)
17 Elise Patkotak?

18 ELISE PATKOTAK: Good evening. My name is Elise Sereni
19 Patkotak, Director of Health and Social Services for the North
20 Slope Borough. I have lived in Barrow since 1972, first as
21 a nurse with Indian Health Service and then as an employee of
22 the North Slope Borough. My testimony today comes from a mixture
23 of two levels of concern - one, as a private citizen who has
24 observed the changes on the North Slope over the past seven
25 years and two, as a health professional who is involved on a

1 daily basis with the problems created by this change. I will
2 confine my remarks to two specific areas - nutrition and mental
3 health. Among the Inupiat of the North Slope, these two areas
4 are inseparable for many reasons, the foremost being the critical
5 links between subsistence, nutrition and culture. I have read
6 those parts of the impact statement that blithly assume that
7 village stores and the federal government will easily fill the
8 void, created by a cutback in subsistence, through outside food
9 sources. As someone who was involved in the previous attempt
10 by government to provide a substitute protein supplement when
11 caribou hunting was curtailed, I can only be highly skeptical
12 of this. The government provided the equivalent of two small
13 roast beefs per family in Barrow. In our smaller villages,
14 the allotment provided for no more than a couple of canned chickens
15 per family. This was our government's response to replacing
16 a family's winter meat supply of caribou. I found it highly
17 insulting as well as extremely expensive. I also question the
18 statements that these off shore developments will stimulate
19 the move to a cash economy in the same paper that admits that
20 all of four to six jobs will be created in the villages of
21 Kaktovik and Nuiqsut. I strongly object to two presumed
22 assumptions implicit in these statements. One is that the Inupiat
23 wants to convert to a cash economy - that this is somehow the
24 logical end point of their culture's evolution. The other
25 assumption is that the four to six jobs that will be created

1 will eject enough cash into the community to take up the slack
2 in subsistence activities. The end point of evolution in the
3 Inupiat culture is not necessarily a cash economy. In my seven
4 years here I have seen the changes - I have watched the Inupiat
5 utilize some advanced Western technology - but the use of it
6 was always with the aim of making their lifestyle more efficient.
7 Their aim was to advance their culture within the subsistence
8 framework. For instance, it was quite logical to replace dog
9 teams with ski-doo's. You don't have to feed a ski-doo except
10 when it's working. It's more efficient and economic than a
11 dog team that needs year round feeding and care. It is highly
12 ethnocentric - and unfortunately all too common for the Western
13 world to assume that all cultures are striving to achieve a
14 cash economy based on a European value scale. Small, indigenous
15 cultures are not given to their respect to assume that they
16 are involving in and of themselves towards their own end point.
17 If subsistence is sharply curtailed as it must be if these lease
18 sales proceed, there will be a shattering effect on the traditional
19 communities involved. The cash and jobs available will never
20 replace the loss. The village stores, without massive injections
21 of federal aid, will not be able to provide sufficient protein
22 at reasonable prices. People's health will suffer. The integral
23 part good nutrition plays in good health is well documented.
24 If they cannot provide the protein rich food they use through
25 subsistence and have neither the knowledge or money to make

1 an equivalent substitute, we will be weakening their whole resis-
2 tance to the disease process. Colds, upper respiratory infections
3 gastroenteritis, these common ailments will increase in both
4 frequency and seriousness in a population with poor nutrition.
5 Even worse, they will not be able to stay in the villages if
6 they can neither subsistence hunt to the level necessary or
7 pay for store bought food. Their only recourse might be to
8 leave their community and move into an urban setting. Of course,
9 there might be some who would find this an acceptable move as
10 it is much easier to harm the land if the people who love it
11 aren't around to make a disturbance. I have neither the time
12 nor expertise to go into the innumerable problems that would
13 be caused by this type of dislocation to the people and communities
14 involved. However, the DEIS comments that there will be little
15 impact in Anchorage or Fairbanks in the way of new jobs which
16 means that people who are dislocated from their present subsistence
17 existence would have little chance of finding a productive,
18 alternative life style there. More simply stated, we would
19 be adding productive people to the welfare roles. One other
20 point needs to be made concerning the relationship between nutri-
21 tion and culture. I see nowhere in the impact statement where
22 anyone has asked the Inupiat of Kaktovik and Nuiqsut whether
23 they wish to eat non-native food. Again, the assumption is
24 blithely made that since beef and chicken are staples in a
25 westernized diet, everyone must like beef and chicken. This

1 is simply not true. I have frequently seen people hospitalized
2 here who simply would not eat non-native food after the first
3 three or four days. They longed for the food they knew - the
4 food that provided them with both the physical and spiritual
5 nourishment they so badly wanted and needed. I submit that
6 if any panelist here today were dropped off in Kaktovik for
7 a year and made to subsist on only native food, he or she would
8 quickly come to realize the unconscious attachments all people
9 have to their particular diets. In the area of mental health,
10 I can only state that as a health professional, I cringe at
11 the thought of the problems this impact would create. This
12 again reverts to the basic assumption of the impact statement
13 that the Inupiat is evolving towards a cash economy. He is
14 not. He is evolving within the framework of his own culture.
15 If he is made to unwillingly convert to a foreign culture, he
16 will be destroyed. I have watched what has happened here in
17 Barrow over the past seven years as cash has partially replaced
18 subsistence. The Department of Public Safety here has the sta-
19 tistics to show the results of this kind of rapid change. Last
20 year there were over eighteen hundred drunk detentions in Barrow.
21 This year it could go as high as twenty-two hundred. This in
22 a population of not more than twenty-eight hundred people. This
23 cannot be explained away by stating that native people can't
24 handle alcohol. That is not the problem. What they cannot
25 handle is the stress and strain of changes that call to question

1 the values and beliefs that were their heritage. They cannot
2 handle a nine to five job, five days a week, fifty weeks of
3 the year without denying the importance of their traditional
4 life style. But if they attempt to live in both worlds, if
5 they take the time to pursue traditional activities, they are
6 seen as unreliable, as failures, in a market economy dominated
7 by East Coast ethics. They are damned if they do and damned
8 if they don't. In a situation like that, it is hardly suprising
9 that the anesthesia of alcohol is attractive. I accept the
10 fact that change must occur. I accept that we cannot shut the
11 door on the outside world. But I cannot accept the destruction
12 of a whole people and their culture to provide perhaps seventy
13 days of oil to the lower '48. I cannot accept that the same
14 technology that put a man on the moon in one decade to preserve
15 national pride in achievement, cannot put those same energies
16 to use in finding efficient, alternate energy based on renewable
17 resources. Neither oil, nor the Inupiat, nor the Bowhead are
18 renewable resources of the present plan of action is pursued.
19 I can also not believe that we would have sent a man to the
20 moon if the technology needed had as many gaps and unanswered
21 questions as is admitted to in the impact statement. Are the
22 Inupiat people and their environment of so little value that
23 the United States would allow development to proceed when the
24 knowledge to do it safely is so inadequate that the impact statement
25 raises more questions than answers. If change and development

1 must proceed, then let it proceed in a timely and safe fashion.
2 Let the technology advance to the point where offshore drilling
3 is as safe to the environment as sending a man to the moon was
4 safe to the man in the capsule. Let the Inupiat people proceed
5 on their own path, working to preserve their environment while
6 accepting some of the inevitable changes. But let this happen
7 only within the framework of safety to this area - to its people
8 and to its wildlife. Technology has not yet advanced to this
9 point and until it does, drilling should not occur.

10 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Elise. Are there any questions
11 from the panel? (No response) Thank you very much. Alan Allen?

12 ALAN A. ALLEN: My name is Alan A. Allen. On May 1st of this
13 year I was hired as the full time manager of the Alaskan Beaufort
14 Sea Oilspill Response Body, ABSORB. My office is located in
15 Anchorage; however, ABSORB's area of interest consists of the
16 off shore and coastal regions associated with the proposed Beau-
17 fort Sea lease sale area. My own background consists of over
18 twenty years of combined study and work in the areas of physics,
19 oceanography, marine biology, petroleum technology and Arctic
20 engineering. Concurrently, I worked as a consultant for various
21 environmental and engineering firms including General Research
22 Corporation, Dames & More and Crowley Environmental Services
23 Corporation. For the past eleven years, my efforts have focused
24 primarily upon the many disciplines of petroleum technology and,
25 in particular, the business of spill prevention and control.

1 I have directed programs involving the preparation of spill con-
2 tingency plans, underwater biological surveys, spill control
3 equipment field tests and numerous oil spill responses both in
4 and outside the United States. During the past two and a half
5 years, I managed an Alaskan firm engaged in the business of oil
6 spill training and actual spill clean up throughout the State,
7 including the North Slope. As such, I feel I'm qualified to
8 make several pertinent comments about the intentions and the
9 readiness of the petroleum industry to meet the challenges of
10 oil spill prevention and control in the Arctic. My comments
11 will be directed to the following three topics: One, ABSORB,
12 what is it and what are its objectives? Two, spill contingency
13 planning, what are the real issues for a meaningful response
14 in the Arctic? Three, response techniques, what equipment and
15 procedures WILL work in the containment, recovery and the dis-
16 posal of oil spilled in the Arctic? First - ABSORB. The Alaskan
17 Beaufort Sea Oilspill Response Body is a joint venture sponsored
18 by thirteen oil companies interested in offshore exploration
19 and development activities in the North Slope of Alaska. This
20 organization was established as an oil spill cooperative through
21 which its member companies could pool their resources and planning
22 capabilities for the prevention and control of oil spills in
23 the Beaufort Sea. The oil spill cooperative concept, as an ap-
24 proach to effective spill control planning, has been used ex-
25 tensively throughout the United States and Canada. During the

1 past decade, for example, the United States-Canadian West Coast
2 alone has witnessed the developm+nt of thirteen oil spill coop-
3 eratives, four of which are located in Alaska. These cooperatives
4 have committed many tens of millions of dollars to the business
5 of training personnel, sponsoring the research and development,
6 conducting field tests of equipment and purchasing vast inventories
7 of assorted material and machinery for spill control. This growing
8 technology, with the inevitable increased awareness of our re-
9 sponse capabilities and limitations, has benefited from the close
10 working relationship between these cooperatives and the many
11 jointly sponsored training, research and field test programs.
12 The application of this oil spill technology, through people
13 already knowledgeable on the Arctic and experienced in conducting
14 cold weather operations, is one of the primary objectives of
15 ABSORB for the Beaufort Sea. This will be accomplished, in part,
16 during the next several months through a series of planning and
17 working sessions involving various cooperatives, ABSORB's Tech-
18 nical Subcommittee, professional consulting groups and represent-
19 atives from the Alaska Oil and Gas Association's Lease Sale Planning
20 and Research Committee, LPRC. The LPRC alone has sponsored nearly
21 one hundred research projects related to petroleum extraction
22 in the Alaskan Arctic. Three of the most recent, for example,
23 involved 1) the design of an ice strengthened, oil skimming vessel
24 for use in water with ice cover, 2) the testing and evaluation
25 of a group of oil dispersants for suitability in Arctic marine

1 conditions, and 3) the review of state of the art air cushion
2 vehicle capabilities for spill control support in the Arctic.
3 These and many other activities are presently underway to establish
4 ABSORB as a fully staffed and equipped body of resources for
5 the offshore exploration program in the Arctic. Extensive oil
6 spill contingency plans, already in effect on the North Slope,
7 are presently being expanded to include the full range of potential
8 spill conditions associated with the off shore environment. Train-
9 ing programs are underway; detailed operations manuals are being
10 developed; and equipment packages are being researched and readied
11 for use. Spill Contingency Planning. Many of the assumptions,
12 statistics and conclusions of Section III.A.3 in the Draft EIS
13 are misleading and inaccurate. There is a great danger in attempting
14 to compare the off shore operations of the Canadian Beaufort
15 Sea and the Gulf of Mexico, for example, with the operations
16 anticipated for the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Differences between
17 the environments of each area are acknowledged within the DEIS;
18 however, these factors are NOT considered sufficiently along
19 with the different drilling modes envisioned to give an accurate
20 assessment of potential spill scenarios. This problem together
21 with the occasional use of historical spill data results in the
22 formation of some conclusions based on numbers which are statis-
23 tically unmeaningful. A full explanation of the specific short
24 comings of Section III.A.3 would require several pages of dis-
25 cussion and it would serve very little purpose at this time.

1 It is important, however, to recognize the following key points,
2 as they will strongly influence the development of a meaningful
3 and comprehensive spill contingency plan: 1) Exploratory drilling
4 in the proposed lease area will involve man made and/or natural
5 gravel islands in relatively shallow water areas. Such operations
6 are NOT comparable to the deep water off shore oil and gas op-
7 erations in the Canadian Beaufort Sea. 2) The initial exploratory
8 drilling operations will be carried out during the winter months
9 when land fast ice will form a solid barrier between the drilling
10 facilities and the surrounding water. 3) Actual drilling activity
11 will not likely begin until 1981, providing additional time for
12 spill countermeasure programs following the lease sale. 4) The
13 discussions and statistics pertaining to tanker operations are
14 not pertinent to the proposed exploration phase of drilling in
15 the Beaufort Sea. It is also quite likely that tankers will
16 not be economically feasible for the development phase. 5) Sta-
17 tistics and safety records involving spills and fires associated
18 with off shore plat forms should NOT be used for comparison here.
19 Instead, shore based drilling experience at Prudhoe Bay would
20 be much more applicable to the mode of drilling from gravel islands.
21 Finally, 6) The assertion in Section III.A.3, that spill clean
22 up technology in ice infested water is not effective due to environ-
23 mental constratins is simply wrong. A wealth of information
24 and experience has been gained which supports the view that ef-
25 fective oil spill countermeasures CAN be developed for ALL aspects

1 of the exploratory drilling program proposed. Oil spill contingency
2 plans are being developed with respect to the above considerations.
3 These plans, together with a detailed operational manual, will
4 be designed to provide the proper mix of personnel and equipment
5 as needed to respond to the full range of potential spills. This
6 range will include the relatively small spillages of fuel, lub-
7 ricating oil and hydraulic fluids which may occasionally occur
8 to the potential, though highly unlikely, event involving a major
9 blowout. The most sophisticated statistical analysis of historical
10 spill data must NEVER reduce the importance of preparing, first,
11 for the most reasonable catastrophic event, and then building
12 in the flexibility to drop back, as necessary, to a spill of
13 lesser consequence. Response Techniques. Response techniques
14 in the Arctic will involve some of the more adaptable conventional
15 procedures used in warmer climates. These techniques, however,
16 will continue to be refined while new procedures are also developed.
17 I have personally been involved in the cleanup and evaluation
18 of numerous oil spills, many of which have involved ice and snow.
19 The success of those operations did not come about by force feeding
20 Lower 48 technology to the problem; but, by working with the
21 environment to let it help itself, and in some cases, to identify
22 totally new innovative approaches. Several specific techniques
23 and experiences involving cold weather cleanup are described
24 in the attached papers I presented at recent technical conferences.
25 You have those attached. These include, case study, Oil Recovery

1 Beneath Ice, and Containment and Recovery Techniques for Cold
2 Weather. Inland Oil Spills. A quick review of these papers will
3 reveal that there are a great number of proven techniques which
4 do lend themselves to the effective cleanup of spills on, in
5 and under ice and snow. It should be recognized that the techniques
6 referenced here are particularly well suited to the kinds of
7 potential small and even moderately sized spills which could
8 result during the exploration drilling from gravel islands. Spills
9 of a larger magnitude and spills which could conceivably involve
10 open water must be addressed separately. Should a minor spill
11 occur during the warmer season, or should a spill overlap into
12 a period when water surfaces are exposed, the kinds of conventional
13 techniques mentioned earlier would work in most situations.
14 Such approaches would involve the use of wier, belt, disc and
15 or rope mope type skimmers, heavy duty ice strengthened booms,
16 and a wide assortment of support vessels equipment and temporary
17 storage containers. The specially designed Arctic rope type
18 skimmer referenced earlier would be developed specifically for
19 this type of spill situation. When and if ice loadings become
20 too great for these more conventional approaches, other options
21 would be considered depending upon the weather, the nature of
22 the slicks, water depth, proximity to land, biological exposures
23 and sensitivities, and the availability of equipment and materials.
24 Such options would include sorbents, dispersants, and various
25 enhanced biodegradation and burning techniques. The near freezing

1 temperatures of the Arctic Ocean would definitely reduce the
2 recovery efficiency of some skimming devices due to the increased
3 viscosity of the oil being recovered. This same condition, however,
4 is favorable since the oil would also have an increased equilibrium
5 thickness of typically one quarter of a centimeter or about
6 one tenth of an inch, and greater which would tend to limit the
7 extent to which the oil would otherwise spread. Compared with
8 equilibrium thicknesses for oil in warmer climates, the cold
9 water slicks would involve areas of coverage which are one hundred
10 to one thousand times smaller for a given volume of oil spilled.
11 This greater thickness could be further increased by the barrier
12 effect of floating ice, thus, improving recovery capabilities
13 of some skimmers. In addition, the burning of oil, should it
14 be desired, would be enhanced by the increased thickness of the
15 oil. With respect to spills of a larger magnitude, such releases
16 could result from the uncontrolled flow of oil from a blowout,
17 a situation which is extremely remote. However, assuming that
18 a blowout did occur, that it did involve oil and that all blowout
19 prevention equipment failed to bring it under control, the oil
20 would go through a rapid cooling process as its expanding dis-
21 solved gasses and passed on into the Arctic air. The cooled,
22 highly viscous droplets of oil would then fall within the confines
23 of the gravel drilling pad or be blown to an area of accumulation
24 downwind of the drill site. Should there be little or no wind,
25 the onsite accumulation would be cleaned up when it was safe

1 to do so, using conventional on shore recovery techniques. Should
2 a wind exist and or the onsite accumulation grow sufficiently
3 to cause oil deposition off site, the oil would eventually form
4 a thick layer on the top of the surrounding ice. Depending upon
5 the conditions of the ice, the amount of oil deposited and the
6 prevailing weather conditions, a number of cleanup procedures
7 could then be implemented. Heavy earth moving equipment might
8 gather and transport the oil to shore for disposal; the same
9 equipment might be used to gather and relocate the oil a safe
10 distance from the drill site. The oil might be burned in place;
11 or it might, simply, be left temporarily until adequate personnel
12 and equipment could be deployed efficiently and safely for its
13 removal. Oil released during the winter drilling months from
14 a blowout would be subjected to some rather severe environmental
15 conditions. These factors involving very low temperatures, thick
16 ice cover, drifting snow, and reduced visibility would definitely
17 hamper the logistics associated with cleanup; however, these
18 same environmental constraints would help to prevent the oil
19 from impacting the marine environment and thereby provide suf-
20 ficient time to plan and implement an appropriate level of response.
21 The already semi solid oil would build up into a thick mat on
22 top of the ice which would involve a relatively small area of
23 accumulation. Snow, which is an excellent natural sorbent with
24 oil, could be mixed with the oil layer, thus forming a mulch
25 like medium. This procedure has been used in many spill situations

1 making it possible to handle a large volume of oil quickly and
2 safely. An even more remote situation might conceivably involve
3 some portion of the oil from a major blowout working its way to
4 an ice water or air water interface surrounding the gravel island.
5 Again, oil would become extremely viscous and be retained within
6 a very small region due to the presence of the ice layer. Should
7 the oil exist on open water between the island and the surrounding
8 ice layer, recovery techniques could easily be employed, as dis-
9 cussed earlier. Any oil which did work its way beneath the ice
10 would be forced into thick pools or lenses of oil due to the
11 natural concavities known to exist within the under surface of
12 the ice. This pooling could result in the containment of up
13 to twenty thousand barrels of oil within an area of radius equal
14 to about two hundred yards or less. 'Kovacs, 1977' Such pooling
15 would provide ample time to move personnel and equipment to the
16 sight and to begin appropriate surface activities. These actions
17 might involve 1) the drilling of holes into ice concavities and
18 the removal of oil by pumping, 2) the cutting of trenches through
19 ice down current of the source to trap oil as it migrates into
20 the trenches, 3) the clearing of snow from the ice surface in
21 a curved fashion down current while piling the snow along the
22 inside of the curve. This promotes the formation of a subsurface
23 trap, since ice growth would be enhanced beneath the cleared
24 ice and retarded beneath the snow berm, and, or 4) the construction
25 of a subsurface ice barrier by flooding the ice surface with

1 sea water, thus creating a thickened ring of ice around the spill
2 site. Oil entrainment within the ice due to continued ice growth
3 could influence a portion of the spilled oil. This entrainment,
4 however, could take several days, depending upon the air temp-
5 eratures and the volumes of oil pooled beneath the ice. Entrain-
6 ment can, in fact, be used to advantage to prevent further migration
7 within the water column and to trap the oil until it can be dealt
8 with at a later time. It is also possible to physically remove
9 portions of the ice along with the entrained oil. Some of these
10 subsurface oil containment and recovery techniques have been
11 presented in earlier testimony by Mr. Richard V. Shafer of the
12 Sohio Petroleum Company. I will not elaborate further on these
13 concepts here, but will refer those interested in additional
14 information to Mr. Shafer's testimony.

15 (For review of Mr. Shafer's testimony, refer to transcript
16 of May 17, Fairbank's hearing, page 113.)

17 A great deal of research and a number of training exercises are
18 well underway to test and evaluate the most efficient techniques
19 for spill control in the Arctic. These efforts will continue
20 at a rapid pace both in Alaska and in cooperation with the Canadian
21 Beaufort Sea drilling program. In conclusion, it is my own personal
22 opinion that a fully adequate program of preparedness is underway.
23 The spill control technology described in this testimony and
24 in the attached papers will provide an effective oil spill counter-
25 measure system for the proposed exploratory drilling program
in the Beaufort Sea. Any additional risks of exposure to oil

1 spills from the development phase would, of course, be nonexistent
2 for several years. This time will be used to identify those
3 concerns and to be sure that appropriate technology is developed
4 on schedule. Thank you.

5 (Written Statement and above mentioned papers
6 are included in Attachment.)

7 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Alan. Are there any questions from
8 the panel? (No response) Thank you very much.

9 RAYMOND NEOKOK: I have a question, Sir. Raymond Neokok,
10 from Barrow, Alaska.

11 CHAIRMAN: One moment. Would you like to testify, Raymond?

12 RAYMOND NEOKOK: I wanted to ask him a question, Sir.

13 CHAIRMAN: Well, in this kind of a hearing, we're not here
14 to debate between people. This panel is here to accept testimony.
15 We'd like to hear from you if you'd like to get up and testify,
16 okay?

17 RAYMOND NEOKOK: Well, I will later on. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN: Very good. In fact, what I'd like to do is call
19 one more person from this list I have, and there are more names
20 on the list, some eight or ten more names. But I know that perhaps
21 some of you people here would like to testify now, rather than
22 wait until all these other people here have had their opportunity.
23 So, I'll call one more person from the list and then I'll ask
24 for someone from the floor that would like to testify, who has
25 not signed up. So, at this time, let me call Kim Moeller, Director
of Public Safety? (No response) Let me try, Chris McDermott,

1 Health and Social Services? (No response) Then, I'll try one
2 more time. Mike Jeffery, Alaska Legal Services?

3 MIKE JEFFERY: Well, I'm..Mr. Chairman, I'd really like
4 to request that my testimony be deferred. I'm here for the duration
5 and I'd be happy to wait. I would like to see some of the village
6 people proceed.

7 CHAIRMAN: All right. Your name, Sir?

8 CHRIS MCDERMOTT: Chris McDermott.

9 CHAIRMAN: Yes, Chris. Please come forward.

10 CHRIS MCDERMOTT: My name is Chris McDermott. I'm a new
11 comer to Barrow having accepted a position as Health Planner
12 for the Borough. I cannot claim expertise, let me catch my breath,
13 in the areas of environmental resource management or in the customs
14 and culture of the Inupiat. Since coming to Barrow, however,
15 I've been moved by the depth of opposition to the proposed sale
16 for exploratory drillings in the Beaufort Sea. By training,
17 I'm an economist and health policy analyst. I've reviewed the
18 DEIS, volume one through three, and many other documents pertaining
19 to the proposed sale. For economic reasons, for political reasons,
20 I believe that the wisest decision that could be made is to delay
21 the sale indefinitely. Below, I will present a brief statement
22 of the economic reasons why the proposed sale is disadvantageous.
23 In regard to politics, however, I'm of the opinion that the will
24 of the majority should rule. The people should determine their
25 own future to the largest extent possible. The Natives of this

1 land stand to gain at least fifteen hundred dollars (\$1500.00)
2 per person, or three million for the tribe in the oil sale. The
3 total revenues from the oil sale, using current prices for domestic
4 oil and the low and high estimates given in the DEIS, will be
5 between three point four and eight point five billion dollars.
6 At these figures, and given the taxing monetation put upon the
7 Inupiat, the Inupiat's stand to gain less than point one per
8 cent of total revenues. Calculating the same way, but using
9 the current prices charged by OPEC Countries, you have to double
10 the revenue accruing for oil sales; but the amount going to the
11 Inupiat stays the same. Moreover, the DEIS Statement states
12 that four jobs will likely be created as a result of the oil
13 activities. These are the potential gains from drilling and
14 development; gains that are only fifty per cent likely. What
15 do the Inupiat of the North Slope stand to lose? The DEIS docu-
16 ments potential environmental degradation of oil industry in
17 the Beaufort Sea. Although such inept a section mentions un-
18 certainties as to the movements of ice, seasonal fluctuations
19 in the behavior and formation of wind and sea channels, move-
20 ments of sea mammals and air forms of life, many sections con-
21 clude that nothing terribly damaging is likely to occur from
22 the proposed activity even though the same sections have state-
23 ments noting the ultimate effects of the environment are contingent
24 on speculation. I'm referring to page 345 on air, 347 on long
25 term productivity and 341 on migratory routes. Moreover, the

1 DEIS, page 78 states that no scientific data is available to
2 pin point the exact distribution of the Bowhead Whale, east of
3 Smith Bay, nor the whereabouts of cows or calves; yet, the DEIS
4 confidently concludes the proposed oil exploration will have
5 little impact on migratory and reproductive patterns of the Bow-
6 head, nor other Arctic species. Although the Government is charged
7 with protecting an endangered species and the economic well being
8 of a community, it has little hard evidence on which to base
9 its care for these species or the people whom it is entrusted
10 to. Because the actual number of these life sustaining species
11 are not known and this impact of this influx of man's machinery
12 and noise on indigenous life forms, there is no way to measure
13 the quantative effect of minor insults to the environment. Nor,
14 for that matter, major spills..witness the Santa Barbara case
15 ten years and fifteen million dollars later. If one has not
16 carefully listed all the cracks, splits and abrasions in an apartment
17 before renting, one can hardly charge outgoing tenants for damages.
18 Such is the case with the Beaufort Sea oil lease sale. In short,
19 the loss of one half of the Bowhead Whale population, or the
20 complete dispursal of seals from in the seas, accesible to the
21 North Slope, could hardly be proved since little is known about
22 the actual numbers of wildlife, not their value in Inupiat eyes
23 and stomachs. While the Inupiat stand to lose their subsistence
24 way of life, they stand to gain little. The DEIS states explicitly,
25 there's no compensation for the loss of a way of life. If I

1 had been hired by the Inupiat to analyze this proposal from an
2 economic standpoint, I would have to recommend that they turn
3 this one down. It's a bad deal. As the DEIS states, however,
4 economical considerations alone are not sufficient grounds on
5 which to base a decision. Other reasons that recommend a delay
6 of the proposed sale are: 1) the great uncertainties which sur-
7 round Arctic ice movements and seasonal fluctuations. 2) the
8 relative newness to ABSORB to this area, a group formed less
9 than three months ago without proven technology to prevent, clean
10 up oil techniques. 3) so called response techniques have proven
11 ineffective in the Buzzard's Bay accident in 1977, where less
12 than one third of the spilled oil was recovered at tremendous
13 costs. They have partly been tried elsewhere. Despite industry's
14 plans to the contrary, 4) the mere fact that technology is available
15 does not ensure that it will be implemented. In the long Arctic
16 night the eyes are silent. Who will watch every move of the
17 oil riggers? Can we trust that oil companies will implement
18 these technologies that are by no means cheap? A major reason
19 for denying the lease sale at this time is that more research
20 is needed to test more oil recovery techniques in Arctic conditions.
21 Although oil developers claim that oil can lie under the ice
22 or be absorbed into surface snow and ice, the Buzzard's Bay ex-
23 perience informs us that usual concentrations of oil in ice
24 and snow are less than three per cent. Just how much snow would
25 have to be removed to withdraw the expunged oil? If the spill

1 went unnoticed and only oil company personnel were on hand, how
2 likely would a clean up be? Like industry experts testify, event-
3 ually the oil will move with the ice in the spring movements.
4 My bet is that a cover up is more likely than a clean up. What
5 do you say? The value of the oil and gas buried under the Beaufort
6 Sea will not deminish over the next thirteen years. In fact,
7 the price of oil is increasing. The State of Alaska, the Inupiat,
8 and the Federal Government stand to gain more from a delay in
9 the proposed sale until research has proceeded in many areas.
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Chris. Are there any questions
12 from the panel? (No response) Thank you again. Is there any-
13 one in the audience now that would like to stand up and testify?
14 Please do.

15 RONALD BROWER: My name is Ronald Brower and I'm with the
16 Ukpeagvik Village Corporation of the village of Barrow and I
17 work there as a land chief. I'd like to read to you a resolution
18 which was passed today by the Ukpeagvik Village Corporation in
19 its relation to IRA. Ukpeagvik Village Corporation Resolution
20 Number 79-16. A resolution opposing the oil and gas leasing
21 in the Beaufort Sea.

22 WHEREAS, the Native Village of Barrow is the federally re-
23 cognized and chartered tribal organization for the Inupiat people
24 of Barrow, Alaska, by the authority of the United States Act
25 of June 18, 1934, 48 Statute 984, and the Act of May 1, 1936,

1 49 Statute 1250. It represents the majority of the Inupiat Eskimo
2 people living on eighty-eight thousand square miles of Alaskan
3 Arctic who are one, indivisible people with a common language,
4 culture, environment and concerns; and,

5 WHEREAS, the realm of tribal autonomy, which has been so
6 carefully respected by the Courts, has been implicitly confirmed
7 by Congress in a host of statutes providing that various adminis-
8 trative acts of the President and the Depart of the Interior
9 shall be carried out only with the consent of the Indian tribe
10 or its Chiefs or Council; and,

11 WHEREAS, The Courts have also held that the Acts of 1184,
12 1891, and 1900 concerning the administration of Alaska protected
13 all use and ocupancy rights of Alaska Natives, including Arctic
14 Slope Eskimos; and

15 WHEREAS, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of December
16 18, 1971, did not extinguish damage claims or contract claims
17 or trespass claims of Native people for acts committed on their
18 land before 1971, or after, both the representatives of the State
19 of Alaska, speaking during the Settlement Act debates, as well
20 as the Federal Courts have interpreted the Law in this way; and,

21 WHEREAS, the Native Village of Barrow and Arctic Slope Eskimos
22 have filed a Federal Lawsuit to enforce these rights to claim
23 for damages to their land. The Lawsuit is now called the United
24 States versus ARCO; the State of Alaska is also a defendant in
25 that suit. This Court case is being brought to obtain just.

1 compensation from the oil companies, state agencies and federal
2 agencies for damage done to the land, water and wildlife of the
3 Arctic Alaska which the Inupiat have occupied and used since
4 prehistoric times; and,

5 WHEREAS, the inherent sovereign power of Indian tribes has
6 been affirmed by Federal Courts since 1832, and the Native village
7 of Barrow has the fundamental right to such power because the
8 Arctic Slope lies in Section 10 of the Alaska Statehood Act,
9 and these rights are also included in Article XII, Section 12,
10 of the Alaska State Constitution; and,

11 WHEREAS, by the sovereign powers, the Inupiat people of
12 the Arctic Slope of Alaska have jurisdiction over the off shore
13 area of the Beaufort Sea and other seas bordering the Arctic
14 Slope, and this jurisdiction is exercised through the people;
15 and,

16 WHEREAS, the Native Village of Barrow has seen how the Inupiat
17 communities of Barrow, Kaktovik, and Nuiqsut, as well as the
18 Assembly of the North Slope Borough, strongly oppose off shore
19 activities in the Beaufort Sea ever since they have been pro-
20 posed by the government and the oil industry. We desire to join
21 them in opposing these off shore activities in every legal way;
22 and,

23 WHEREAS, we find the subsistence hunting of the people of
24 the Arctic Slope of Alaska is critical to maintain their health
25 and well being, yet this ability to hunt is being cut back by

1 ever increasing government regulation and ever increasing industrial
2 activity on the Arctic Slope; and,

3 WHEREAS, oil activities off shore in the Beaufort Sea are
4 the greatest threat to the continuance of our subsistence hunting
5 and to the survival of the wildlife in Arctic Alaska and to the
6 purity of the Arctic environment. This threat comes from improper
7 and hasty application of modern technology to the sensitive Arctic
8 environment; and,

9 WHEREAS, the noise and other pollution from these off shore
10 activities damages the habitat of the Bowhead Whale, and the
11 migratory birds, and fish during their migrations and also during
12 the development of their young. These problems already exist
13 and they will be made much worse if more oil activities are allowed
14 off shore in the Beaufort Sea and other Arctic off shore areas.

15 NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that; the Native village
16 of Barrow

17 1) Objects to the proposed Joint Federal/State Beaufort
18 Sea OCS oil and gas lease sale scheduled for December, 1979.

19 2) States that the State of Alaska and the United States
20 Government must immediately cancel this proposed sale, as the
21 tribal government on the Arctic Slope have not consented to this
22 plan.

23 3) States that the Governments of the United States and
24 Alaska and the North Slope Borough should use their funds to
25 provide more information and other scientific data immediately

1 about all aspects of any additional proposals for off shore oil
2 activities in the Arctic Slope.

3 This was introduced and adopted June 4, 1979 and signed
4 by our vice and our treasurer.

5 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ronald. Do you have a copy for the
6 record?

7 RONALD BROWER: I will provide you with a copy.

8 (Resolution is included in Attachment)

9 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is John Carnahan here?

10 JOHN CARNAHAN: My name is John Carnahan. I'm a research
11 historian with the planning department of the North Slope Borough.
12 I've got a couple of comments to make on the area of cultural
13 resources and two of the maps in the graphic package. The BLM
14 OCS Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Beaufort
15 Sea lease sale is seriously deficient in the area of cultural
16 resources and in supporting graphic materials. Although they
17 identified the historic and cultural sites along the Beaufort
18 Sea coast and on the Barrier Islands, the Draft Environmental
19 Impact Statement made barely mention. The only site documented
20 to any degree was Leffingwell's cabin on Flaxman Island, an er-
21 roneous addition to the National Register for Historic Places.
22 Leffingwell's cabin was moved to Brownwell Point by Henry Chamberlin,
23 a trader who used it for a store house. The cabin now on Flax-
24 man Island with the National Register plaque on it belongs to
25 Mrs. Mary Akootchook of Kaktovik, who's father built the cabin

1 in 1922. Forty-three other sites of historic and cultural signi-
2 ficance have been located along the Beaufort Sea coast, thirty-
3 three on land and ten on the Barrier Islands. These sites have
4 been documented through oral history given by current North Slope
5 residents. Their testimony recalled generation upon generation
6 of subsistence use of the land. In addition, two of the sites,
7 Tiguarik Island and Flaxman Island, with its annual trading fairs
8 between Inupiat and Barrow on the west, Herschel Island on the
9 east and others from inland villages. These were not isolated
10 instances, but recurred year after year, decade after decade,
11 establishing a continuity of land and resource use seldom paralleled
12 in America's history. The act of returning annually to a site
13 or areas, strengthened the personal and spiritual associations
14 between the people and the land. To the Inupiat, these historic
15 sites are tangeable lengths between ancestral traditions and
16 their current struggle to preserve their cultural traditions against
17 the growing pressures for change. In a recent report to the
18 North Slope Borough, William Brown and myself, both historians,
19 identified ten historic and cultural sites with potential for
20 National Register nomination. These sites were along the Beaufort
21 Sea coast or on the Barrier Islands and were all documented through
22 oral history testimony as well as primary and secondary historical
23 documents. Of the ten potential sites, three of particular historic
24 and cultural importance have been nomonated to the National Register
25 by the North Slope Borough. These three sites are not the only

1 considered likely to achieve National Register designation and
2 are certainly not the only sites available for nomination; but
3 were considered the most important in the immediate threat of
4 impact through the proposed Beaufort Sea lease sale. The other
5 sites identified in the lease sale impact area should be researched
6 and nominated as well so that the National Register status would
7 need to be respected by those interested in that area's development.
8 This nomination process, however, is not a local responsibility,
9 but must be pursued by responsible Federal and State agencies
10 in accordance with existing laws, regulations and executive orders.
11 Those properly identified as cultural resources should then be
12 excluded from the lease sale with adequate provision made for
13 their future protection. The lease sale should be delayed until
14 after Federal and State agencies have complied with existing
15 legal requirements for the location and identification of such
16 property. By failing to treat the existing historic sites with
17 potential for National Register nomination as such, the Draft
18 Environmental Impact Statement is in direct violation with provisions
19 by Executive Order 11593, which clearly calls for referring
20 any questionable historic property, quote, "that might qualify
21 for nomination." end quote, to the Secretary of Interior for
22 his opinion, to the State Historic Preservation Officer and to
23 the advisory council on historic preservation. Section 106 of
24 the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 states, and I
25 quote, "The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect

1 jurisdiction over a proposed of Federally assisted undertaking
2 in any state; and the head of any Federal Department or an in-
3 dependent agency having authority to license an undertaking shall,
4 prior to the issuance of any license as the case may be, take
5 into account the effects of the undertaking upon any district,
6 site, building, structure or object that is included in or eligible
7 for inclusion in the National Register." The procedure set up
8 by the advisory council on historic preservation for the guidance
9 of Federal agencies, under 36.CFR 800, restates this stipulation.
10 36.CFR 800 further provides that projects which may have uniform
11 adverse effects on the National Register or eligible properties,
12 and where authorization to proceed may severely limit the op-
13 portunity to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on a case by case
14 basis, should be considered as a unit prior to authorization.
15 In this instance, given the nature of historical and cultural
16 sites in the lease area, they should be considered as a unit
17 since exploiting or mitigating adverse effects on a case by case
18 basis will be extraordinarily difficult. The National Environ-
19 mental Policy Act in 1969 also requires assessment of cultural
20 resources that might be effected by a federal undertaking. The
21 BLM OCS Draft Environmental Impact Statement is clearly in vio-
22 lation of all the Federal requirements. It seems appropriate
23 at this time that a responsible federal agency be brought in
24 compliance with the National Preservation Act of 1966, the National
25 Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and Executive Order 11593 and

1 any supporting regulations; even if it causes a delay in the
2 lease sale. On the subject of the graphics, there were two maps
3 in the graphics package, package number ten which was entitled,
4 Cultural Resources. That map was as incomplete and erroneous
5 as the text that was written on the subject. The classifications
6 on the map are properly shown either as eligible for inclusion
7 on the National Register or those lacking sufficient information
8 to evaluate eligibility are terribly inaccurate and fail to take
9 into account of the location and documentation of historical
10 and cultural properties by the North Slope Borough's Traditional
11 Land Use Inventory. While the inventory's a continuing project
12 and is somewhat incomplete, it's far more accurate than the pre-
13 sentation on graphic number ten. The sites on the map as lacking
14 sufficient information for judgement of eligibility have been
15 used as trading sites and subsistence areas for many generations.
16 To impute the lack of historical significance of such sites is
17 an ethnocentric judgement sadly out of place in a federal document.
18 Graphic number eight, labeled Land Status is also woefully in-
19 complete. Failure to note even the North Slope Borough's selection
20 of State land on the North Slope of Alaska, in addition, the
21 sociological considerations scarcely begin to identify the multi-
22 plicity of uses of various sites along the Beaufort Sea coast
23 and the Barrier Islands. Once again, the North Slope Borough's
24 Traditional Land Use Inventory contains far more complete docu-
25 mentation of land use and occupancy for these important historical

1 and cultural studies. Cultural resources along the Beaufort
2 Sea coast are not defined in terms of architecture or buildings
3 alone. Beyond such static material categories is a whole panoply
4 of dynamic resources. Spiritual associations with places and
5 activities shared by local residents, subsistence hunting, fishing
6 and gathering pursuits. Traditional inter village transportation
7 and trading patterns. Attitudes of local residents towards National
8 and cultural resources; and some, the world view of the Inupiat
9 people that integrates them with their homelands. These dynamic
10 cultural resources are at stake in the proposed Beaufort Sea
11 lease sale and have not been adequately addressed by that Environ-
12 mental Impact Statement. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, John. Are there any questions from
14 the panel? (No response) Thank you very much. At this time
15 I'll again request that someone from the audience that hasn't
16 signed up, please volunteer?

17 EMILY WILSON: My name is Emily Wilson and I've got a state-
18 ment from Raymond Paneak from Anaktuvuk Pass and he wants his
19 read and I will speak in Inupiat first before I read the state-
20 ment. (Inupiat) There is so much talk about the Beaufort Sea
21 oil and gas lease sale. Everytime oil exploration starts, they
22 always spoil the ground and mess up people's lives. That is
23 why the people of Kaktovik don't want the Beaufort Sea lease
24 sale. Accroding to the map, what I see is that the proposed
25 area is large and is right about where sea mammals might be

1 travelling or on route. The villagers on the coast know where
2 the sea mammals travel because they have hunted them for many
3 many years. They know what they are talking about. The fish,
4 whale, seal and other sea mammals travel back and forth along
5 the coast. We villagers of Anaktuvuk Pass are opposed to the
6 Beaufort Sea lease sale because we get food from Barter Island,
7 Barrow and Nuiqsut. The village gets quite a lot of maktak and
8 fish from the coast villages. I think the people on the coast
9 will have bad feelings if the Beaufort Sea lease sale is opened,
10 and making a living will be hard for these Arctic coast villagers.
11 Rather than oil, the food is more important to these villages.
12 Raymond Paneak, Anaktuvuk Pass.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Emily. Flossie Hopson?

14 FLOSSIE HOPSON: My name is Flossie Hopson and I'm going
15 to read a prepared statement for the North Slope Borough Department
16 of Conservation and Environmental Protection Office. The fact
17 still that we, the Inupiat people base our culture on the environ-
18 ment, nature and the land around us. It's obvious from our point
19 of view that the Inupiat people will survive for generations
20 to come. Our future generations are the ones who will be living
21 off this land. To understand our culture is to understand the
22 correlations of history, archaeology, socio economic factors,
23 land and wildlife factors to a livelihood of subsistence patterns
24 of the Inupiat people. The relationships of history and culture
25 cannot be separated. The same is true for subsistence resources

1 and the human food web process, including organisms of the smallest
2 regime. The total regime of sea mammals, fish, land animals,
3 birds, and caribou is all inter related and dependent upon each
4 other. To destroy one small part of the regime is to endanger
5 the other parts. One begins to wonder if the hierarchy of State
6 and Federal Governments understand these inter relationships
7 of the total ecosystem as a whole. The total ecosystem provides
8 the network for the continuation of a subsistence lifestyle.
9 The Inupiat people are dependent on the subsistence resources
10 and we are also dependent upon each other for sharing whatever
11 resources are available. Often times the human resource is not
12 discussed in priorities. We cannot expect you to understand
13 our ways in just a few hearings. All of our local information
14 is significant to the integrity of our culture. You will have
15 gained some knowledge but it would take history books for you
16 to know what we know; just as you have indoctrinated us of your
17 history. Let us reassure you that we aim to protect the sub-
18 sistence rights of the Inupiat people. Just as an urban family
19 strives to live comfortably, we strive to survive from the re-
20 sources that are inherent in our land and sea environments. Just
21 as you raise corn and cattle, the Inupiat hunt and fish for a
22 living. Our culture is NOT eroding away as you have stated on
23 page 339 of your EIS. We have taken what is useful to us and
24 applied them to our way of life and that does not mean that our
25 culture is eroding away. The material in the EIS volumes is

1 based on speculation, incomplete studies and conclusions have
2 been made from unknowns. For example, page 35, Off Shore Perma-
3 frost. Quote, "information on the distribution of thaw table,
4 shallow subsurface sediments is unavailable. Data are also lacking
5 on sub seabed soil temperature profiles." The process which
6 is so significant to be included is missing, that of the process
7 of sea ice that should have been explained for discussion on
8 hazards inherent on sea ice. There has been no differentiation
9 given for processes and no reference material available for what
10 has been discussed. Page 41, quote, "Because ice conditions
11 vary from year to year and place to place, the description of
12 the annual ice cycle given here must be considered as representative
13 rather than absolute." End quote. This statement implies pure
14 speculation. Table II.A.4(e)1 carries no discussions of modi-
15 fications of fast ice which must be included to discuss the process
16 cycle of sea ice. Figure II.A.4(e)2 is incomplete because it
17 is based on unsubstantiated material and based on one year of
18 observation. Page 44, quote, "The greater width of the zone
19 in such areas might permit larger movements of the ice sheet
20 to occur, although there are no substantiating data available.
21 No public data exists regarding the pattern or extent of move-
22 ment of the landfast ice sheet along the Beaufort Sea coast during
23 breakup." End quote. Local data exists. The Inupiat people
24 have always taken heed to the dangers of sea ice, dangers of
25 ice conditions, as in the words of several respected elders,

1 Mr. Horace Ahsogeak, Barrow, states, quote, "The weather conditions
2 are never the same each year. And in the fall time, the ice
3 really piles up. The pressure is so strong there is nothing
4 that can withstand it. Especially on the shore of the sandspits."
5 In the words of Mr. Otis Ahkivgak, quote, "Elders warn about
6 the young ice in the fall time because the ice does not always
7 remain in the same area. Whenever the ice is formed on the coast
8 line, it is very unstable before it becomes very thick. It leaves
9 the shoreline without warning in the fall time and is very danger-
10 ous." These quotes are only words of caution but they must be
11 seriously considered in discussing ice movement. The DEIS has
12 under estimated the importance of processes and the dangers of
13 ice conditions. On page 46, major zones have been described
14 but the failure to state that the ice zones are very dangerous
15 is absurd. For example, it has been stated on page 46, that,
16 quote, "hazards related to Zone II are somewhat greater than
17 those related to Zone I." And further down in discussing potential
18 hazards in Zone III are significantly greater than in Zone II
19 because of the high probability of flow leads forming. These
20 statements tells us of the magnitude of the potential hazards
21 that would be predetermined by ice movement, the wind and the
22 current. Our people have seen what can and could happen during
23 a storm when the ice starts piling up. We have also some sig-
24 nificant facts about the Barrier Islands. The lagoons and Barrier
25 Islands are biologically very productive, as has been stated

1 on page 56, quote, "Barrier Islands are subjected to rapid erosion
2 and can be extensively reshaped during storms." We have heard
3 our elders talk of the importance of the Barrier Islands. For
4 example, Sam Kunakanna of Nuiqsut during the OCS public hearings
5 during the Elders' Conference, 1978, states, "The whole area
6 is used by all kinds of animal life. The area is a very delicate
7 one. There is an abundance of birds nesting and molting on those
8 islands. We still depend very much on the ocean, rivers, lakes
9 and the Barrier Islands." We have also heard testimonies from
10 village people about the inherent dangers of ice pile up over
11 the Barrier Islands. Time and time again during the public hearing
12 at Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and Fairbanks it has been brought up that
13 the Inupiat people depend upon the resources of the land and
14 the sea. The total ecosystem is all inter related. We have
15 heard examples of what the turbulent sea ice can do. We know
16 the strength of the moving ice. In your own words, as stated
17 in the DEIS, page 46, quote, "Structures placed in this zone
18 will interact with major ridge formations, whereas ice island
19 and floeberg incursions are entirely possible." End quote. Examples
20 of pressure ridge movements and ice overruns were testified by
21 both villages by people who, themselves, has experienced or know
22 of these storm surges. Examples of what has already happened
23 to some of our resources impacted from past exploration and oil
24 development were given. Quote, "Available public information
25 on potential natural hazards obtained from the BLM NOAA OCS program

1 has not specifically identified the presence of the following
2 types of potential hazards in or close to the proposed lease
3 area. And I have for purposes of being short, cut off. Those
4 are referenced on page 37. Information is lacking to make specific
5 conclusions and to make further conclusions from assumptions.
6 It is evident from these statements of unknowns, should have
7 been included in the DEIS but they weren't for the purposes of
8 having something done because it wasn't required of them. Con-
9 clusions are based on speculation. This is the kind of information
10 that leads to misconception of realities and misinterpretation
11 of data. Our local data proves that what is included in the
12 DEIS is purely speculation. The most incomplete and inaccurate
13 data is in the Volume III, Graphic Section. Even the data re-
14 ferenced to the North Slope Borough is incomplete and misconstrued.
15 For example, on graphic 8, only black dots on the coastline show
16 sites of significance but there is not backup data, which should
17 have been used for interpretation of the map. This shows you
18 that there has been no effort to consult with the local public
19 while in the process of putting the DEIS together. One of the
20 reasons given for failing to include data on food web relation-
21 ships is, quote, "because of the fragmentary nature of the lit-
22 erature." No doubt that our mammals, wildlife, fish and birds,
23 our basis for subsistence lifestyle will be adversely affected
24 by this proposed lease sale and those impacts will be unavoidable.
25 Quote, "Unavoidable effect would be a further erosion of the

1 subsistence lifestyle." This is infringement of the rights of
2 the Inupiat people to survive off the land and ice environment.
3 Further findings of impacts that the DEIS has stated includes,
4 page 333, quote, "Marine organisms in the Beaufort Sea are capable
5 of assimilating the heavy metals and petroleum hydrocarbons.
6 These hazardous materials could be transferred to people who con-
7 sume local marine animals." Furthermore, page 334, quote, "It
8 is felt it would be acceptable to allow dumping of these drilling
9 components." When on page 332, the DEIS has stated that, quote,
10 "The effects and accumulation rates of drill muds and cuttings
11 upon the near shore environment are not well known." Furthermore,
12 page 193, "Of definite concern to the higher trophic levels in
13 the marine food chain, including man, is the possibility of uptake
14 hydrocarbons, especially in carcinogenic form, in benthic organisms."
15 Further, that, page 191, quote, "Exploration activities causing
16 impacts upon the benthic communities include the discharge of
17 drilling muds and drill cuttings, dredging for artificial islands,
18 and burial of benthas due to the construction of artificial islands."
19 Further effects include, quote, "The physical effects of an oil
20 spill include smothering and abrasion removal and alteration
21 of substrates from cleanup activities. Immediate effects on
22 marine organisms occur from a single large infusion of petroleum
23 into the marine environment, usually from a spill. Hight mortality
24 of marine organisms may occur almost simultaneously with or at
25 sometimes after a spill." End quote. These unavoidable,

1 irreversible impacts will happen because, quote, "During some
2 conditions, such as breakup and freezeup, oil spill containment
3 and cleanup will be virtually impossible due to lack of adequate
4 technology and safety considerations." You'll find that on page
5 346. These risks will become reality just as it has happened
6 in the Beaufort Canadian waters. These statements threaten the
7 life of the Inupiat and threaten with dangers and impacts imposed
8 by the proposed lease sale. May we remind you that the Inupiat
9 is given as much a right to a life as the rest of the American
10 people. We must also be protected of our way of life in those
11 same terms. The DEIS mentions the irreplaceable, unavoidable
12 impacts on a culture, on a people. There is no discussion of
13 consideration for what will happen. Irreplacing a way of life
14 with what? Page 334, quote, "Culture resources surveys are not
15 expected to be required by the Federal Government prior to any
16 drilling activity on the construction or placement of any structure
17 for exploration or development on a lease. The Federal Government
18 has an obligation to do cultural surveys. Implementation of
19 this directs all Federal agencies before they make decisions
20 about undertaking a project to identify cultural resources that
21 may be affected. We request that the Federal Government comply
22 with its responsibility under Section 800.4 of CEQ Procedures.
23 The Secretary of Interior is mandated to preserve, protect,
24 enhance, identify, survey, evaluate cultural resources, sub-
25 sistence resources, historic sites, archaeological sites

1 prehistoric sites, land, sea mammals, birds and wildlife, the
2 environment through its different responsible agencies. The
3 local public must be afforded an opportunity to participate in
4 the rule making process. The State Government has a responsi-
5 bility through its own laws, to protect, preserve, enhance,
6 identify, survey, evaluate, consult with local government, the
7 cultural, subsistence, historic resources BEFORE any develop-
8 ment takes place. The disputes of ownership of State and Fed-
9 eral lands must not be overlooked and it must be resolved be-
10 fore any determinations. There have been no cooperative agree-
11 ments to resolve responsibilities and differences for implemen-
12 tation and enforcement of operating standards. We refuse to
13 let the State and Federal Government toss around the question,
14 quote, "Whose responsibility is this?" quote, on a way of
15 subsistence livelihood. With all these significant points we
16 have made, we want to reassure you that we are standing to-
17 gether to oppose the lease sale and that the lease sale should
18 be delayed. We will reaffirm our stand that the life and life-
19 style of the Inupiat is the most important factor to be consider-
20 ed in the decision making.

21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Flossie. Are there any
22 questions? (No response) Thank you again. At this time, I
23 would like to call a twenty minute recess.

24 (Hearing recessed at 9:50 p.m. and reconvened at 10:15 p.m.)

25 CHAIRMAN: At this time I would like to hear the statement

1 of Molly Peterson.

2 MOLLY PETERSON: Do I have to go up there? (Indicating
3 the witness table)

4 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

5 MOLLY PETERSON: My name is Molly Peterson. I was born
6 and raised here in Barrow. And my testimony is, the proposed
7 Beaufort Sea lease sale, to be held in December, 1979, is said
8 to be of National interest, so I'm sure all the Inupiat would
9 feel very insulted, as I would, if they felt that their views
10 were not going to be taken into consideration. Not only are
11 we U. S. citizens and as such, part of the National interest,
12 but we are obviously the people most affected by this lease sale.
13 We Inupiat are in the majority up here for a change. Usually,
14 we're in the minority. Keeping this in mind and reviewing the
15 Draft Environmental Statement prepared by BLM, it seems obvious
16 to me that the life of us Inupiat are going to be seriously
17 impacted by any oil development activities in the Beaufort Sea.
18 The very issues that concern my people most in the Draft Environ-
19 mental Impact Statement, like for instance, the whale, are those
20 like the following: on breeding areas, quote, "very little, if
21 any, information." End quote. on reproduction and growth,
22 "little is known," on mating season, "not well defined." on
23 location of calving grounds, "scientists not certain." on
24 gestation of calving periods, information is obscure or there
25 is none at all. Apparently nothing is known about the harm to

1 to Bowheads from oil and hydrocarbons and how the oil fouls their
2 baleen plates. Apparently the effects of oil on Bowhead food
3 sources is not known. Apparently the critical habitat of the
4 Bowhead is not well defined and there is no information on the
5 effects of the gravel islands and ice conditions on the Bowhead.
6 And all this is on a mammal that almost everyone has been talking
7 about in the last few years, because they have been considered
8 not only endangered; but even on the list of depleted species.
9 Surely, in good conscience, with so little data known on this
10 great animal, the State and the Federal Governments can't con-
11 done a sale which seems highly likely to contribute most towards
12 its extinction. The DEIS mentions that studies are being con-
13 ducted now and some of them will not be finished in time to be
14 considered by those who will be deciding whether the sale will
15 be held this December or not. A great deal of money is being
16 spent on these studies and, as a taxpayer, I would like to urge
17 that the sale be delayed indefinitely so the Final Environmental
18 Impact Statement will, at least, have some of the answers to
19 the issues that make up the lives of those of us who live in
20 this area. I would just like to point out two issues in the
21 DEIS. One is the one which states that the effect of gravel
22 islands in the migration path of whales is unknown. I was told
23 by an elder that the whales follow their food source when they
24 are migrating and that the water current controls that source.
25 He said that by erecting gravel islands in the Beaufort Sea, the

1 course of the current will be changed and will take with it the
2 food source of the whales which, in turn, will change their
3 migration patterns. The other issue is that in the DEIS, it was
4 pointed out that one of the worst possible effects on the Bowhead
5 Whale could be that its population will be reduced by half. The
6 Government believes the population is anywhere from a few hund-
7 red to seventeen hundred. If this is cut in half, the same
8 Government agencies will again blame our subsistence whaling and
9 start imposing yet more regulations and restrictions on us like
10 they did when the caribou population supposedly declined. In
11 addition to being in favor of an indefinite delay, I would also
12 suggest that the Final Environmental Impact Statement be reviewed
13 by the people being impacted, the Inupiats; although that alone
14 is a tremendous impact in itself. And having gone, or tried
15 going through the DEIS, I feel there are too many reasons not
16 to delay the sale date and the ones I've mentioned are only a
17 few. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN: Thank you Molly. At this time, I would like
19 Edith Nashoalook to read a statement from a lady in Fairbanks.

20 EDITH NASHOALOOK: My name is Edith Nashoalook and I'm
21 speaking for Mary Ann Warden from Fairbanks. She is my sister.
22 My name is Mary Ann Warden and I'm from Kaktovik originally.
23 I have lived in Fairbanks for approximately twelve years. I
24 speak for myself and the people who have moved to the city for
25 personal and health reasons. I am urging you to listen seriously

1 to the testimony of the people you saw in Kaktovik and Nuiqsut
2 and listen to the people of Barrow. What happens to the people
3 up North, happens to us in the city. Because we have moved to
4 the city does not mean that we have lost our culture and heritage.
5 Most of all, we have not lost the taste for the food that we
6 grew up with. It has been said that the whale, the seal, the
7 ducks, the caribou and the other animals up North must be under
8 consideration; but it was emphasized that man must not be for-
9 gotten. The Inupiat's main food comes from these animals. Must
10 we be forgotten, too along with the animals? History shows who
11 has always been considered first where money is concerned. Not
12 only has it happened to the American Indians, but to those in
13 the way of development. We, the Inupiat, were there before the
14 oil was discovered. We will still be there after the money is
15 gone. Please consider the possibility of delaying the oil lease
16 sale until there are some questions answered with clarity. If
17 these hearings are to have any effect at all on the decision of
18 the sale, please open your ears to those who oppose the sale. I
19 know what is inevitable but I will not be silent any longer. I
20 know I cannot stop the ice flow or the earthquakes, but I can
21 use my voice to ask you to weigh the situation seriously and
22 consider the testimony equally with fairness. I cannot conclude
23 without commenting on Mr. Herrera's statement made yesterday.
24 I have not toured any oil rigs with Sohio-BP, but I have seen
25 and heard the ice flow when it was coming. The ice is more

1 convincing any day than what Mr. Herrera said. I am sure if
2 Sohio could have their way, they would like to have the shores
3 of Barter Island. And sometimes communication is not always the
4 best between the oil companies and the Inupiat. Maybe the person
5 Mr. Herrera was talking with was pointing to the animals and
6 not the drill. I know for myself that I would rather have the
7 animals on the shores of Barter Island any day. As I have said,
8 communications sometimes is bad and maybe one sided, or a simple
9 nod or yes can be made as a statement. Again, I am thankful for
10 the opportunity to speak for myself and my people. I urge you
11 again to listen and remember what you have heard. My prayers
12 also go with you. Thank you. This is from Mary Ann Warden.

13 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mary Ann's your sister?

14 EDITH NASHOALOOK: Um hum.

15 CHAIRMAN: Thank her for us. At this time, I would like to
16 ask someone from the audience to speak. I know I talked to
17 two or three gentlemen outside that said they would like very
18 much to testify. Molly, would you like to say that in Inupiat?

19 INTERPRETER: (Inupiat)

20 DANIEL LEAVITT: (Inupiat)

21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Daniel. Molly, would you give us a
22 summary of that, please?

23 INTERPRETER: His name is Daniel Leavitt. He doesn't have
24 any papers like the other people to give to you, but he'd like
25 to say something. Whenever we hear about something that's in

1 danger in regards to our land, we always talk about it. He went
2 back to where he grew up five years.,it's been five years now
3 since he's been returning to where he grew up. He went there
4 in 1919 when he was two and a half years old. This is to the
5 east of here where this lease sale is, that area is. And he
6 lives there until 1936. He returned there after being employed
7 when he came. He started working and stuff and then around
8 1970, he finally went back over there. He said he's not a hunter
9 or become a hunter until late..he's comparing to his brothers
10 and sisters, but when they lived there, they never went hunting
11 because there was the sea, the lakes, the rivers and the land.
12 There were animals where they could get food from. He's con-
13 cerned about why a lot of these lakes and rivers are getting
14 too shallow. He's found where they..these seismicgraphic testing.
15 He's even seen them at the edge of Tsukpuk Lake and he's..he
16 can't help but blame something like that because there's lakes
17 where they just could put part of a fish net and they will get
18 fish. When they stop for lunch, they can pick up lots of fish
19 for lunch with just part of a net in the water but now even
20 people try with two hundred foot nets and still don't get that
21 much. There is one lake where you can't find any fish at all.
22 There is one that were a few but he has seen the tests going on
23 over there too and he's afraid that there won't be any more
24 fish there again. Tsukpuk Lake is another he's wondering about
25 that's getting shallower over there. The streams, little rivers,

1 whatever you call them, where they shoot out from Tsukpuk Lake,
2 they used to be able to go in boats in those but they can't even
3 go on them. Some of them less than half an inch of water on them.
4 He's wondering why the water in the lakes is so shallow and he
5 blames it on the tests that keep happening after promising that
6 they wouldn't do it anymore, they still keep doing it.

7 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Molly. This Gentleman right here.
8 He's next.

9 RAYMOND NEOKOK: Yes. My name is Raymond Neokok. (Inupiat)
10 That's first. Now, I'm going to read it in English. My name
11 is Raymond Neokok. I'm an Eskimo hunter from Barrow, Alaska.
12 I'm a hunter not because of pride in the hunt, I hunt to have
13 food on my table. How beautiful is your land. White lights,
14 automatic lights, handsome food, computerized ecology, scientific
15 knowledge of how to replace a God given organ. Flying on a plane,
16 which I was told, virtually lands itself. Beautiful wonders
17 within your grasp. All you have to do is push a button here
18 and one there. How long do you suppose you're going to use
19 these beautiful inventions? The TV commercials say, just another
20 generation. In just two hundred years, U.S. has gained recog-
21 nition as being a world power. Two hundred years young and
22 already old because you fight against Mother Nature. How, you
23 ask? Pollution of air you breath, contamination of food you
24 eat and sorry waste of fuel you need which you have not found
25 replacement for. I have listened to your speculations, your

1 data and your shamefully hidden lies about stopping an oil spill.
2 But you really don't know how to do it, because people, even in
3 the oil industry do eventually make mistakes. You don't have
4 the knowledge of cleaning up it completely to the satisfaction
5 of Mother Nature, who does not fight back. She only waits for
6 you in the middle, her conquering soul. Eskimos have lived in
7 barren land for thousands of years. We have had to deal with
8 Mother Nature and we have learned to go by her rules only. When
9 we make mistakes, she is quick to punish instantly. And some-
10 times she is not too favorable. Then she starves us, slowly,
11 and we learn to respect her a little bit more. When she is
12 happy, we live joyfully and abundantly. She protects some of
13 the animals. She protect them with territory they will use so
14 they will survive another day. Eskimos took a little longer
15 so they are not so numerous as the animals. We finally learned
16 that if we are to survive, we must learn the way of the animal.
17 We have learned not to kill so many healthy and young animals
18 all the time. We are the ones..they are the ones who replenish
19 our food. In my time, I have learned where they will be when
20 I want them, I am still learning from them. What is more im-
21 portant, I have learned to take only what I will use for that
22 season. My father has taught me never to say that I am going
23 catch this kind of animal today. I have found out on more than
24 one occasion, when I do say so, there is no such animal to be
25 had. I am a raw meat eater, preferably frozen, whether it be

1 whale, caribou or seal. I have learned to let quite a lot of
2 it ferment. I put on some whale oil or seal oil and wait awhile
3 before I eat it. All of the animals that I have eaten, they are
4 not full of fatty chemicals. They are not gauged and given
5 vitamin shots to keep them healthy. They are Mother Nature,
6 period. This is all endangered. Our main source of blubber is
7 in danger. Mostly by false information or by funds not budgeted
8 to study them accurately. Endangered even more so, are the
9 pollution that is sadly neglected or not reported and mostly
10 hidden and falsified. I have yet to see a headline stating
11 these facts. We are slowly but surely polluting critical habi-
12 tats of the animals. On sea, we want to put holes into Mother
13 Nature and let her lead a little. We talk about endangered
14 species and polluting the environment and you have speculations
15 of correcting that problem. But, I am an endangered species
16 also, for I have to live from the animals, with the animals
17 and as the animals. Without them, I will not survive. Mother
18 Nature punishes those who live against her wishes. My only
19 hope is teach you all I can about Mother Nature. Otherwise,
20 you will surely kill the last frontier of this young Nation
21 of the Americans. (Inupiat)

22 This is my other statement. My people, we are at war.
23 We are fighting for our very existance. Our livelihood is being
24 exploited by the very people we elected to join as a free Nation
25 under God. Our pursuit of happiness is stopped by the Govern-

1 ment's legal technicalities. We, the Inupiat, are dictated to,
2 and contaminated. Freedom of speech has been stopped for us
3 because of State and Federal Governments expects us to under-
4 stand their back door tactics of their high classed bureaucratic
5 language. Our own protector, as she is called, is killing our
6 seal pups by allowing seismic testing this year during the
7 pupping season. History is repeating itself. We see, here and
8 now, the same thinking that led Americans to virtually destroy
9 our brother, the Indians down south. No, they are not using
10 gunpower to try and kill us. They use their legalities, their
11 predictions and mostly their ignorance of the few people here
12 that they are regarded as just an obstacle to their plans.
13 They steal our lands, desecrate our graves, and destroy our
14 food. Then they expect thanks when they are ordered to return
15 what was ours from time immortal. Judges need proof of owner-
16 ship when we don't have the deed for our lands that we use to
17 feed our kids. We will die slowly and probably soon because
18 our Government doesn't have the time to consider so few. When
19 they move south, we will live like bums. We will all be on
20 welfare and we'll be called that no good Inupiat. We'll be
21 considered lazy but willing to work. We will become outcasts
22 because we will be out of our environment. This is some future
23 for my people and it will happen and the great Nation will not
24 give a damn. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Raymond. At this time, I want to call

1 Carl M. Hild.

2 CARL M. HILD: Thank you very much. My name is Carl Marshall
3 Hild. I'm a health educator and coordinator for the children's
4 receiving home for the North Slope Borough. I first came to
5 Barrow in 1971 to do research on Arctic mammals, including the
6 polar bear. I became fascinated by this very fragile yet very
7 harsh environment. I hold a Bachelor of Science Degree in bio-
8 logy and have seven years experience in working in residential
9 programs. I wish to speak in two ways on two issues. First,
10 as a concerned citizen, biologist and resident of the Arctic
11 region. I oppose the leasing of land for off shore oil develop-
12 ment at this time. When I started my research and was learning
13 about polar bears, there's not much research on their denning
14 sites. These bears are classified as endangered species. Soon
15 after, it was realized that much more information was needed about
16 this animal. Action needed to be taken and it was. Research
17 projects locating denning areas and a local agreement on
18 the conservation of polar bears was reached with the Soviet
19 Union. Now, if the oil lease goes through, we will not only
20 be invading the denning area of the endangered polar bear, but
21 the United States Government will be breaching its agreement with
22 a far larger bear. The Soviet Union. Many other forms of
23 wildlife nest, den, and breed in the proposed lease area. Many
24 of these animals are on the food chain for the Inupiat. Fish,
25 birds and sea mammals must live in a clean pollution free environ-

1 to be good food for humans. The fragility of the Arctic environ-
2 ment is at stake. This is demonstrated in what little will start
3 thermal erosion. Black oil and water on the ice may start a
4 series of irreversible events that could lead to disaster. There
5 are too many unknowns to removing oil from the off shore area.
6 Considering we know nothing of the force of Arctic pack ice, we
7 do have, with our limited vision, an idea of how it tears away
8 bluffs, levels buildings, crushes ships and shifts unpredictably.
9 No man made object can stand up to these glacial forces. This
10 is the same force that carved mountains in twos and scraped out
11 the Great Lakes. An oil rig, on any kind of pad, will not shun
12 the pack ice. We cannot afford to learn by mistake in this area.
13 As an individual concerned with the environment, there are too
14 many questions to be answered to even consider off shore oil
15 drilling. The second way I would like to give testimony is in a
16 professional sense. As coordinator of the children's receiving
17 home, I'm at the pulse of many social problems within the North
18 Slope Borough. The Environmental Impact Statement Draft speaks
19 of family income being well below State levels. Unemployment rates
20 are relatively high. Dollar purchasing power is less here than
21 in most areas of the State. Eighty-eight per cent of the heads
22 of households have less than an eighth grade education. In
23 contrast, the Draft also states, the physical and psychological
24 well being of the North Slope Inupiat depends heavily on sub-
25 sistence activities. Subsistence activities play an important

1 role in Kaktovik. Employed people depend on them for thirty per
2 cent of their food needs; unemployed people, from forty to eighty
3 per cent of their food needs. Subsistence activities are very
4 important here. They are life. At the children's receiving home,
5 we note a definite trend. During hunting seasons, our home is
6 not busy. Families hunt together. Whaling season brings families
7 together. Summer fish camp are fun for everyone. Caribou hunting
8 in late fall and preparation for Christmas all aid to the family.
9 But take it away, kill the fish or make them uneatable, destroy
10 the snow goose nesting ground, eliminate the whale's summertime
11 peaceful environment and the Inupiat will not have food. Tempers
12 will flare, children will be abused and neglected. Few jobs, if
13 any, are promised to the Inupiat people. What is said in the
14 draft is, quote, "The overall changes cannot be determined positive
15 or negative except by those effected." End quote. I would say,
16 the people of the North Slope have seen changes already and they're
17 negative. The Draft also states, "As for the North Slope Borough,
18 increased revenues will be more than adequate for providing
19 the needed increase in service," End quote. Since the pipeline
20 was started, there has been three hundred per cent increase in
21 child abuse and neglect in the State of Alaska. In the past
22 three years, over fifty children from the North Slope Borough,
23 who could have lived in a residential program, have been moved
24 off the Slope and away from their culture. In this one area alone,
25 the increased revenues would need to cover additional social

1 workers, the construction of additional residential homes, the
2 cost of keeping children at the homes, salaries for the child-
3 care specialists to staff the homes and much more. It is not
4 worth it. If those increased revenues are put totally to re-
5 placing the food, that will be loss to the subsistent hunter. It
6 may cover for a time but once the fish are sickly, the geese are
7 gone, the whale are dead or living elsewhere, and the oil runs out,
8 then what? There will be no more increased revenues. There will
9 only be scars. From what I've seen and read, the people of the
10 North Slope Borough do not want oil rigs off shore. This is
11 their environment, their ecological nitch. If the snail darter
12 and whooping crane can be protected and their home environment
13 preserved, then the same should be true of the polar bear, the
14 snow goose, the Bowhead Whale and most importantly, the Inupiat.
15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Carl. Dale Brower Stotts, Alaska
17 Eskimo Whaling Commission?

18 DALE BROWER STOTTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of
19 the Panel. The Whaling Commission is organized tribal authority
20 which proceeds from the laws the United States granting the
21 Inupiat community of the Arctic Slope with full rights to govern
22 those essential, those things in life which are essential to
23 maintain the Inupiat integrity and we have taken a year now to
24 seriously look at the pros and cons that are a subject of this
25 hearing tonight. We have taken many long hours, talked to our

1 residents in the various communities here on the North Slope,
2 members of the scientific community, compared their data with the
3 knowledge of the Inupiat residing on the North Slope and we have
4 spent a long time in weighing the National interests which have
5 been projected by the various proponents of the off shore exploi-
6 tation here in the Beaufort Sea. In listening to various people
7 in addressing the many inter related issues, the Alaska Eskimo
8 Whaling Commission has come to a number of conclusions, one of
9 which is that this whole hearing is an illegally proceeding hear-
10 ing. The reason that we are here is to tell you that we feel
11 that the different agencies of the Federal and State government
12 have exceeded their authority in conducting these hearings. There
13 is an organization here which is the tribal organization of all
14 of the Inupiat residents on the Slope. And there are procedures
15 by which acceptance of these type proposals, or dismissal of
16 these proposals can be reached. And it is from the basis of your
17 approach to the leasing of these submerged lands off shore who's
18 title is in question in omitting from the first stages of this
19 act..your activity, which the oil and gas industry would like, in
20 omitting the Inupiat from any of the early planning, is what we
21 most strongly object to. The people up here have always maintained
22 what their forefathers have achieved. And have done so peacefully.
23 History has documented it as well. But not until recent times
24 has there been conflict with the Eskimos' economy and others'
25 desires to occupy space and to utilize resources which once were

1 never under their sight. So, we have a major question to be re-
2 solved, which is now some fourteen years old..the trespass at
3 Prudhoe Bay, which came about from the bad leasing tactics of, at
4 that time, a different State administration and without pro-
5 tection from the Federal Government for the people here and has
6 been a continued plague to the people's minority economic develop-
7 ment in these regions because that the machinery of justice has
8 not worked in our favor. And lands that could have been reasonably
9 leased with total Inupiat cooperation have been stolen outright.
10 The intimidations which people feel are very real from the acqui-
11 sition of lands because of multinational strengths and power and
12 given over in a seemingly National interest for a seemingly Na-
13 tional interest purpose. We begin to feel the oppression of these
14 quiet ways that resources exploited, resources are exploited in
15 Alaska. We realize how distant that we are from the rest of the
16 United States and we understand how the economics of the media
17 have worked against us in not reporting consistently what is hap-
18 pening to Native cultures up here. We do not pretend that we
19 have not made some progress while the Alaska Native Claims Settle-
20 ment Act has given some greater abilities to a Native community
21 to achieve their goals and their desires. We are still faced with
22 the very unreal, yet real, obstacle. And that is the multinational
23 interests in our resources. The special preference given to large
24 corporations to obtain access to these areas over the rights which
25 the Inupiat people have under their own autonomy to discuss

1 these, these proposals, uh, have been most damaging to the people
2 here. The politically imposed land and animal quotas given to the
3 people here. Given, not worked out, is what people are most op-
4 posed to, is what the Eskimo Whaling Commission would like to
5 speak to at an International level. That we do not feel, judging
6 upon the past couple years of experience we've had with our Fed-
7 eral and State Governments, that reasonable treatment is being
8 given to the issues that are most critical to us. It's not that
9 the resource could not be gained, used, distributed, it's the
10 manner in which the resources are being. We've heard from the
11 people who's..who stand to be most effected on their desire to
12 lead one way of life, which is not that of an employee of an oil
13 or gas operator necessarily, but that whose livelihood conflicts
14 with the activities of these operators. And we understand how
15 the economic pressures and lobbying which is brought to bear to
16 satisfy these multinational desires eventually become incorporated
17 into a national trend. We have seen the Trans Alaska pipeline
18 and the haul road construction and the total distruction of a
19 major fish resource at the Salminikok River. The destruction of
20 the Tsukpuk Lake. Who is going to pay these damages? If there
21 was some way that we could be assured of a equal partnership,
22 I believe the Inupiat people would willingly address the subject
23 of leasing of petroleum rich land. We would also discuss the
24 sale of the resource at prices which people could live with and
25 would not try to inflate the precious lifestyle of people in need

1 of this oil and gas resource. That is our perogative; that is
2 your alternative. The end result, we hope, of your hearing is
3 that you will have understood that there are process, procedures
4 by which the issues, these issues can be addressed without having
5 to go through the special interests which bring about the question
6 of leasing to begin with. We have a major conflict with the same
7 industries over the trespass at Prudhoe Bay, yet to be resolved.
8 The destruction of their activity, yet to be resolved. And it
9 has been fourteen years since their coming. When this is all
10 done, we'll probably see three of four generations of good Americans
11 wasted in trying to pay attention to the details of their one
12 industry's activity. In closing, Mr. Chairman, we'd like to change
13 the feeling that, in this Country, we should not have to fear the
14 judge for we don't fear the law. Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. One moment, there was one
16 lady that had her hand up real early and I think we should ask
17 her to testify.

18 MARTHA STACKHOUSE: My name is Martha Stackhouse. I'm a
19 Barrow resident and I don't belong to any one group and this is
20 my own testimony. We are here to discuss a problem of the pos-
21 sibility of the lease sale in Beaufort Sea and also the possibility
22 of an oil spill. Let's take a look at the other areas which en-
23 dangers lives because of pollution. There are reports of large
24 amounts of oil floating in middle of the Pacific Ocean. There
25 are remnants of tar on the California beaches due to oil spills,

1 which they say they have cleaned up. But the tar is still there.
2 These are only a couple of examples of oil spills where there is
3 not even a danger of moving Arctic polar ice conditions. There
4 are more pollution problems due to smog created by cars in the
5 large cities which cause lung cancer. Most of the people in the
6 Lower 48 eat store bought foods which are so full of preservatives
7 that after years of eating this type of foods, also causes cancer.
8 Rivers are almost all polluted causing drinking water shortage.
9 We are fortunate enough not to be in this situation. Our air
10 is clean, our oceans not polluted, we eat natural foods from this
11 ocean. This we have done for thousands of years, living in har-
12 mony with nature. Now, the oil companies want to drill off shore
13 and some have even started without our permission, which, in fact,
14 endangers our lives. As I view the world today, I see a sad sit-
15 uation which endangers the whole world. We are ruining the air,
16 the oceans and the rivers. The ecosystem is broken. They say
17 that this oil is badly needed, but we don't really need it. There
18 are other alternatives. There is solar energy which can be used
19 for almost anything. No pollution involved. Steam could be used
20 for cars and for our area, there is the power of the wind. The
21 natural renewable source for modern conveniences. Our ancestors
22 use circular homes for thousands of years which could be the
23 best architecture for homes up here and uhm, we could build the
24 dome houses, which are by far cheaper than the rectangular ones
25 and also use less heat just by the fact that it is circular.

1 These alternatives are pro life, pro human. We do not want to
2 pollute our ocean, our air and our rivers. We do not want the
3 animals to die because of oil spills. There is talk of endangered
4 whales last year, therefore there was a limited whale hunt. Who
5 is really endangering the whale? The Inupiat people? Or the oil
6 companies? We hunt and use everybit of the whale. To me, it is
7 the oil companies who endanger the ocean mammals, fish, migratory
8 birds and human life itself.

9 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Martha. Yes Sir?

10 DON LONG: My name is Don Long. I'm with Arctic Slope
11 Regional Corporation and with the North Slope Borough Assembly.
12 There are several people here from smaller villages that would
13 like to have a couple moments here, have comments to make. I'd
14 like to introduce, first, Lorrie Kingik and Roger Silook, Joe
15 Noongwook and Alfred Leavitt.

16 CHAIRMAN: If they'd like to speak--

17 DON LONG: It would be in order that they make their presen-
18 tation. They're from different villages from here in Alaska.

19 CHAIRMAN: Fine. Why don't you just have one at a time
20 come up and testify?

21 DON LONG: Okay. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN: You're welcome.

23 LORRIE KINGIK: My name is Lorrie Kingik from Point Hope.
24 (Inupiat)

25 DON LONG: That was Lorrie Kingik from Point Hope. Also,

1 representatives, for the record, are Mae Hank and Elim Optulink
2 should be put in the record for the presentation.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Don.

4 DON LONG: Now, the next person we have is Roger Silook from
5 Gamble and he'd like to make his formal presentation.

6 ROGER SILOOK: My name is Roger Silook from Gamble, Saint
7 Lawrence Island. My education is limited in English but I claim
8 a Master's degree in Eskimo education. That's why I am here to
9 say a few words. I'm going to make my statement very short in
10 order to be heard. If I make it long, none of you will listen.
11 I have no idea of this environment here. I don't know the Beau-
12 fort Sea, but one thing I know, we are connected by the food
13 chain all the way from Kaktovik to Saint Lawrence Island. The
14 main food is our Bowhead Whale, which migrates all the way through
15 Saint Lawrence Island and beyond. These uh, oceans, Arctic oceans
16 and Bering Sea, contains very delicate life. It needs long, long
17 time to study before the oil exploration and test drilling takes
18 place. I'm going to tell you an example, what I mean, pertaining
19 to Bowhead Whales. We have scientists that did the research this
20 spring on a policy using two helicopters and a motor craft boat
21 which is not fitting for research. These whales are very sensi-
22 tive. This resulted..no whales for Gamble and Savoونkut. The
23 whales did not migrate the route they take every year. Instead,
24 they migrate past the island the other way because there's traffic
25 in our area. The whales are very sensitive in our area. When

1 they migrate south, they're behaviour becomes different. In
2 Beaufort Sea when the oil lease sale is proposed, that's where
3 the Bowhead Whales take their peaceful vacation every year and
4 refresh themselves with each other. So, their behaviour is dif-
5 ferent here. When they migrate, they most likely working for
6 themselves, trying to survive. What nature plan is something like
7 taking a train all the way from Kaktovik, passing along the coast
8 to all the coastal Eskimos, take what they want from these marine
9 mammals. The very thing I am afraid of when the oil drilling takes
10 place is two things going to happen to these marine mammals.
11 Either they relocate themselves somewhere to Pacific Ocean or
12 will they die out because of the mental anguish. That's one very
13 big thing I fear of. Because I have an experience. We used to
14 have a little dog. We love that little dog. He was never hurt
15 until one day when he start chewing on a chair, I slap him. The
16 poor thing almost died. He never eat for three days because that
17 was the first experience he had. The same thing will happen to
18 the Bowhead Whale. The whales migrate back and forth. When
19 they migrate between the Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean, there
20 is a big hall way they took to migration. The Bering Sea and
21 Arctic is their living room, where they live. There's no way
22 to make the whales understand what's going to take place. No-
23 body will tell them. We will. We will tell the Government what's
24 going to take place when they protect these whales. Thank you.

25 DON LONG: The next person from the village of Wainwright

1 is Rosman Peetook. and Terry Tagarook. Rosman?

2 ROSMAN PEETOOK: My name is Rosman Peetook, Wainwright
3 Village Council member and I don't have any resolutions so I'll
4 testify in my own language. (Inupiat)

5 TERRY TAGAROOK: I was going to say something. My name is
6 Terry Tagarook, from Wainwright. In the past our ancestors sur-
7 vived through the bitter cold, the bitter winds, hunger and the
8 Inupiat people survived. What we don't want is the sale of the
9 oil lease. We don't want the drilling to be done, otherwise, it
10 will just kill off the people like the winters. Cold winds in
11 the past. The Inupiat people will want to survive. The people
12 in Wainwright don't want to see that happening on the sale lease.
13 That's all I say.

14 DON LONG: Thank you, Terry. Now, we have Joseph Noongwook
15 from Savoونkuk.

16 JOSEPH NOONGWOOK: My name is Joseph Noongwook from Sav-
17 oonkuk. First of all, I would like to say in my own language.
18 (Eskimo dialect) Now, I will try to say in English. I'm a member
19 of the RAA School District for the past five years. I've been
20 in Council for eleven years. I'm a member of the Eskimo Whaling
21 Commission. I've been traveling to the villages for the past
22 five years all along the coast in my region and this morning when
23 I got into Barrow, I see that we're one. One Eskimo. That we
24 could hunt whale, walrus, birds, fish everything we could eat.
25 So, I'm not new to any villages or even cities when it comes to

1 my travels. I know that we Eskimos always depend upon sea mammal,
2 birds, fish and fowl and all the animals that we can eat. That's
3 all I can say. Thank you.

4 DON LONG: We have, from Point Lay, from Point Lay we have
5 Amos Agnosoga.

6 AMOS AGNOSOGA: My name is Amos Agnosoga. I'm from Point
7 Lay and representing the Point Lay Village Council. We're against
8 any off shore drilling in the Beaufort Sea although we're a long
9 ways from where it's happening. Our stores don't hold any kind of
10 meat. We have to depend on sea mammals and oil companies don't
11 have technology for preventing the oil spills. Thank you.

12 DON LONG: We have Pat Hugo from Anotuvik Pass.

13 PAT HUGO: My name is Pat Hugo and I'm from Anotuvik Pass.
14 I would like to comment on the impact from the oil industry which
15 has come up. We just heard it up there about ten years ago
16 because we're further in and we are among the first of the Eskimos
17 to see the impact because we depend on the Eskimo. The impact
18 of the pipeline is severe and very damaging to the land, not
19 only fishing but also the wildlife habitat in this region. I
20 do not know how come our State Fish and Game is ignoring that
21 even though in their studies they have seen that there has been
22 a drastic change in the migration of the caribou. A decline of
23 the caribou which they thought the Eskimo slaughtered carelessly
24 after they've been eating them for thousands of years. All in
25 one year, all of the sudden, they thought the Eskimo got careless

1 and almost wiped out their food source. The caribou migration
2 in mountain passes, up the coast, and on the, uhm, edge of the
3 mountains which are easier to travel. And the caribou not only
4 the migration are lost but also migrates to Alaska and the pipe-
5 line that goes right down through the State is an obstacle for
6 the caribou. The people in Anotuvik Pass have said that the
7 caribou is one major herd and not the three herds that the Fish
8 and Game has divided them up to. That the reason the Fish and
9 Game has divided that, is trying to cover up the impact of the
10 pipeline on that species. For twenty years I've been living in
11 Anutuvik, there have been drastic change in migration of caribou.
12 The Fish and Game from the State should be well aware of that
13 because they have been up there studying for year by year on how
14 the caribou travels. Now they are trying to ignore to cure that
15 problem because it is not their food source they're worried about.
16 It's a minority's. The caribou migrates twice a year through our
17 passes up there. During the springtime when they are heading
18 towards their calving grounds, which is soon to be another oil
19 field. Then in the fall time they migrate south using the passes
20 before the winter sets in. And I have living proof that the
21 caribou migrates on the whole region of Alaska, that also into
22 Canada and we will swear by our word that the caribou was one
23 major herd. There is so much activity on shore, I do not know
24 if there is really a need right now to drill off shore unless
25 driven by greed and once all the natural habitat is gone in this

1 region, it cannot be compensated. As Emily Wilson read earlier
2 on that resolution passed by our Mayor, we are opposing the off
3 shore drilling that's supposed to go on in December. Thank you.

4 DON LONG: Okay. We have one more person from the village
5 of Barrow, Alfred Leavitt.

6 ALFRED LEAVITT: (Inupiat)

7 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Alfred. Thank you, Don. I know
8 there are others who would like to testify but I would like to
9 take a ten minute recess at this time.

10 (Hearing recessed at 12:25 a.m. and reconvened at 12:35 a.m.)

11 CHAIRMAN: I'd like to start the hearing again, please.
12 Don, you have one more person?

13 DON LONG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've got one more
14 person from Wainwright, Florence Ahmaogok.

15 FLORENCE AHMAOGOK: My name is Florence Ahmaogok from
16 Wainwright and I'm one of the Cultural Members there. This is
17 just a rough sketch I have. I was going to prepare another one
18 but uh...concerning the Beaufort Sea sale, that's one hundred miles
19 long. Just imagine from Barrow to Wainwright, that's about one
20 hundred miles and that's a lot. If they ever decide to drill
21 holes, there's a lot of holes there and you never know, there's
22 going to be, maybe, high tides and ice pilings like we used to
23 have in some other years, maybe that will never happen. Maybe
24 there will never be oil spill but if there is an oil spill, that's
25 something else. We are looking at the picture from the good

1 side and the bad side. Number one, Beaufort Sea sale, no not now.
2 With our present environmental and cultural impact statements, we
3 want at least one hundred per cent that there be no, so called,
4 accidental oil spills. Just in cast there should be an oil spill,
5 there going to be a lot of investigators from our side that will
6 give us real good reasons why there's an oil spill. And we will
7 also be told that there will never be anymore of this because
8 they've learned from one broken piece of oil rig or whatever you
9 call it. (Inupiat) Number two. (Inupiat) Why are the fish on
10 the coast, the Arctic coast, the Arctic Ocean, why are they dying
11 and washed upon beaches? Found dead and some are dying. What
12 is killing them? (Inupiat) Three. Why don't we see any more
13 snipes on our coast? There use to be lots of them around until
14 I was grown up? (Inupiat) Four. To me, an Eskimo, my dinner
15 plate is often times full of food from Chukchi Sea, that is Arctic
16 Ocean. Who is going to take that good food away from my plate?
17 Oil spill can only do that. That good food will be taken away
18 from my plate by some outsiders exterminating the game that our
19 kids now eat to survive the cold winter months. (Inupiat) Eskimo
20 is not a sports hunter only. Subsistence hunting is something
21 else. Very few of us called Eskimos know the true meaning of it
22 because in publicity, we often times read that, sure, we Eskimos
23 are hired too, and we work part time instead of full time, some
24 of us. Some of us, full time, yes. Still, we're living under
25 subsistence way of living. Eskimos kill animals to eat, not to

1 make any big trophy rooms like others do. If money for them and
2 fame..(Inupiat). And our cultural heritage comes from way back;
3 not just only me. White man's food good. We like that too, but
4 the main diet will not be snatched away from our tables. We will
5 continue to eat our caribou and our birds as long as we live up
6 here in the Arctic. Our children will continue on the same way.
7 (Inupiat) We don't want to see any kind of sea lease sale in
8 our life time, while there is Prudhoe Bay and other areas where
9 you can pump oil. (Inupiat) Too bad you're not dealing with an
10 Eskimo of Seward days. You know how Seward was being teased buying
11 that ice box while the Eskimos were living in igloos and don't
12 have any radios and no contacts of any kind. This, I want you
13 to know that, this is a head on collision. We're not agreeing
14 with your so called lease sale. (Inupiat) That's all I have.

15 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Florence.

16 DON LONG: I'd like to make a final comment. I'd like to
17 thank each village that made their presentation; from Point Lay,
18 Gamble, Wainwright. I think there's a mutual interest that they
19 do object to the lease sale because of these off shore lease
20 sales. There's a, you know, if the interpretation were to be,
21 right now, translated, it would come to a mutual understanding
22 that they disagree to this lease sale, for each village and their
23 people's interest. And I would like to thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Don. There's a young gentleman over
25 there that asked to speak and if you'll give us a moment, we'll

1 get to you.

2 THOMAS NUSUNGINYA: (Inupiat) Now, I will speak in English.
3 Why don't you disclose to us Inupiat of what technical concepts
4 you are to utilize on extraction of the oil on off shore? So far,
5 you have only told us of the area to be leased. How do you plan
6 to bury the pipeline on the ocean floor? How do you plan to keep
7 the oil from being by the ice movement? Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Thomas. I will ask you to speak. I
9 still have three people on the list that I'll get to after this
10 lady and then you all can follow. Thank you.

11 ANNIE BROWER: (Inupiat)

12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Annie. Would you translate that for
13 us, Molly?

14 INTERPRETER: All the ones? All the ones that were not..

15 CHAIRMAN: No, just this one.

16 INTERPRETER: Just this one? What about the other ones?
17 I think they all should be translated if any of them are going
18 to be translated.

19 CHAIRMAN: Okay. It will take us quite awhile.

20 INTERPRETER: There's four of them altogether. No, it won't.

21 CHAIRMAN: No? All right. Then why don't you go ahead.

22 INTERPRETER: Lorrie Kingik was from Point Hope. His father
23 was from Barrow. He spoke first about the whales. He was sur-
24 prised that the whales came early this season. They came in
25 first of March and this was the first time it's ever happened

1 that he can remember. Ever since he grew up, he grew up on
2 Inupiat food. Mostly seal. And he mentioned how when he tries
3 to eat white man's food, he gets hungry quicker than he would if
4 he ate Eskimo food. And the other thing that he didn't like was
5 the data that was given on the whale hunters and the caribous.
6 The regulations on the caribous. He mentioned how he has many
7 grandchildren. His family is large and one caribou can never be
8 enough for one year. And his comment on the land, he's commenting
9 that this area that's on the proposed lease sale belongs to the
10 Native of the North Slope Borough. He used as an example, the
11 quaint old Native store that Annie took over, promising them
12 that they would get more money from their shares in the Point Hope
13 Native stores but he himself has never received one red cent out
14 of it. And that is why he is opposed to anything like this lease.
15 He's opposing this lease because we are just going to be lied to
16 again like it has always happened in the past.

17 (Rosman Peetook) INTERPRETER: And Rosman Peetook from
18 Wainwright was also here testifying. He was talking about the
19 disputed portion of the lease sale area of there. He's commented
20 that they, there's a fight over that even that portion of the
21 land even though they've never seen it, they've never been on it
22 whereas us Inupiat's been hunting on it since time in memorial.
23 There's people buried on it. People that died on it; might not
24 be buried on it, but they died on it. Probably buried somewhere
25 else and he's also against this lease sale. He says there were

1 very great men a long time ago that could probably be..that would
2 probably have been called honorable so and so and when the white
3 man first came in, this was long time ago, they brought many bad
4 habits to give to these people. The Inupiat people are always
5 surviving. That time they lived. It's a little bit better now
6 but now we have to fight for the land and fight for our culture.

7 (Alfred Leavitt) INTERPRETER: Alfred Leavitt, from Barrow,
8 also spoke. He wanted to thank you for coming here to hear what
9 the people have to say. And he commented that the only way you
10 will know anything about the Inupiat is by listening to the people
11 here and he's concerned about his children and their children and
12 his neighbors and his fellow Inupiat. About..because we don't
13 have gardens like everybody else. We consider the ocean our
14 garden. We start hunting from April until October for the rest
15 of the winter and that ocean is like the garden. Just growing
16 like your gardens start growing to feed you people. He commented
17 also that the animals will get scarce, whether on land or sea,
18 once they start drilling and oil development's out there. He
19 again thanked you people for coming here and would want you to
20 realize that even a little spill of oil will kill like it did
21 quite awhile back when there was small spill from a ship out there
22 by Barrow where many ducks and many seals were killed. He's
23 afraid the industry will kill many more animals.

24 (Annie Brower) INTERPRETER: And Annie Brower's the last
25 person. She says she's been hearing about this Beaufort lease sale

1 since 10:30 this morning. She's a member of the planning commission
2 and they met and had public hearings since 10:30 on. She also
3 compared, like Florence did, how big that area is up there. It
4 would be comparable to the land between Barrow and Wainwright.
5 She commented quite a bit on how they've been trying to work on
6 Coastal Zone Ordinances as planning commission and how the oil
7 industry is opposing them. Every little ordinance they've been
8 trying to work on has been opposed and here this is what they
9 are trying to do for the Inupiat and also for the culture.. Be-
10 cause that was given to the North Slope Borough as a power to
11 do but they get opposed every little turn they try to do, also
12 being, as she considered, being threatened by the oil industry.
13 There is evidence of no fish in lakes, even though they're not
14 that close to the ocean and he can imagine how much more damage
15 will be done to the animals that are on the ocean. The food that
16 we eat, she commented how even you try to go to the store to
17 buy meat and stuff, how costly it is and how it doesn't satisfy
18 you stomach because you get hungry right away, whereas, if you
19 eat Inupiat food, it sustains you better, longer. And she wants
20 to back up everybody that testified tonight against the lease
21 sale because she is also opposing it.

22 CHAIRMAN: Molly, thank you very much for summarizing all
23 those. I agree, we should listen to it all. At this time, is
24 William F. Brown here? City of Barrow?

25 WILLIAM F. BROWN: My name is William Franklin Brown. Just

1 for the record, I'd like to read a letter from Winton Weyapuk, Jr.,
2 Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, from Wales, Alaska. It is
3 addressed to, Honorable Guy Martin, Assistant Secretary for Land
4 and Water Resources, United States Department of Interior.

5 Dear Mr. Martin, I am submitting this letter as written testimony
6 for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement hearing to be held
7 in Barrow, Alaska on June 4, 1979. I feel that both the oil
8 industries and our Federal and State Governments are proceeding
9 illegally with the proposed oil and gas lease sale in the Beaufort
10 Sea. Our governments are putting up for sale and oil industries
11 are preparing to buy areas that rightfully belong to the Eskimos,
12 who live along the coast of these Arctic waters. Those areas
13 also belong to the mammals, water fowl, fish, even plankton who
14 inhabit the Beaufort Sea. They, unfortunately, are unable to
15 speak. The only way they would voice their opposition is by
16 their physical absence if disaster should strike them, if they
17 were driven away or killed by oil spills, by waste and noise
18 pollution. I feel that the Federal and State Governments and
19 the oil industries have not yet proven beyond doubt, that the
20 activities of the oil companies action which may result from
21 the illegal proceedings, will not harm in any way even the most
22 lowly and simple creature in the Arctic biological foodchain.

23 I thank you for the consideration of this testimony. Sincerely,
24 Winton Weyapuk, Jr. AEWC Member, Wales, Alaska 99783

25 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, William. May I have a copy to go

1 into the record?

2 (Mr. Weyapuk's letter is included in Attachment.)

3 CHAIRMAN: Yes Sir, you're next .

4 MORGAN SOLOMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is
5 Morgan Solomon. I'm a member of the City Council of Barrow and
6 I'm saying this as a concerned citizen. A few years back, I
7 had the privilege of working for the oil company in Prudhoe Bay.
8 There was approximately forty-four of us, for the oil company,
9 that be working there. We started out as roustabouts. That is
10 equivelant to a common laborer. Some of us were very fortunate
11 to be able to train on oil field technology, in which I was
12 priveledged to train as a operator for Atlantic Richfield Company.
13 During the short few years that I worked, I learned quite a bit
14 about oil development process, in my terms. Terms in which I,
15 myself, as an Eskimo, understand. I watch the development of
16 Prudhoe Bay as it is today. It started out from a small, com-
17 pound into a very large, almost the size of Fairbanks, growing
18 about Prudhoe Bay. During those short few years that I've had
19 priveledge to work, my comrads, the people that worked with me
20 began to resign or they were left out of a job for one reason
21 or another. Another big company, next to the ARCO, which was
22 British Petroleum, at that time, they did not have one Native
23 from Barrow, until about two years later. The oil companies
24 had promised the Eskimos of the North Slope that there would be
25 jobs available to them and that these jobs would provide some

1 income for individuals that desires to work there. We have heard
2 from time to time, that they were going to pick up other villagers
3 such as Kaktovik, Anaktuvik Pass, the new village of Nuiqsut,
4 Wainwright, Point Lay and Point Hope. I waited five years for
5 that to come to reality, but when I left the oil company, not
6 one, ninety miles away from Prudhoe Bay, at Kaktovik, was hired.
7 They have hired thousands of people from Lower 48 with oil field
8 technology, they call it. Most of these technology, in my terms
9 today, are maintenance people. Maintenance personell. Heavy
10 equipment operators and such. Very little bit of oil field tech-
11 nology at that time for Native people was zero. There was privil-
12 edge to train our Native people, but because they say we have
13 limited education, we were denied such previledge. There was
14 University of Alaska that had oil field technology, electronic
15 technology courses which, if the oil companies wanted to do, I
16 say, if the oil companies desire to hire our local people, they
17 could have trained through our finer University of Alaska. But
18 no, they hire people from the Lower 48. Now, last couple years,
19 the oil companies wanted Point Thompson sales so they could
20 develop that area. Today, you have heard my people and of their
21 desires to work for the oil companies, but there haven't been,
22 up to this day, an exchange program so that they can understand
23 our environmental impact. Their desires is to grab the Beaufort
24 Sea so they could develop that particular area and yet, the oil
25 companies have denied the priviledge to the Native people to

1 be employed and because of that, we are here today. And I would
2 like to see that if there is going to be development of the
3 Beaufort Sea sales, first and foremost, you must unify with the
4 North Slope Borough Government. This government is a sole res-
5 ponsibility of our culture. They have expertise to manage our
6 culture and to provide for us the identity that we, as a Native
7 people today, have struggled to keep and maintain. I would like
8 to address and conclude that we are not against any development;
9 but we would like to see our people given the same priveledge in
10 a learning process of the development of our natural resources.
11 And that, furthermore, we would like to work with the oil companies,
12 rather than against them so they can better understand our way
13 of life because our livelihood is at stake, because the develop-
14 ment produced great amount of money to their pocket and nothing
15 will be gained to our people if you don't work and unify to
16 develop this sale. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Morgan. Good statement
18 There's a lady back here that would like to testify?

19 LISA VONSEGAZER: My name is Lisa Vonsegazer and I've lived
20 in Point Lay for six years now. Many of the people from Point
21 Lay have been in the states, Lower 48, or in Anchorage and Fair-
22 banks before going to school or having some kind of training.
23 And they returned to Point Lay because they prefer that way of
24 life. They prefer subsistence hunting and they prefer the Native
25 food. And over the past five years, oil companies have come in

1 and talked of exploration and now drilling in the Beaufort Sea.
2 And they often talk about more jobs for the people, more money,
3 but the people that have lived in the State, that have lived in
4 a money economy, have returned home because they prefer hunting.
5 Money means nothing if there will be no more seals and no more
6 walrus and no more belugas. Because that is what they prefer
7 to eat and that's their way of life. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Lisa.

9 JOASH TUKLE: My name is Joash Tukle. That's, right in the
10 mark is my born, right on this side of island there, that's my
11 born. (Mr. Tukle is indicating map) I stay over there for twenty,
12 thirty years, still what are eating fish, hunt animals. No clothes
13 is from white people. I eat from there. I have to talk Eskimo
14 now. (Inupiat)

15 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Joash. Molly?

16 INTERPRETER: That's Joash Tukle. He was born into where
17 his place was up there and he lived there until he was twenty-
18 seven years old, eating the animals because there's no groceries
19 to buy out there. He says all the animals are where the whales
20 migrate through. All those islands also have whale bones on
21 them and he mentioned that where the comparison was given that
22 that area there was as long as from here to Wainwright, he said
23 that it is longer than that. He mentioned how for the last three
24 years the whales migration has been different. There was only
25 one whale during one fall that anybody sighted and last fall there

1 was just very few that were sighted. And they also know that
2 since they never got that many whales this spring, that they
3 must hunt again next fall and they have no idea how that hunt
4 will be because of how it's been deteriorating through the years.
5 He told about now Thomas Napolak from Nuiqsut met with some
6 skin divers out there using compressors, that they were not using
7 dynamite but they were using compressors and they didn't do that
8 all the time. These guys told him that when, how they're doing
9 this and they're in the water, how it really hurt their ears and
10 he mention how much more sensitive animals ears were . They've
11 always hunted whales all along those islands from long time ago,
12 Tapuk got a whale on almost this end of the map there and Thomas
13 Napolak also got one towards this end of it. So you will know
14 that this is where they hunt whales but with any development out
15 there, he can imagine how much farther out they will be.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Edith?

17 EDITH NASHOALOOK: My name is Edith Nashoalook and I am
18 an Eskimo born in Barter Island am not a resident of Barrow.
19 And I had read my sister's testimony earlier and it triggered
20 me to say something. And I think we've been through this route
21 before, what with the limit of whales, limiting the whales and
22 it never dawned on me why they were doing that. Because they
23 were trying to blame the Eskimos for the whale getting smaller
24 and smaller in number, in amounts and I was never aware of that
25 Beaufort Sea oil drilling. That was the whole thing, the main

1 problem that is affecting the whales. You know, it's not the
2 Eskimos. And I am deeply against the lease sale of oil drilling
3 on the Arctic Ocean where our main source of food comes from.
4 This will and is now effecting the animals in our oceans. Note
5 that I said, now is effecting the animals, because they were
6 already drilling at, on Beaufort Sea and I am dead set against
7 it. Whoever gave them permission to come into our land and our
8 ocean, were not at all thinking of the possibility of oil spills
9 and the effect it will have on the sea animals. They were only
10 thinking of money. Why are the oil companies suddenly drilling
11 on the oceans where our main source of food comes from? Are they
12 not satisfied with drilling on OUR land? I don't see why they
13 need to drill for oil, especially on the ocean, where we get our
14 food supplies, such as whale, seal, bearded seal and walrus. I
15 agree with Lorrie Kingik when he said that he does not get sat-
16 isfied with western food. That's understandable. We were brought
17 up eating our Eskimo food and we will continue to hunt and eat
18 what our stomachs agree with. This drilling is jeopardizing the
19 well-being of each and every Eskimo that lives here, especially
20 the elderly, who depend on Eskimo food completely. How would
21 you like somebody to drill on your land, where you have livestock
22 and vegetables? What you depend for food? This is what the oil
23 companies are doing right now! They are jeopardizing the liveli-
24 hood and invading our way of life, our privacy, our culture. So,
25 therefore, I am DEAD SET AGAINST the lease sale for drilling oil.

1 In conclusion, I'd like to say that what I see here is another
2 battle like at Wounded Knee.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Edith. Sir, would you like to testify?

4 ARNOLD BROWER, SR.: My name is Arnold Brower, Sr. and I
5 live at Barrow. I'm associated with village corporation, village
6 IRA, City of Barrow, a member, and also a member of the North
7 Slope Borough Assembly. First, I want to back up the statement
8 that the Mayor made. And also stating that the Impact Statement
9 was inadequate. We have to be considered in the resources we
10 have here that have been depleting slowly, against our own will,
11 even though there are EIS statements written up to protect them
12 now. They are slowly depleting our resources, the renewable re-
13 sources. In 1979, this summer, there is not one of Federal or
14 State to monitor what has been done in exploration for seismic
15 for oil. Not one of the EIS has been drafted to follow. None
16 of it has been proven. We have found sources of explosives,
17 blasting caps, dynamite, packages in our . The one
18 damage before, that we later found out, there was little come
19 back on the fish resources. There's no fish in those lakes
20 now. We will have to add to that. The exploration has been
21 done. The damage is already done. Who's going to protect
22 them? You're talking to those people who are, right now, taking
23 in that same area where the EIS going to be followed even though
24 the testimony here has been given in the area of that lease
25 sale, off shore lease sales in the Beaufort Sea. I would back

1 up, one hundred per cent, the statment that Joash Tukle made
2 on whale. In the area that you have marked red and blue, there
3 are channels in that area where the plankton or some food sources
4 of the whale have been known. Where the whale playfully are going
5 west, all the way from Demarcation Point, I have observed with
6 the Geodetic Survey for a number of years and all of these where
7 we have gone through have whale bones left by the Eskimos, in-
8 dicating that the whales had come all the way to the coast zone,
9 using the coast zone for feeding grounds. You also indicate a
10 plan for yourselves that these are true statements. I have been
11 working with the Coast Geodetic Survey for a number of years and
12 observed the movement of whales during the course of fall. I
13 want to bring out that compressor which Joash Tukle had also
14 mentioned, which was off shore, which also, the Department of
15 Interior will claim that they will use on that Impact Statement,
16 on all the lakes or water that may be considered to be inhabited
17 by fish. This year we've found some indication that rivers that
18 was blasted with dynamite and evidence in the lakes where blasting
19 cap material was thrown, in that area of blasts. I don't know
20 how to put that in..if the compressor was used, these evidences
21 would never have been left in the middle of the lakes. We have
22 proofs, we've been there, we've examined them and I think some
23 of these Federal commitments, State commitments, what evidence do
24 we have besides words, that this Impact Statement, so nicely
25 worded, that it will be used in this off shore lease sale? It's

1 so easily broken and most of the commitments in that Impact
2 Statement was taken and put in there, are reassuring that..it
3 fools you. To me, the area where the exploration will take place
4 is an argument between the Federal and State and the Eskimo.
5 Eskimo trying to survive and other resources trying to gain, some
6 for wealth, some for energy. Eskimo has claimed from time I re-
7 member, all of North Slope to be in their jurisdiction. I have
8 never heard one language of an Eskimo to surrender, either to
9 Russia or to the United States, or to have an agreement set in
10 writing or in language, that they were defeated or sold. I think
11 this is the persistence of the Eskimo tribe, that they, ever since
12 they talk about this jurisdiction over the North Slope, that
13 they have come and told, that it is THEIR land. They also made
14 the commitment that they would not trespass, of the oil industry,
15 the State and the Federal Government combined. And even on a
16 negotiation basis to endanger the land in search of this tre-
17 mendous oil they had found in Prudhoe Bay. The Eskimos still
18 claim that it's theirs, through a tribal government. I think
19 this should be considered strongly before all of this action and
20 activity took place, to provide for, in case of a mishap, some
21 type of an assurance that the livelihood goes on in the Eskimo
22 world. On any impact statement, I have not seen, or any promise
23 of a mishap, of all the resources of a large mishap, we remember,
24 we recall that the water fowl nesting grounds, raising their young
25 ones is in this colored map. Most of the migratory animals pass

1 through this area and should be studied strongly, not only for us
2 but for the entire North America because these migratory paths
3 are all migratory within the North American Continent. This
4 is their nesting grounds. This is their home for raising their
5 young. This is where they become plentiful. Take that away
6 by a mishap, one can wipe out a major of our food resources as
7 an Eskimo. We don't grow any vegetables. This is our gathering
8 for subsistence. I think these should be considered strongly.
9 The people's statements, most of these people are asking that
10 they be considered strongly. That safe measures be taken in
11 this area before this type of a sale takesplace. If they wish
12 to provide it, assure us that we go on..in other words, we would
13 like..if everything should happen to empty all the lands, Russia
14 will let us have the resources that we have so we could live on
15 in the same nature and not left without on the North Slope.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Arnold. Mike Jeffery?

17 MIKE JEFFERY: My name is Michael Jeffery, I'm an attorney
18 with Alaska Legal Services in Barrow and just before I start..
19 isn't it just incredible..it's now what? Before two in the
20 morning, to see this room still almost full and there still is
21 a lot of people who want to talk and I'm not the last witness or,
22 I'm sure, even close to it. I know the interest the people have
23 in this sale and how much they want to talk. What I gave to
24 the Chairman, I'm going to summarize my prepared statement in the
25 interest of time, but what I gave to you is a whole group of

1 documents. I realize that we're talking about a particular doc-
2 ument and that's this Impact Statement. On the other hand, the
3 people of the North Slope have been talking for a year solid, in
4 hearings of all different kinds, about off shore oil drilling,
5 and I think that that material must be on the record on this
6 decision also. The previous conversations have been to the State
7 or to a Court or whatever, but the information contained in there
8 is very directly relevant to what we're talking about here. What
9 you have is a transcript of the Inupiat language testimony that
10 was given about Bowhead whaling in September of 1977, the impact
11 statements that were held here in Barrow. You have the transcript
12 of the Elder's Conference testimony at Barrow in May of 1978
13 which concerns outer continental shelf drilling. You have the
14 transcripts of the Point Thompson hearings in the villages on the
15 North Slope and you also have a set of sworn affidavits that were
16 filed in lawsuits that were started in November of 1978 about the
17 Duck Island well. There's sworn statements from whaling captains,
18 from North Slope residents, some of them going on to seven or
19 eight legal pages, for they very carefully note down why it is
20 that they are opposed to off shore drilling. You MUST have that
21 information also. Some of those people have already testified
22 for you. Many of them haven't been able to come over tonight,
23 but you have their testimony there now. Also, in that packet is
24 the, finally, the original resolution from Kaktovik, which we
25 did get copies of. Finally, you have it there as well as the

1 resolution from the Anutuvik Pass City Council which they passed
2 opposing the sale. You've seen how united the feelings are in
3 the North Slope about this and I don't need to...you've seen it
4 for yourselves. I want to make clear that you haven't seen the
5 last of me or heard the last from me. We're going to be giving
6 you longer written comments about all this. There's so much to
7 say, there's no way that it can even begin to be addressed in the
8 hearings so what I'm just going to do is address a couple of
9 things and then you'll be getting some more things in the mail
10 before the deadline. What I was going to talk about tonight are
11 basically two points. The industry does not have adequate oil
12 spill cleanup technology for off shore work in the Arctic to go
13 on safely, and also, the present laws concerning compensation
14 provide no protection to Arctic Slope people if a spill happens.
15 Now, I've attended the hearings at Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and I also
16 heard the hearing in Fairbanks. I heard the testimony about oil
17 spill operations that was given in Fairbanks and, of course, I
18 heard what we've heard tonight. There's a kind of a..when we
19 hear these industry panels, there's a kind of flow that's..well,
20 we know what we're doing. The rigs are very safe. Maybe there'd
21 be a chance of a spill but even if there were, we can clean it
22 up and there's lots of government regulations that protect the
23 people anyway and..so don't worry. That we should just go ahead
24 with the sale now. But, when I remember the books that I've read
25 and the testimony that people have given, I know that that's

1 pretty misleading. For example, Mr. Rick Shafer, when, of course,
2 he's employed by British Petroleum or Sohio Petroleum Company,
3 and he's now president of ABSORB, and he testified in Fairbanks
4 and I found his testimony frightening. And the reason is that
5 because he was talking about, and as Mr. Allen also said to-
6 night, we are GOING to develop these plans. We are GOING to do
7 these tests. We are GOING to look at this and this and this.
8 Well, shouldn't this, they talk about we're going to use the
9 state of the art technology, well, what worries me is exactly the
10 state of the art. Now, it seems to me, for example, I was, I
11 participated in a tour that the AOGA arranged on March 31st where
12 a number of people from the North Slope went to several wells,
13 the Niakuk well and the Reindeer Island well and the Duck Island
14 well. When I was touring the Duck Island well, I talked to Mr.
15 Bob Brite who's the Exxon drilling manager, and I asked him
16 about their oil spill training courses and he said that there
17 was no course at Prudhoe. That they train the crews in Texas,
18 you know, to deal with oil spills in the Arctic. Well, it seems
19 to me that that's not adequate. And that well had been drilled.
20 Luckily, nothing happened. Appendix 11 of the Impact Statement,
21 especially page 13, talks about the impact of Arctic weather on
22 the workers up here. Now, if you remember back to the testimony
23 in Fairbanks, where Mr. Page asked Rick Shafer if these various
24 techniques that he was talking about have ever been tried, and
25 then he said, that yes they had, and one good example of that

1 was the oil spill that happened in Nome. He was talking about
2 that. And then when asked if the oil had been cleaned up very
3 much, he said, a, quote, "Large proportion" unquote, of the oil
4 had been recovered. Well, I read a report about that particular
5 oil spill incident. You have it in the packet and actually Mr.
6 Allen was the one giving it to you. It was written by Mr. Allen
7 and was presented at the Off shore Technology Conference in
8 Houston, Texas in May of 1978. The report states that six thou-
9 sand gallons of number two diesel fuel was spilled from a fuel
10 storage tank onto the snow and into the ice and waters of the
11 Snake River in the winter of 1977. The report concludes that,
12 quote, "One third of the six thousand gallons of diesel oil spilled
13 were recovered." End of quote. Picking up one third is not,
14 by any standard, a large proportion. The report also states that
15 although one thousand gallons may have evaporated, the remaining
16 three thousand gallons, and I'm quoting, "conceivably could have
17 been lost downstream of the primary recovery area, trapped in or
18 beneath the ice cover where the detection methods deployed did
19 NOT reveal it. Or simply retained a greater depth of the soil
20 at the spill site." And of course, when the weather got warmer,
21 there was breakup and the report says, "During breakup a few
22 months later, some scattered irridescent patches of oil were
23 observed drifting away from the immediate area surrounding the
24 spill. The spill site." The report has additional details of
25 the state of the art. It says, one problem, of course, one problem

1 is that we have, is locating the oil underneath the ice. At the
2 Nome spill, the method of locating the oil is, quote, "sniffing
3 by nose and by the use of a highly sensitive hydrocarbon sniffer
4 or any cracks or open fissures in the ice surface." End of quote.
5 I can easily imagine an oil spill in the Beaufort and there's
6 the ABSORB crews out there on the ice, sniffing away. The Arctic
7 winds blowing by and there they are, sniffing for the oil. Now,
8 the Allen paper admitted that the minus thirty degree temperatures
9 slowed down the rate of recovery. The oil recovery rate, quote,
10 "for the conditions being dealt with was only two gallons per
11 minute." End of quote. Since the hoses taking the oil from the
12 spill site were freezine up, quote, "the recovered oil was simply
13 handcarried in five gallon buckets from the oil mop to the
14 storage container." Now, I've spent more time with this because
15 Mr. Shafer, on two occasions, both in response to Mr. Page's
16 question and also in an article in the Anchorage Times on
17 April 22, 1979, cited this known case as the example, his example
18 of how well, how well the cleanup technology works. How are
19 we to draw any assurance from this dismal record? Consider,
20 especially, that the Impact Statement clearly states that if
21 the Beaufort Sea lease sale happens and the development occurs
22 over a period of years, there is going to be a lot of oil going
23 into the water. Now recently, we saw again how people cannot
24 find oil underneath the ice. The Canadian icebreaker John A.
25 McDonald, leased to Dome Petroleum, lost seventy thousand gallons

1 of fuel oil underneath the ice from a gash in the side. The
2 Anchorage Daily News reported this December 2, 1978, it re-
3 ported that up to that time, the search efforts had failed. I
4 recently got a letter from Dome Petroleum, the executive vice-
5 president, and he didn't tell me that they've found any oil
6 since then. He just was saying that, well, such a small amount,
7 it won't be a problem. Now, the Draft Environmental Impact
8 Statement leaves this final work on oil spill cleanup. "Presently,
9 containment and cleanup technology in ice infested waters is
10 NOT effective due to the physical limitations imposed by the
11 environment on available technology. The EIS will not assume
12 effective action in case of oil spills." Now again, I can only
13 use that statement with the table, III.A.3-1, which is found just
14 after page 171, which shows the predicted oil spill amounts going
15 out into the water. So, the Government is proposing to lease
16 off shore, they're predicting that large amounts of oil will go
17 into the very sensitive Arctic environment and at the same time
18 informing us that the oil cannot be effectively cleaned up. Now,
19 I'm not saying that that technology could never be developed, but
20 I'm saying that the Arctic is not the place to start putting up
21 oil rigs and risk major spills off shore while the technology IS
22 being developed. The conclusions of the Impact Statement of the
23 oil cleanup technology is, quote, "Not effective" are supported
24 by three more documents that are in this packet of material. A
25 Canadian government publication entitled, Oil Spill Countermeasures,

1 another one is an appendix concerning oil spill risks and clean
2 up in the Canadian Beaufort Sea that appears in the book, Oil
3 Under the Ice and finally, an excellent presentation on March,
4 1979 by Don Gamble, Director of Policy Studies for the Canadian
5 Arctic Resources Committee. Now, what is left is you've heard
6 people are very afraid of what would happen if spills can't be
7 cleaned up. The Impact Statement talks about compensation funds.
8 And, but if we look at all these things, we can see that they
9 offer little hope for Arctic Slope residents. The place to
10 start is that there can be no compensation for the loss of a
11 way of life. You've heard that in Kaktovik. Mark Simms pointed
12 out that what we're facing here is a moral issue of whether the
13 Government can allow a leasing program off shore that threatens
14 the extinction of an endangered people, the Inupiat Natives of
15 the Arctic Slope. Also, remember the moving testimony of Marilyn
16 Agiak in Kaktovik, who talked about, she's from near the Dalles
17 Dam project in Washington State and she talked about the three
18 thousand dollars per person that was given to the Native there
19 when they lost their fishing rights because of the dam. She
20 said, of course, it was quickly spent and now the people had al-
21 most nothing and she said that she was urging the people here to
22 keep on fighting against losing their way of life. How can we
23 even talk about compensation up here where the wildlife, you
24 know, you talk about migrating birds, this is where they're
25 migrating to, you know. People in the Lower 48 might be worried about

1 off shore development because of their beachfront homes, weekend
2 fishing or boating or swimming trips, but up here, as you've heard
3 so eloquently tonight, the issue is survival and that's why people
4 are interested in the animals. How can that need for survival
5 be valued in the dollar terms? We're talking about actual sur-
6 vival in the Arctic. And just, for example, they compared, in
7 the Santa Barbara spill of 1969, they got an idea of what had
8 been lost by the oil spill by comparing the damage, an area of
9 the coastline farther down the coast that wasn't damaged. Well,
10 up here, there's nowhere to compare it to. This is where all
11 the animals and birds are nesting. Where are you going to com-
12 pare to even find out? We don't know how many there are here.
13 How can we even begin to talk about it? One idea that an attorney
14 in California had, and I'm submitting his article in that packet
15 also, his name is Edwin DuBiel, and he was involved in represent-
16 ing the State in that Santa Barbara oil spill litigation. He
17 points out that what you should do is get an injunction against
18 the oil companies, forcing them to ACTUALLY replace the birds.
19 Or ACTUALLY replace, physically, the barnacle. Get them all back
20 there and then see what they begin to talk about in payments of
21 money. He, also, Mr. DuBiel pointed out that it is VERY difficult
22 to sue the oil companies. You might have to travel all over the
23 world trying to track down the experts who had allowed the oil
24 spill to happen because of other operations. Where would the
25 compensation money be coming from? In the Impact Statement, page

1 15 and page 322, we see discussions of a two hundred million
2 dollar oil pollution fund in the Title III of the OCS Lands Act
3 of 1978 which would handle full claims for economic loss arising
4 out of or directly resulting from oil pollution for a certain
5 list of damage claims. There's a one million dollar fisherman
6 contingency fund, but of course, that's only for commercial
7 fisherman and we don't have that up here so much. So, but if
8 we begin to look a little closely at that pollution fund, we
9 find that we need to understand a little bit more about it and
10 I put an article entitled, Implementation of the Off shore Pol-
11 lution Fund, by Beck and Moeller, from March, 1979. It talks
12 about that off shore fund. Figure one on page 14, there is this
13 incredibaly complicated graph that has ten or fifteen different
14 levels and this is the, you have a spill up at the top and then
15 you have this slow process and there's an appeal through the
16 Administrative Law Judge and the Secretary of Interior and the
17 courts and you can just imagine how long it's all going to take
18 if there's any dispute about the timing. And then, there's
19 another interesting feature of that claim. They point out that
20 since the claim fund comes from a three cent per barrel fee on
21 off shore oil development, as a matter of fact, since the claim
22 fund only started in March of 1979, there's not very much money
23 in the claim fund right now. And, in fact, they don't expect that
24 it'll even get up to the minimum amount of one hundred million
25 dollars for fifteen years and the maximum amount that they're

1 looking for, two hundred million dollars, won't reach until the
2 year two thousand. So, then, they covered the problem though.
3 What if you have an oil spill in the meantime and you need to
4 get a claim against the fund? Well, you get a Government note.
5 That's what you get. You get a Government note with the assurance
6 that it will earn interest until it can be paid off. But, you
7 won't get the money until the fund balance reaches enough to
8 pay off your claim. This is what's being held out of the Impact
9 Statement, is the compensation fund. Now, another little, one
10 thing one hopes from liability loss is that they will encourage
11 the industry to operate in a safe manner because they're afraid
12 of having to pay a lot of money. But, once again, this comp-
13 ensation fund has an interesting feature and that is the limit
14 on the liability of an oil company. It says, quote, "All re-
15 moval and cleanup costs plus an amount for damages which is limited
16 to thirty-five million dollars." Now, for example, in the Santa
17 Barbara oil spill, the actual recovery of people from that, to
18 the State and individuals was fifty million dollars. But now
19 there's a limit of thirty-five million dollars. And, you don't
20 have to pay any damages into the fund. The oil company would
21 be exempted from making payments for a spill if, quote, "an un-
22 anticipated, grave, natural phenomenon," happened. Or, quote,
23 "exceptional, inevitable, and irresistable," force caused the
24 spill. Well that sounds like an ice push to me. It seems to
25 me that anytime there's an ice push that comes up over, this is

1 exactly what we've been hearing people talking about, anytime
2 there's an ice push, an unusual one, granted, but one that would
3 actually go over the design that has been done, the company would
4 not have to pay into the fund. Now what does that mean? Well,
5 of course, it comes down to relative risks and maximum profits.
6 The people here are risking their survival if an oil spill happens.
7 Oil company technicians must consider only the company interests
8 in keeping its insurance rates and vestment costs down and the
9 bottom line profits high. And National interest is simply not
10 going to inspire the level of care demanded by Arctic Slope people
11 threatened with the loss of their health and their lives. Now
12 there's a problem, if the funds didn't give you relief, you could
13 go after the companies in court. The Santa Barbara oil spill
14 litigation took eight years and you already heard at Kaktovik when
15 Gorden Rankin, who's an Anchorage resident working in Kaktovik
16 told you how the plaintiffs just have to prove just absolutely
17 every little thing in court if they wanted to sue, make one of
18 these claims. So, let's just summarize a bit. The true state of
19 the art for oil cleanup is accurately stated by the DEIS, that
20 says, quote, "not effective." While the oil cleanup crews are
21 sniffing for the oil and mopping it up at the rate of two gallons
22 per minute, as in the Nome spill that Mr. Shafer keeps telling
23 us about, half the spilled oil is seeping into our food supply.
24 If someone relies on the legal system for some partial relief,
25 he is met with the offer of a Federal liability fund that will

1 compensate with paper notes that may not be redeemed for many
2 years. If that option's rejected, then the other choice is to
3 bring an individual law suit against the oil company, which also
4 could take many years. The problems of documenting claims in
5 the Arctic would be extremely difficult. And what you're looking
6 at is the destruction of the subsistence hunting of a people
7 depending on the grace and joy of the Lord to bring the animals
8 by. And you see that so clearly in the Whaling hearing testimony
9 which I've given to you. That culture is threatened beyond
10 compensation by a culture of greed and consumption that offers
11 in return, what? The hope for a small cut of the spoils. Now,
12 an examination of the history of the Inupiat people shows that
13 there's been times when there's been a lot of jobs and there's
14 been times when there's less jobs. The constant has been the
15 ability to feed themsleves off the land and the water. I've
16 heard people talk about when the Inupiat go out on the ice,
17 they're very,very cautious. And why? Because one mistake can
18 mean the loss of their life. Or one mistake can mean the loss
19 of their equipment. Young men die. There was a funeral recently
20 in Wainwright on the ice now, if you take chances. Now, newcomers,
21 they don't know. I didn't know. My first time out on the ice,
22 I got frost bite in both feet because I did not pay enough
23 attention. But, newcomers go out there and they don't know how
24 quickly the ice conditions can change and how strong the sea ice
25 is. They may go out on the ice and if they've guessed wrong,

1 they may not come back. Well, the oil companies are newcomers
2 to the Arctic. They tell us they know what to do and that they
3 have planned for the sea ice. Well, the Inupiat, as has been
4 pointed out by industry representatives in Fairbanks, the Inupiat
5 have looked at the rigs, which is true; they've listened to industry
6 presentations which is true; but the Inupiat also know, from their
7 long experience, the way the sea ice moves. And what is the
8 conclusion that you've heard from all three hearings? People
9 are against the sale. They're afraid that the oil companies do
10 not, in fact, know what the ice is going to do. And they're
11 speaking from very long experience. So, the tragedy facing us
12 is that we have oil industry newcomers. Now, the Government is
13 going to have this lease sale and allow them to go off, off shore,
14 there's a chance. They're going to take chances but there's a
15 little difference. If I go off shore and I make a mistake, I
16 might die out there, granted. But it's only me. An oil company
17 goes out there and they make a mistake, what we're talking about
18 is the destruction of the people and the wildlife of the Arctic.
19 So, for these kinds of reasons and more that we'll provide to
20 you in writing, this lease sale MUST be stopped. And that's the
21 conclusion of the testimony that I have. I'd like to ask for
22 a little bit of additional time to put in some cards and wires
23 that have come in from other parts of the Country.

24 CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead, Mike.

25 MIKE JEFFERY: All right. I just..I'm not going to read

1 all of these in the interest of time, but..I'm going to give all
2 these to you and I'd like to just summarize them just a bit. The
3 point is that we're not alone here. This hearing is happening
4 in Barrow, Alaska, the Northern most community in the United
5 States but there are people all over the Country who are interested
6 in this and they have been sending telegrams, wires, post cards,
7 phone messages to get put on the record and I'm going to do that.
8 I just wanted to point out some of the ones that have come. One
9 is from, for example, from Summertown, Tennessee. It says,
10 Hear Ye, we support the Inupiat Eskimos' efforts regarding the
11 leasing of polar lands in the Beaufort Sea. To undermine the
12 ecology and ultimately the livelihood of Native peoples for pro-
13 fit is unsuitable behavior for this age. Whether it is in
14 Tennessee or Alaska or any place on earth, it is neither just nor
15 humane to jeopardize the life ways of the Native people. On be-
16 half of twelve hundred residents of the farm, I urge that no
17 lease be made to oil interests and that traditional ways of the
18 Native people be preserved. Signed, Edward Sierra, Executive
19 Director. Then we have a telegram from San Francisco. It has
20 thirty different signatures on it. Proposed oil drilling in the
21 Beaufort Sea will destroy the habitat and breeding grounds of
22 the Bowhead Whale. It is the ultimate and most deadly threat
23 to the species. It will also destroy Alaska's subsistence hunting
24 culture in North America. That would be Alaska Eskimos who are
25 unanimously opposed to the drilling. In return for the almost

1 certain extermination of the Bowhead and the culture of the
2 Eskimos, the United States would gain two to three months of oil
3 to feed an energy addiction that cannot be sustained much longer.
4 We urge you to deny permits for any drilling in the Beaufort Sea
5 for oil. Then, another petition, it's got forty-six different
6 signatures on there, I haven't counted them, but I'll just read
7 this too because so many people took an effort to do it. It's
8 from San Francisco, the California Farm Center. We as a group,
9 feel the necessity of speaking out strongly against establishing
10 oil rigs in the Beaufort Sea in Alaska. The whales and the
11 Eskimos are part of mankind's natural heritage and their continuing
12 existence should not be jeopardized for a relatively small quantity
13 of oil. The monetary advantages of the multinational oil corp-
14 orations shouldn't take priority over the pricelessness of an
15 endangered species and are indigenous people. We think if these
16 corporations would cultivate a more universal outlook towards
17 preservation of our ecosystem and the salvation of mammals who
18 have inhabited the earth longer than man himself, they would
19 win the respect of many people. This could actually make us all
20 smart enough to do with less fossil fuels and put our resources
21 into the development of alternative energy such as solar and
22 wind power and so on. It is time for the oil corporations to
23 change their image and cooperate with the people rather than
24 exploit them. Obviously, we cannot take the risks involved
25 in this particular venture in Alaska. Risk of destruction of a

1 sacred people, the Inupiat Eskimo, risks due to shifting ice
2 flow, high Arctic winds and the potential for a serious oil spill
3 and risk of extinction of many land and sea mammals. This must
4 stop before it begins. As a group of concerned citizens, we do
5 not support this project and pray for the preservation of our
6 wonderful natural resources. Here is a telegram signed by three
7 people opposing the sale in San Francisco. A letter from New
8 Lebanon, New York. We are deeply opposed to the project which
9 involved leasing a part of the Beaufort Sea for the purposes of
10 drilling oil. According to informatin we've received, the possi-
11 bility of an oil spill is extremely high due to the huge force of
12 shifting ice. Such a spill would cause severe harm to the sea
13 species who inhabit the waters, and thus, the Eskimos who depend
14 on these animals for food. A few month's or even a year's supply
15 of oil is not precious or important enough to warrant the possible
16 destruction of these species and the Eskimos. We urge those that
17 are deciding the outcome of this case to prevent this extremely
18 hazardous project. Firozia Alice Kagan, Secretary of the
19 concerned citizens of New Lebanon which he explains is a group of
20 fifteen citizens dedicated to the preservation of life as we know
21 it. And then, I'll just briefly point out where these are from.
22 Three people from Berkely, three organizations from Missoula,
23 Montana, a telegram from seven people from San Francisco, the
24 Goldstein Family in New York City, a person from Minneapolis,
25 eight people or nine people in Berkeley, phone message from a

1 Ph. D. who's husband did a bunch of work at Point Hope and she
2 says she's in Elkton, Virginia, She says, I believe to permit
3 oil drilling in the Beaufort Sea is to run of causing death and
4 human suffering on a large scale. Indeed, the proposed drilling
5 could ultimately result in the annihilation of the people of the
6 area. For a civilized people knowingly to expose its citizens
7 to such a grave risk in unconscionable. A letter from Oakland,
8 a letter from New Lebanon, New York, a long telegram from Chelsea,
9 Michigan by a man who's visited up here. Just the last part of
10 it, a careful review of the epidemiology of Eskimo nutritional
11 needs will show the oil drilling in the Beaufort Sea creates un-
12 acceptable risks of destroying the Eskimo diet, dooming the
13 Inupiat to heart disease and stroke and bringing the community
14 to the brink of genocide. I request that before any oil explora-
15 tion begins, the Department of the Interior carry out epidemiological
16 studies on the importance of sea mammals to the nutritional well-
17 being of the Inupiat Eskimos. Without such information, oil
18 development would be racist and irresponsible. A letter from
19 San Francisco, a letter from Hingham, Massachusetts, from San
20 Francisco, a long letter which I won't read but it's by the
21 Professor and Chairman of the Department of Epidemiology of
22 the University of Michigan. A telegram from San Francisco, a
23 phone message from Menlo Park, a letter from Cupertino, a letter
24 from..another letter from San Francisco, a letter from Santa
25 Barbara, and he says, and of course, he knows something about that

1 because he is from Santa Barbara, Alaska's one of the world's
2 last more or less environmentally preserved areas. Whether the
3 oil companies are using crisis to attempt to destroy this ter-
4 ritory for profits, or the construction conglomerates are attempt-
5 ing to cut all the trees, it makes little difference, of course,
6 he's talking about Southeast, to the extent the Federal Govern-
7 ment aids and abets these large companies in their attempts to
8 rape Alaska, the Federal Government is working against the interest
9 of the citizens of the United States. I do not particularly care
10 whether it is Jimmy Carter and Democrats or Ford and Republicans,
11 any administration doing this, I will work as hard as possible to
12 see removed. Another letter from Sacramento, a letter from
13 Oakland, post cards from Yakima, Washington and San Francisco,
14 Sunland, California and Los Angeles, California and a copy which
15 you'll get directly down in your office, this is just a copy of
16 a letter sent to you from San Juan Capistrano and then lastly,
17 the National Greenpeace Organization supported that long telegram
18 that you got and requested that the Great Greenpeace Foundation
19 of America support that telegram read into the record. Rocky
20 Mountain Greenpeace sent a telegram saying Beaufort sale in Alaska
21 is a delicately balanced ecosystem. We fear the long term environ-
22 mental effects of the oil exploration activity in this area, there-
23 fore, we strongly oppose the sale of off shore sites there.
24 Greenpeace Monterrey. Please halt the proposed off shore oil sale
25 in the Beaufort Sea. The threat of whales and the health and

1 welfare of Native Americans is at stake. The risks involved out-
2 weigh any advantages. Greenpeace Ann Arbor, supports Greenpeace
3 Alaska in calling for postponement of the Beaufort Sea oil lease
4 sale. Letter will follow, keep up the good work. So, I'm just
5 going to introduce all these on to the record. I feel sure that
6 by the time you receive our final comments, because of the mail
7 lag, there's going to be quite a large number more of these. But
8 there is concern all across the Country about what's happening up
9 here. It's not just people here. You've heard various testimony
10 of people here but there are very strong feelings of people
11 Outside also. And so, I just wanted to put this on the record.

(All of Mr. Jeffery's above mentioned documents are in Attachment)
12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mike. I know that there are a few
13 more people that want to testify, but I'd like to have a ten
14 minute recess.

15 (Hearing recessed at 2:25 a.m. and reconvened at 2:35 a.m.)

16 CHAIRMAN: I'd like to start the hearing again. Perhaps
17 we can finish in the next hour. Perhaps. (Laughter) This Gentle-
18 man right here would like to testify.

19 GEORGE AHMOOGAK: Thank you very much for giving me the
20 opportunity to testify for the Federal joint State leasing that
21 is proposed for December of '79. My name is George Ahmoogak.
22 I'm a Board Member for Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. I
23 also serve as an Executive Board Member of the Arctic Slope Re-
24 gional Corporation as well as the Village Corporation of Barrow
25 and I've worked before for the North Slope Borough as a Director

1 for the Tax Department for three years. I'm currently resigned
2 out of that position and working with the Village Corporation.
3 I've also worked with the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission on its
4 efforts to fight on the whale issue when we had problems with the
5 International Whaling Commission trying to place moratoriums on
6 it. My testimony is short and brief. It's dealing mostly with
7 the Environmental Impact Statement. Inadequacy of the contents of
8 the Impact Statement that has been drafted our for several months.
9 We had been trying to put our input to the State Department of
10 Natural Resources, the Federal Fish and Game and several social
11 departments of the Federal Government and OCS office in Anchorage
12 on the Federal department side and we had no working relationship.
13 We had met with these four different Federal agencies, from the
14 State agencies for past four months in hashing it out on what our
15 input has been on this Environmental Impact Statement but we had
16 never even got up to the front door to...they didn't even take any
17 of our concerns. Our position right now, the Environmental Impact
18 Statement is totally inaccurate, incomplete and it's mostly hypo-
19 thesis at this time. The contents is not adequate enough to sat-
20 isfy the needs, as you have heard most of the testimony and right
21 now we have public interest groups that are willing to contest the
22 contents of the Environmental Impact Statement in Federal Court or
23 whatever means that could be. We have public interest groups such
24 as Mother's Club. We've got public interest groups such as
25 Veteran's of Foreign Wars in this Arctic coast. We have Arctic

1 Slope Native Association, a nonprofit organization for Arctic
2 Slope, we've got various numbers of public groups that would be
3 willing to set up a defense fund to fight the very contents, in-
4 adequacy of this Environmental Impact Statement conforming to the
5 National Environmental Protection Act. I'm sure that from the
6 history we've learned, through the Trans Alaska pipeline projects
7 that have gone on, Sierra Club had done a wonderful job in delaying
8 the construction of the Trans Alaska pipeline because of environ-
9 mental concerns. And we are ready to take this position because
10 of what the contents that we see now are totally inaccurate to
11 meet and to be ready for the Joint Federal State Lease sale coming
12 up in December and we're willing to go to court to find a defense
13 fund just for stalling the very oil and gas lease sale that is
14 proposed for December and I'm sure we have good legal arguments
15 and I'm sure that you'll probably see us in court in the near
16 future. Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, George. Is David Benton here? You've
18 waited a long time.

19 DAVID BENTON: I wouldn't have missed it for the world. I
20 was going to say, good evening, but I guess I'll say good morning.
21 My name is David Benton and I represent Friends of the Earth,
22 Alaska an arm of Friends of the Earth an international organization,
23 it is our position that this sale should be delayed until certain
24 problems are resolved. I've been working personally on analyzing
25 environmental data concerning this sale, this particular sale for

1 about a year and a half. Upon reviewing the Environmental Impact
2 Statement, we noted several deficiencies within the document and
3 those are going to be submitted to the Alaska OCS office in our
4 written comments. Tonight, well, today, I would like to very
5 briefly discuss just two of those and then I have some things I
6 would like to read. The two things I'd like to discuss are con-
7 tained in Section II.D.5 which was the Beaufort Whale sale and
8 III.A.3--

9 CHAIRMAN: Could you speak up. Some of the people in the
10 back of the room can't hear you.

11 DAVID BENTON: Sorry. The subjects I want to talk about
12 are the Bowhead Whale, Section, which is the Endangered Species
13 Section II.B.5 and the Section III.A.3 which sets up certain
14 assumptions on oil spills. Okay, Bowhead Whales, uhm, the Section
15 on Bowhead Whales is continually poorly written. Aside from that
16 fact, one thing is dramatically apparent and that is that very
17 little is known about Bowhead Whales. I have a whole list of things
18 that were listed in the Environmental Statement, plus some things
19 that I've come up with, and I'm not going to read them to you,
20 simply because most of them have been mentioned already and I
21 would encourage the panel to consider the voice of the people
22 here and then talk about what it is that they're much more familiar
23 with than either you or I. But one thing I would like to draw
24 your attention to is that the Draft Environmental Statement, as
25 it goes and lists the information gaps that exist concerning this

1 mammal, uh, it also describes certain study programs that were, or
2 are to be initiated by BLM and I, uh, those stage programs are
3 primarily the Project Whales contract that was awarded to NARL,
4 are not described in the Environmental Statement anywhere and I've
5 had conversations with people at the OCS office and so far as I
6 can gather right now, there is no final study proposals to that
7 program yet, although some of those things are being conducted
8 right now. Those studies will take, at a minimum, a year to con-
9 duct. Particularly this study of the effects on baleen, of oil on
10 baleen. Other scientists, particularly people at Marine Mammal
11 Commission have estimated two to three years to get that infor-
12 mation. If BLM is to be in compliance with the Endangered Species
13 Act, I would think that this would argue that the sale must be
14 delayed until this information is supplied. The second topic that
15 I was going to just touch on, very briefly, concerns the amount
16 of oil that will be spilled by a blowout and the estimate that's in
17 the Draft Environmental Statement, uh, that estimate is, on the
18 average blowout, twenty-one hundred barrels and we feel that this
19 is an exceptionally low figure given Arctic conditions. This
20 twenty-one hundred figure is based on what are called OCS statistics.
21 But there's no citation where the statistics are derived from and
22 those statistics are not provided and the locations or the areas
23 which they're, those spills which generated those statistics
24 occurred are not provided and that information should be provided
25 if we're going to effectively analyze the validity of those statis-

1 ics. In lieu of the fact that that information is not available,
2 that twenty-one hundred barrel figure seems highly unlikely for
3 two reasons. Okay, the Beaufort Sea itself is an exceptional
4 case where the climate hazards in the area are extremely severe.
5 The Draft Environmental Statement, on page 292, estimates that in
6 the event of a blowout, a relief well could be begun in fourteen
7 days and a well could be shut down, a blowout could be shut down
8 in thirty-nine days. Okay. That's one consideration. The second
9 consideration is that the lease area is located next to Prudhoe
10 Bay, which is an extremely large reservoir and it's near the
11 MacKenzie Delta which has high formation pressures and indeed, the
12 State has identified an area in the eastern portion of the sale
13 that has high formation pressures. Wells in the Prudhoe Bay area
14 might conceivably flow as much as eight thousand barrels a day.
15 It would be not unlike the Beaufort Sea wells to flow at the same
16 rate. If you take that figure, uhm, of eight thousand barrels,
17 and if you use a conservative figure of six thousand barrels and
18 you just figure that for thirty-nine days, you come up with two
19 hundred thirty-four thousand barrels of oil. To get a perspective
20 on two hundred thirty-four thousand barrels of oil, you have eight
21 million, eight hundred thousand gallons of oil. That's a lot of
22 oil. No matter how efficient your clean up technology is, I
23 don't think that anybody would say they could get the total amount
24 of two hundred thirty-four thousand barrels of oil. Admittedly,
25 that's a very simplistic scenario I've just painted for you. What

1 I'm trying to do is show that the assumptions that the Impact
2 Statement is based on are inaccurate or at least inadequate. Now,
3 there's no way we can assess where that twenty-one hundred barrel
4 figure came from and until we can do that, there's no way we can
5 assess how valid the Impact Statement is. It would seem that,
6 given that, given certainly about the twenty-one hundred barrel
7 figure, that it might be that two hundred thirty-four thousand
8 barrels is just as reasonable. In fact, I used information that was
9 contained in the Environmental Impact Statement except for one
10 thing and that was the flow rates. Now, these flow rates could
11 highly vary. I'm just..it's quite conceivable that some Prudhoe
12 Bay wells flow at three thousand barrels a day. The Sohio-BP
13 Sag number one, uh, well came in at ninety-three hundred barrels
14 a day and dropped to five thousand barrels a day. So, I'm some
15 where in the ball park. The only reason that I'm really pointed
16 this out to you is to demonstrate that that section of the Draft
17 Environmental Statement might very well be inadequate. There's
18 several other reasons that we feel that the sale should be delayed.
19 One of which, the North Slope Borough needs time to complete and
20 implement the Coastal Management Plan and time to conduct further
21 research on all that, especially the environment. That infor-
22 mation is contained in our written comments. Right now I have
23 just a couple of things I'd like to submit to you. First, I'd
24 like to read a couple of very short..this is from..well, Mike
25 said that uh..and showed you all those letters, okay, about uh,

1 that came from Outside and uh, what he was telling you was there
2 is a lot of concern, not only in Alaska, and that is very true.
3 I represent one environmental organization in Alaska. There's
4 several environmental organizations that are National environmental
5 organizations and are concerned about this. They want to get copies
6 of the work that I have done. They want to submit comments on the
7 sale also. They have all voiced to me that they feel a delay in
8 the sale is imperative and they all voiced their support of the
9 Inupiat people in their plight to get this thing solved. One of
10 the things that I have here is a short letter from the Seattle
11 Audubon Society and that's the only one that I'll read to you.
12 To the Hearing Officer regarding the oil drilling off shore on
13 the Beaufort Sea. The Seattle Audubon Society appreciates this
14 opportunity to state our agreement with the contention of the
15 councils of the communities of Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and Barrow that
16 off shore exploration and or drilling for oil on the North Alaska
17 coast would be hazardous, not only for the livelihood of the
18 community but to the wildlife. The damage that would follow a
19 major oil spill or blowout would have far reaching effect on this
20 fragile habitat which accommodates nesting colonies of millions
21 of migrating birds. The success of the breeding colonies solely
22 determines the population of these species in the entire Lower
23 48 States, Mexico and South America. In view of the inevitable
24 oil spills due to a combination of severe Arctic weather and ice
25 conditions, it is sincerely urged that no permits be granted for

1 off shore oil exploration. The other thing here is from the
2 Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs. It's long, I won't read it
3 to you but they have two hundred thousand members and their senti-
4 ments are the same. This is from Greenpeace Oregon which as thirty-
5 five hundred members and the same again. So, I thank you very much
6 for the opportunity to present my testimony.

7 (Above mentioned documents are included in Attachment)

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, David, and we'll put that into the
9 record. Tim Bradner?

10 TIM BRADNER: Mr. Chairman, it's late so we'll just submit
11 a written statement.

12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You suggested that you'd like to
13 testify?

14 ROBERT TILDEN: My name is Robert Tilden. I'm from the
15 University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan. I've been sent
16 to observe these hearings on the Beaufort Draft Environmental
17 Impact Statement by the Sava Foundation of Chelsea, Michigan.
18 I attended the hearings in the villages of Kaktovik and Nuiqsut.
19 I heard the Fairbanks hearing on KBRW here in Barrow. And I
20 will report on these hearings to Sava, the academic community
21 of Ann Arbor and people interested in environmental issues. I
22 work for the University of Michigan's school of public health.
23 Although trained as an environmental planner, environmental
24 epidimeologist, I have spent the last two years working as a
25 researcher and instructor in the health planning and economic

1 development program. My job has consisted of doing cross effective
2 analysis for health sectors of countries on Africa, Asia and
3 South America. Working with the World Bank and a United States
4 agency for international development, I have become familiar with
5 many of the problems for delivering health care in underdeveloped
6 areas that are dependent on one cash crop or one national resource.
7 In many ways, the North Slope is like an underdeveloped Country.
8 Many of its health problems are similiar. Population age dis-
9 tribution is quite similiar as are the sanitation problems. The
10 economic dependency is strikingly similiar. And it's just as
11 unhealthy here as it is in Bangledesh or Zaire. I know many people
12 have put much work in drafting the Environmental Impact Statement,
13 however, if it were submitted to me for a grade, I would return
14 it and tell whoever wrote it to be more suscinct, more to the
15 point, focus on the issues, delete some of the sections that are
16 not pertinent and to include some they have not considered. Uh,
17 one of the major imperfections I have found with the documents is
18 some of the conclusions and summaries at the end of the sections.
19 Many of the crucial uncertainties or problems discussed in the
20 body of that section. A good example of this would be the summary
21 on page 190 which includes the statement, the effects on primary
22 producers on the food chain will not be large and will not effect
23 any of the larger animals migrating or breeding in the area. This
24 is on page 190, paragraph 3, while on the preceeding pages of the
25 text, the following comments are made. Oil may cause death.

1 Increase or decrease photosynthesis. Reduced transporations.
2 Increased respiration. Inhibit translocation. Prime pollution
3 could occur in areas with limited circulation. Recovery could
4 take from four to ten years or longer. Damage due to habitats
5 from near shore and off shore pipe laying and construction.
6 Drill cuttings and muds in formation waters could require several
7 growing seasons for recovery. This is on page 188, paragraph 5
8 and 6. Such editorial programs are understandable but when they
9 occur again and again, accumulative effect is to downplay the
10 importance of some serious concerns. In the final draft of this
11 Environmental Impact Statement, I hope conscious effort is made
12 to decrease the number of such inconsistencies. I would also like
13 to say that if this booklet were submitted to me, it would get a
14 D, and that would be because I like the nice photographs. And
15 on a separate for photographs, I'd give it a grade more than it
16 deserves. The text contains quite a bit of misinformation and
17 I'd like to submit some comments on this booklet. I stongly re-
18 commend that the Federal Government and the State of Alaska adopt
19 alternatives from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and
20 delay the sale for the three reasons stated. Other major reasons
21 for the delay of the sale--

22 "CHAIRMAN: Robert, would you excuse me for a second, would
23 you identify that document you are describing?

24 ROBERT TILDEN: This is, Questions and Answers on the
25 Beaufort Sea Lease. It's published by British Petroleum, Sohio

1 and it's claimed to be from 311 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska. Uh,
2 two major reasons that I would say to delay the sale that should
3 be considered are risks and uncertainty. The DES (sic) states
4 over and over again, that vital gaps of information are missing.
5 This makes the risk impossible to gauge. Much of this risk stems
6 from uncertainty and cannot be eliminated. There will always be
7 a great deal of uncertainty involved with the risks due to ice.
8 The ice behaves differently from year to year. Last year in
9 Barrow, ice override destroyed some utility poles. The power
10 and force of the ice cannot be controlled or predicted. The ice
11 is at the mercy of the winds and currents and the unpredictable
12 Beaufort gyral. If you cannot forecast weather, you cannot fore-
13 cast ice. If you can't forecast the movement of the ice, then
14 you're at its mercy. The major types of risk and uncertainties
15 that I will address are health risk, environmental risk and economic
16 risk. As a prelude to the discussion on risk, it might behoove us
17 to look at the important tradeoffs. What lies under the Beaufort
18 Sea that has the oil companies so excited? The DES (sic) says
19 that point five to one point two five billion barrels lie beneath
20 the Beaufort Sea. At 1977 demand levels, this field could then
21 supply the U. S. with, from fourteen days to seventy point two
22 days of oil. In 1985, the year that the oil from this site might
23 become available to the Lower 48, if the sale goes on in December,
24 the demand for oil will be much greater than the present level.
25 That means the importance of this field will then even be less.

1 When the oil companies talk about National security and freedom
2 from foreign oil supplies, this field will bring neither freedom
3 nor National security. The tradeoff is two weeks to two months
4 worth of oil against the potential death of the last subsistence
5 hunter culture in the United States. There are many health risks
6 involved in this undertaking. The most significant in many pro-
7 found ways, seems to me, to be the mental health of this community,
8 which will, undoubtedly, be severely impacted. In comparing the
9 in patient admissions for the Barrow hospital between 1972 and
10 1978, the obvious points stick out. The first is that the number
11 of admissions in the days of incapacitation differ little from
12 1972 until 1978. Admissions in 1972 were four hundred ninety-six
13 versus four hundred sixteen in 1978. While days of incapacitation
14 were one thousand six hundred ninety-nine in 1972, they are one
15 thousand five hundred ninety-three in 1978. Comparing aggregate
16 totals hides some important shifts in the cause of within
17 this community. The biggest difference between 1972 and 1978
18 admissions is in a category called mental disorders. In 1972, there
19 were twenty-seven admissions and thirty-eight days of incapacitation,
20 while in 1978, there were seventy-seven admissions and two hundred
21 fifty-six days of incapacitation. This is a two hundred eighty-
22 five per cent increase in admissions and a six hundred seventy-four
23 per cent increase in the amount in incapacitation, a very significant
24 increase, indeed. The majority of the difference between 1972
25 and 1978 is an acute alcohol intoxication. In addition, the

1 amount of incapacitation due to trauma increase, reflecting a
2 serious community alcohol problem. This problem is undoubtedly
3 a function of the rate, of the rate of social change that has taken
4 place in this community over the last seven years. With the
5 development of the Beaufort Sea oil lease, the DEIS observes that
6 lifestyle and traditional northern slope communities expected to
7 be impacted in terms of the rate of its social change is on page
8 250, paragraph 6, the rate of social change, which has already been
9 so devastating to the North Slope, is expected to accelerate.
10 With it, the community health problems will also accelerate and
11 intensify. The oil lease sale also poses a potential risk to the
12 subsistence hunting of the North Slope. The construction of off
13 shore gravel pads, the dredging of gravel from river deltas, the
14 release of small amounts of tornation water and hydrocarbons will
15 impact on whales, seals, polar bear, caribou and fish. The DEIS
16 is very clear about this, although it doesn't make any estimates as
17 to the accumulative effect of all of these insults because of the
18 uncertainty involved. There are many animals upon which..but these
19 are the animals upon which the foundations of subsistence hunting,
20 and hence, the culture of this region is based. The stores in
21 Nuiqsut and Kaktovik can in no way meet the nutritional needs of
22 those communities. This also presupposes that there is a market
23 economy with jobs, cash flow, marketing, warehouse and a demand
24 for goods and services which also does not exist. This means
25 that the Beaufort Sea oil lease will impact the nutritional status

1 of the population. As has already been mentioned, the Federal
2 Government and State Government does not have the capacity to
3 effectively address the nutritional needs of these communities,
4 let alone, motivate the communities to appreciate a Lower 48
5 diet. The respiratory infections, uhm, lower nutritional level
6 translates out to more deaths due to childhood diseases such as
7 measles. More deaths to lower respiratory infections such as
8 pneumonia. It would mean more cases of diarrhea and more diarrhea
9 related deaths. Is mall nutirtion and cultureal degradation worth
10 one month's worth of oil? The risk to the Inupiat is great. The
11 risks should not be discarded lightly. They should not be ignored.
12 For a Country that spends more and a higher percentage of its
13 gross national product for health than any country in the world,
14 I'm amazed that the health issues are so blatantly disregarded
15 in the DEIS and by policy makers that are involved in this de-
16 cision. I have a hard time disassociating environment, health
17 and economics in my own thinking. It must be remembered that
18 environmental risks also implies a health risk and an economic
19 risk. The fact that many of the environmental systems that will
20 be impacted do not have a market value, does not mean that they
21 are economically worthless. There's not much of a market for zoll
22 planktors, but with these tiny organisms, fish and marine mammals
23 could not exist. The market for Bowhead Whales is restricted in
24 the U. S. because of Government directives. Does this mean they
25 are economically worthless? Although accountants have a hard

1 time with the appropriate value for non market commodities, econo-
2 mists tend to view such factors with economic's tools of shadow
3 pricing and opportunity costs. I see no such attempt in the DEIS
4 to price out the loss to the Inupiat other than the value of
5 subsistence activity that is estimated at three thousand to five
6 thousand dollars per person per year. In order to develop coastal
7 policy that will benefit everyone, analysis should be undertaken.
8 Before this can be done, though, some of the uncertainties need
9 to be eliminated. Some of the risk to the environment is known.
10 We have a good idea of the amount of formation water that will
11 be produced. We know that oil companies want to release this
12 water, which the DEIS says is highly saline and oxic and contains
13 aeromatic hydrocarbonds, page 332, paragraph 4. We know the range
14 of probability of release of oil into the environment, even though
15 the probability functions are developed from historical experience
16 in areas where the risk is less. We have a rough idea about the
17 amount of noise associated with the development of the field. We
18 have a good idea of the type of animals and organisms that could
19 be impacted by the oil production in the exploration. The DEIS
20 is also very clear about those areas where little is known. The
21 bottom line is that the accumulative risk is unknown. This is
22 a direct function of lack of knowledge. We should not be so
23 quick to take these risks. It is very easy for the industry panel
24 to say that the risk means little because they don't have to live
25 on the North Slope. The Federal Government is mandated to protect

1 the people of the North Slope. Proceeding to make decisions with
2 this amount of uncertainty borders on the criminal. The cleanup
3 technologies are new, some untested, many unproven. Those that
4 have been tested have shown very little promises of effective
5 containment activities in this environment. This sale should be
6 postponed until some of these uncertainties are resolved. Only
7 then can intelligent policy be made that allows for full production
8 at minimum risk. Some of the areas where information is needed
9 in order to make intelligent decisions would include: research
10 into more effective ways to contain and clean up oil spills, the
11 habits and migration patterns, feeding behaviors as well as season-
12 ality of the Bowhead Whale, the effect of lower level hydrocarbon
13 on different members of the food chain of the Arctic environment.
14 The effect of noise on birds, fish and marine animals. The effect
15 of development of gravel islands and gravel causeways on different
16 elements of the food chain. Ways of minimizing the impact of
17 pressure ridges and surges outside the Barrier Islands. Research
18 into the dynamics and kenetics of ice surges. In the Fairbanks
19 hearing, we heard the oil company panel dismiss many of these
20 unresolved questions as insignificant or already resolved. For
21 example, one member of the panel started talking about breakdown
22 in metabolism of and hydrocarbons. He dismissed the
23 passage of carcinogenic compounds as an unfeasible concept. He
24 spoke of such forcefulness and confidence that I almost found
25 myself believing him. However, I've been working on a related

1 problem in Michigan for over a year and I hope to show that the
2 passage of a carcinogenic compound is a feasible concept and has
3 SEVERELY impacted a significant porportion of the State of Michigan.
4 In 1973, four hundred pounds, now this is just four hundred pounds,
5 of PBB, which is poly brominated , were accidentally introduced
6 into cattle feed for Michigan's dairy belt. PBB, while not present
7 in crude oil, shares many similarities with compounds that are con-
8 tained in oil, such as benzopyrines. It is a carcinogenic
9 compound. It tends to accumulate in fat tissue, where, using a
10 forty dollar word it's , like the petroleum products in
11 question. It's also an compound like the products in
12 question. While these compounds are different, there are enough
13 similarities that I think this case of PBB in Michigan's food chain
14 warrants some discussion. The four hundred pounds of PBB were
15 fed to cattle. Chicken on the farms also ate this cattle food.
16 Farmer's dependent on their farm animals were hit the hardest for
17 the problem. The prevelance of tumors was higher in this pop-
18 ulation. Loss of memory is frequent and the ability of these
19 people to fight off disease was diminished. Today, over thirty
20 per cent of all Michigan mothers have PBB in their breast milk.
21 Six years after a small amount, only four hundred pounds of this
22 compound were entered into the food chain, it's still with us in
23 a very big way. Over two hundred million people in the State of
24 Michigan carry this compound in their bodies. It was NOT digested.
25 It was NOT metabolized. The people who tell you the passage of

1 carcinogenic compounds is not a feasible concept are mistaken. I
2 will mail a recent write up on this episode that was published in
3 Lancet, prestigious medical journal recently. It will prove be-
4 yond a shadow of a doubt, the passage of such compounds are not
5 only possible but a very frightening reality. The oil companies
6 tells us, the people of the North Slope that they have all the
7 answers. We should not take the oil companies' words that they
8 have eliminated all the uncertainties. The Federal and State
9 Government are charged with finding out the facts. As an environ-
10 mental planner and an analyst, I have no problems with the idea
11 of proceeding under conditions of uncertainty as long as there
12 is a reasonable boundary to the range of uncertainty. Unfortunately,
13 the DEIS makes all too clear, in many crucial areas, the limits
14 of certainties are not known. So little is known about the im-
15 portant factors of the habits of the Bowhead Whale. No estimates
16 of effectiveness exists of untried technologies and accumulative
17 impacts of all different environmental insults, which include noise,
18 safety of gravel islands in twenty meters of water, the active
19 shear ice zone, the effect of low level hydrocarbon pollution on
20 food chain, effective gravel causeways, effective gravel removal,
21 on caribou herds and fish, effect of buried pipes on the benthos
22 communities. Before intelligent off shore policy can be established,
23 these uncertainties MUST be eliminated. Or at least bounded with
24 certain levels of probability. In conclusion, I would like to
25 address the area of economic uncertainty. One thing is certain.

1 The oil under the Beaufort Sea is not going anywhere. The oil will
2 be there in one year; the oil will be there in ten years. It's value
3 will be greater in one year, and greater in ten years. The shortages
4 of oil will not disappear, so that keeping oil in reserve is not
5 an impractical idea. The State and Federal Government stands to
6 make more money if they wait. The only significant impact of
7 waiting on the sale will be on the oil companies' immediate profit
8 margin. This is why they are pushing for the lease sale in Dec-
9 ember. More profits for them now, less revenues for the State.
10 The economics that should be the most important is the economy of
11 the North Slope. It is clear that the area would benefit more
12 from the removing of the one thousand five hundred dollar per
13 capita tax limit that the oil companies ramrodded through the
14 State Legislature than from the delicate development of the
15 Beaufort Sea. Recently, I read some interesting comments by
16 Kenneth Arrow, a noted American economist about pollution, which
17 he calls extranatalities, as they are outside the market system. It
18 was his feeling that those supporting the external cost, in this
19 case, the diminishing of subsistence hunting, should be in some
20 way compensated for the costs that they bear so that the market
21 cost of production, in this case of oil, would reflect a true
22 cost of production. Thus, the cost of oil would reflect, not well
23 head transportation costs, but also the cost of the Inupiat Eskimo
24 brought to bear because of the environmental insult associated
25 with this project. The DEIS, as I mentioned earlier, claims that

1 the economic value of subsistence hunting is roughly three thousand
2 to five thousand dollars per person per year. The DEIS also
3 states, and I quote from page 250, paragraph 5, the overall impact
4 of the proposal on subsistence lifestyle may be to reduce the
5 number of some species during the years, so that there will be
6 less wildlife resources available for food gathering. Hunting may
7 need to be curtailed for some periods to allow population recovery.
8 So, impacted species become rare. The DEIS makes no attempt to
9 estimate the reduction of subsistence hunting due to environmental
10 impacts. In lieu of any numbers, let's pretend that the reduction
11 would be seventy-five per cent for a ten year horizon. This number
12 can't be defended, but by the same token it can't be refuted be-
13 cause it's another one of those important uncertainties that hasn't
14 been addressed by the DEIS. Seventy-five per cent reduction of
15 subsistence hunting translates out to a two thousand two hundred
16 fifty dollar to three thousand five hundred dollar cost of 1979
17 dollars to each Inupiat; these versus a one thousand five hundred
18 dollar per capita tax benefit, much of which is lost to administra-
19 tive overhead that will never find its way to the people. This
20 translates out to a net loss of seven hundred fifty to two thousand
21 dollars per person per year. This is not the worst case. This
22 is a very real possibility. And this net loss does not include
23 those costs associated with community degradation, community mental
24 health problems or the loss of the way of life that these people
25 hold so dear. I ask the panel to consider this. If our Government

1 offered to destroy your way of life at a price of seven thousand
2 five hundred dollars, twenty thousand dollars for each person in
3 your family over ten years, what would your reaction be? Does
4 this Government which breaks off diplomatic relations for sup-
5 posed human rights violations have any other alternative than to
6 delay the sale until the uncertainties are reduced so the risks
7 can be minimized? Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Robert. There was a young lady sitting
9 here that looked like she had some testimony to give. There she
10 is.

11 MAE RINA HANK: My name is Mae Rina Hank and I'm Village
12 Coordinator for the Village of Point Hope. The State and Federal
13 Government, they say that every person, regardless of race of
14 color has a right for freedom of religion in the United States.
15 Are WE the Inupiat people, considered United States citizens? In
16 our culture we hunt animals to survive. We do not waste food.
17 When an animal is caught, it is religion to give THAT animal,
18 whether from the land or sea, to give THAT animal a drink of fresh
19 water or food to thank the animal for coming to the hunter and
20 getting killed so that us Inupiat will not starve. And that the
21 animal's spirit will transform into another animal, whichever he
22 wants to be, and will come to us again because of the way we
23 treated it. It is our religion. What will happen if there is
24 an oil spill? Some of our animals will die. Others, like the
25 whales, seals, and fish will probably change their migration

1 route. What will we eat? White man's food? Three quarters of the
2 Inupiat cannot afford to live on their food alone. The cost of
3 living is too high in Alaska. Everyday of our lives we eat the
4 food we hunt. What is our Government going to do to protect our
5 religion? What are they doing? If they do not know of our religion,
6 then they do not know how much, they do not know much about which
7 way the animals migrate, whether by land or sea. Which way the
8 ocean current goes, how to protect our animals from oil spills.
9 We use the ocean year around to hunt for food. Spring, we hunt
10 whales, seals, belugas and walrus. Summer, we hunt seals, bearded
11 seals and sometimes walrus. Fall, we fish night and day with nets.
12 Winter, we hunt seals, polar bears. In February we go fishing
13 for with hooks on the ice. The ocean is our life. The
14 ocean provides us with food to eat. Our children to eat. We,
15 the Inupiat, have the most priceless food in the world. We cannot
16 buy the type of food we eat from any grocery store in the world.
17 Will our children or grandchildren know what we hunted? Will they
18 know what animals we eat? Will they know how to hunt whales? Will
19 they know how to hunt on the ice? What will our younger generation
20 of Inupiat do? Will they survive? Our children, grand children,
21 great grand children, have a right to what we had? We can't
22 think of only the present. We are also responsible for our future
23 Inupiat. And how they will learn to survive. And the cost of
24 living so high in Alaska, will our future generation forget our
25 culture? We have to work to gether for our rights and survival.

1 That is the only way the Inupiat will survive. The Government
2 took away our land. Now it's the ocean they take away from us.
3 We have nothing left that belongs to us. They have taken every-
4 thing from us. Our land and sea. What will they take from us
5 next? Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mae Rira. Sir?

7 NUVUK KUNUK: (Inupiat)

8 INTERPRETER: Okay. He's saying that we've heard many
9 times the elders saying that they will help even in death. We
10 also know that there are many water fowls in Prudhoe Bay where..
11 and there are not no longer that many over there. All the animals
12 that used to be around there. He also knows that oil and gas was
13 spilled in Sag River. He knows that people will probably leave
14 the area and we also know that up here in the Arctic there are
15 many lakes. You shouldn't even call them lakes because they are
16 all inter connected and it's better by calling them rivers. It
17 hurts to speak of but that's the only way to be heard. He knows
18 that the Inupiat food is very important to us. It's hard to go
19 without it. He found it out personally when he went to school
20 in Oregon.

21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that
22 would like to testify? It's your last chance?

23 BOB WORL: I'll try and be done by plane time. (Laughter)
24 My name is Bob Worl and I work for the North Slope Borough Planning
25 Department. I would like at this time to say that I will submit

1 a more complete and more coherent, possibly, written statement
2 at a later time. But uh, as we've been going through this hearing
3 process, a number of things seems to be gaps, even in the kinds of
4 information that are presented to you. The people of the various
5 communities have given you expert testimony on the environment,
6 which I'm sure will fill a great number of gaps and there are some
7 other things which relate directly to the Draft Environmental Impact
8 Statement and the process of these hearings and the future decisions
9 that will be made as a result. Paramount, I believe, is this
10 atmosphere in which the hearings are being conducted. The hearings
11 regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed
12 lease sale in the Beaufort Sea are essentially to determine whether
13 or not the information contained in that document is sufficient to
14 warrant a lease decision by the Secretary of Interior and the
15 Governor of Alaska. In the hearings that I have attended, Kaktovik,
16 Nuiqsut and part of Fairbanks, I've heard the hearing officer, Mr.
17 Hank Noldan, repeatedly reassure the audience that the decision has
18 not been made and that testimony given would be fairly evaluated
19 and a decision by the Secretary of Interior would be made on the
20 basis of all the evidence and the documents and the evidence pre-
21 sented at the hearings. The very real question that arises is
22 whether this, in fact, is a fair statement. Given the preponderance
23 of evidence that indicate that a decision, at least, by the State
24 of Alaska, who is a party to this thing, has already been made
25 and that not only precludes any further discussion of the Draft

1 Environmental Impact Statement which also jumps ahead to preclude
2 more than so from a consideration of the Impact Statement, required
3 under NEPA for the sale. And as evidence of this, I would like to,
4 I don't have a copy of it with me but I'll try to acquire one, after
5 the Fairbanks hearing, the panel held a press conference. I don't
6 know..I didn't attend the press conference but I did read the
7 press coverage which skipped, completely, the process which we
8 are now participating in and talks strictly about as soon as this
9 hearing is out of the way, then we begin dealing with the develop-
10 ment of a draft environmental impact..or an impact statement on
11 the production of the oil that is to be found in the Beaufort Sea.
12 And uh, all in the press in Alaska is very much behind, I believe,
13 the Beaufort Sea, based on the, based on the kinds of press cover-
14 age that's been given. But I thought that it was very interesting
15 that after a press conference with the hearing panel, that this
16 was the coverage and the statement that Mr. Noldan made did not
17 come through in that press coverage. Only the fact that we are
18 now looking ahead after this process is out of the way, to getting
19 on with the preparation of the statement regarding the production.
20 Which would be the next phase. Numerous statements by State of-
21 ficials notably the Commissioner of Natural Resources and the
22 Governor of Alaska, indicate a prior decision to not only proceed
23 with the Beaufort Sea sale, in spite of serious and significant
24 gaps in the scientific information, but also to proceed as scheduled
25 in December of '79, prior to solving the scientific collection of

1 data to Bowhead Whales. Ice mechanics, ice over ride and ice
2 fore casting, oil spill effects, clean up potential and long range
3 impacts on wildlife, economic considerations including maximized
4 benefits for all state residents and maximized work opportunities
5 for residents of the region and the State. And the pitiful con-
6 sideration of the impacts of either the sale or the consequences
7 of a spill or even production of petroleum from the lease sale
8 area on the only permanent resident population, the Inupiat.
9 Examples of a prehearing decision follows, and I might preface this
10 with another statement that was carried in the press, uhm, this
11 was a quote on 5/15/79 in the Anchorage Daily News, uhm, by Mr.
12 Gillilend who is here with us tonight. There is every indication
13 that North Slope residents have conflicting opinions about leasing.
14 I've heard very little conflicting opinions from the assembled
15 residents at the various hearings, I might add. And that many
16 are concerned about subsistence values that may be in jeopardy.
17 The Secretary of Interior's Special Assistant for Alaska, Jerry
18 Gillilend, further states that, quote, "the decision will be based
19 on information derived from the hearing and elsewhere. It cannot
20 be arbitrary or fly in the base of fact." Other examples of
21 press coverage. 5/11/79, from the Anchorage Times, the Governor
22 asks postponement of seven other OCS sales proposed in the
23 Federal draft five year plan, quote, "until proven safe technology
24 is developed in the near shore Beaufort Sea." Unquote. Hammond
25 cites need for safe technology, strengthened regulatory mechanisms,

1 those are quotes, before other areas EXCEPT the Beaufort Sea
2 are leased. Drilling should take place in the near shore areas
3 where drilling has already taken place and technology is proven.
4 Again, quotes. Meaning the Beaufort Sea, based upon the experience
5 of Prudhoe Bay. 5/3/79, again, Anchorage Times, quote, "The
6 State needs the proposed Beaufort Sea oil and gas sale to bolster
7 future State revenues, Bob LeResche said today. He has no plans
8 to delay the sale set for December. I've got to worry about
9 the State's revenues eight to ten years from now. The Beaufort
10 is the area we know most about and it's near an existing oil
11 field." Unquote. This article goes on to cite a number of
12 interesting facts. One, the North Slope Borough is implicated
13 as a major benefactor of the sale, acquiring twenty-five per
14 cent of the revenues. He was uh, secondly, he was meeting that
15 day with Tom Cook, also with us here today on the panel, with
16 the Division of Minerals and Energy Management; and three, Senator
17 Ted Stevens, again, this is a bit of a disjuncture in the State's
18 political arm of it, I would say, uh, Senator Stevens is op-
19 posed to the sale, citing the advisability of exploring safer
20 on shore acreages, which are also good prospects before taking
21 the seaward plunge. Noteably, the Arctic Wildlife Range and
22 the Natural Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. These articles have
23 also been followed up with a number of other articles and state-
24 ments by these officials and editorials by the Alaska press,
25 which poo-phoo the concerns of the local residents in favor

1 of some greater good to be derived from developing the sensitive
2 Arctic area in advance of safe technology and advance of knowing
3 the adverse effects of accidents or even of safe activity. And
4 most specifically, in advance of any inkling of the impact this
5 event will have upon the Inupiat residents; and the viability
6 of their culture, society and, indeed, their integrity. Perhaps,
7 the most important impact is going to be the resulting break
8 in the faith of the Inupiat and all people who are wary observers
9 in this process, in the institutions of Government, when, despite
10 scientific, Statewide and National, economic and environmental
11 evidence against the sale, the Beaufort Sea sale IS going to
12 take place. For the Inupiat, this sale may be significant as
13 a watershed era, marking the end of the North Slope Borough,
14 the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the Upeagvik Inupiat
15 community of the Arctic Slope, indeed, the concern of the Federal
16 and State Governments as protective buffers between themselves,
17 as Inupiat and the outside Western world. It is for this parti-
18 cular problem and the lack of consideration given to it in the
19 DEIS, that I'd like to address myself further. As to this part-
20 icular problem, which I direct your concious attention for a
21 very few moments, for it is a perspective that is too often
22 voided in such deliberations and never considered in the context
23 of mitigation. Because it is, in effect, it is an effect that
24 cannot be mitigated in the same sense as other impacts. Mitiga-
25 tion of the following can only occur through the application of

1 time, understanding and the application of the United States'
2 oft quoted human rights policies. It requires an understanding
3 that in terms of dealing with the International problems of
4 petroleum dependence and supply in the State of Alaska, and
5 particularly this region, are a developing Nation in the same
6 sense as any Country in the Third World. For those Inupiat
7 who's entire lifeways stand to be irrevocably changed and who's
8 people will soon be scattered without the benefit of a link
9 to the past or present, this panel, the Governor and the Secretary
10 of Interior bear an awesome responsibility. Permenant residents
11 of the Arctic must deal with a large volume of technical material,
12 literally in the thousands of pages; at least five hundred of
13 which are in front of you in the form of the DEIS, which I would
14 say, probably another five hundred have been presented as testimony
15 over the past several weeks. The Secretary of Interior, who
16 will be making the final decision on behalf of the Federal Govern-
17 ment will be dealing with a twenty-five page summary of major
18 pointsfor consideration, called by various names, but I believe
19 known as a Secretarial Decision Document. It is, in part, the
20 work of this panel to determine which points are salient for
21 inclusion in that document. From reading carefully, the DEIS
22 and being involved in the preparation of some of the technical
23 report documents that were SUPPOSED to be the basis for the
24 DEIS, it is apparent that something went wrong. If the present
25 DEIS is used as a base for the preparation of the Decision Document,

1 the social, cultural, subsistence and health material will be
2 a total loss as tools for the decision. The Draft DEIS covers
3 a wide range of material relating to the North Slope and the
4 communities. Page 106 to 112 discusses the communities and
5 the present situation in each, regarding housing, jobs, facilities
6 that normally are indications of the degree of community well
7 being. Much of this information is accurate; however, some
8 is totally inaccurate. For example, page 107 indicates that
9 Barrow has a number of movie theaters. In fact, Barrow has
10 none. NARL has one, which has only recently been made available
11 to the community of Barrow on any sort of regular basis. But
12 these are minor points. Beginning on page 112, number 8, social
13 cultural systems, major problems begin to occur. Page 116,
14 quote, "The cultural values are most elusive yet provoking emotional
15 responses if subsistence is threatened." End quote. It is
16 evident through testimony previously presented at Kaktovik,
17 Nuiqsut and now Barrow, that subsistence resources represent
18 far more than emotional content. Nutrition and economics alone
19 makes subsistence a critical issue or more than emotional import.
20 Page 117, the real significance of subsistence does not include
21 gathering per se, but rather a socio cultural identification
22 of the tradition and unique lifestyle. Again, the nutritional
23 and economic importance is denigrated; a dangerous and unsupportable
24 contention. The DEIS further states that if whaling were to
25 cease, then commercial food would suffice as substitutes. That

1 socio cultural damage would be irreparable and that language,
2 though important, is drastically being eroded and is making
3 it impossible for the knowledge of the older more experienced
4 hunters to teach the younger people and that the erosion of
5 subsistence is a major factor in the erosion of language. Well,
6 it is a certainty that language is a factor, this simplistic
7 analysis is misleading, indeed. Also mis stated. Page 118,
8 urbanization, this is a quote, "Urbanization, which is actively
9 being pursued by the Inupiat is bringing about inevitable and
10 accelerating erosion of subsistence living." Unquote. Again
11 a quote, "The key to understanding subsistence living today
12 is to realize that this lifestyle has been qualitatively changed
13 since the first non Inupiat contact. An integral part of sub-
14 sistence living is that it is dynamically changing in the direc-
15 tion of urban values and will continue to do so, regardless
16 of OCS development." Unquote. These conclusive remarks demand
17 some response. They are substantively wrong. They illustrate
18 no understanding of the dynamics of culture, the dynamics of
19 the North Slope, or the impact of wholesale, rapid change. Change
20 which does NOT allow the social, cultural and psychological
21 processes to keep pace with the demands placed upon individuals,
22 communities and culture. Much of this material was prepared
23 under subcontract of the OCS office by Worl Associates of which
24 I am a part. But none of that material appears in the DEIS.
25 What does appear is the above statements and many like them

1 denigrate the time and effort that went into the preparation
2 of those documents and at the same time, denigrate the relation-
3 ship between the products prepared for the OCS office and the
4 synthesis which appears in the Draft Environmental Impact State-
5 ment. I refer you to technical reports numbers 9 and 22 respect-
6 ively, which attempt to analyze the changes which are occurring
7 in a balanced form. Since none of that information apparently
8 was used in preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact State-
9 ment, or if it was, then, for the record, I wish to state, that
10 in no significant way is there ANY similarity between what was
11 prepared and what appears in the DEIS regarding potential impacts
12 from inappropriate pervasive developments such as those under
13 consideration here. In brief form, the following comments dis-
14 cuss significant areas for your consideration; and again, I'd
15 like the panel to read the Worl Associates Technical Reports,
16 particularly the sections on potential impact. That's in report
17 22 which is uh, assessment of impacts. Another document from
18 the Deapartment of Environmental Conservation within the Division
19 of Planning and Program Coordination, uh, from the State of
20 Alaska, dated September 28th is also here included. I think
21 that it speaks well for itself and directly to the concerns
22 that you have heard from many citizens during the hearing process.
23 I'll not read it or discuss it except to say that it certainly
24 speaks for the State of Alaska to approach the lease sale with
25 more care and caution than it has. And there was a copy of

1 it here earlier, but it's basically a thing called Issues and
2 Choices in Alaska's Environment, published in September of 1978
3 by the Division of Planning and Program Coordination, Alaska
4 Department of Environmental Conservation. There is a very short
5 section on Arctic policy and a short section included with that,
6 which states that subsistence and other traditional land, sea
7 and ice uses, and I'll just read one sentence from this. If
8 I can find it. "No resource development will take place which
9 is likely to result in the genocidal destruction of one racial
10 or cultural group of Alaskans for the benefit of any other group
11 of persons." That's the only thing..I direct you to this and
12 the questions that follow it because it apparently was an official
13 State document which, the circulation of which I'm not aware
14 of. As a participant and co author of a series of technical
15 reports done for the socio economic studies program, I'm extremely
16 annoyed with the quality of the assessment of that work. And
17 at the lack of inclusion of significant areas which are necessary
18 for an accurate understanding of the complexity and fragility
19 of the social, cultural and economic sphere. To the extent
20 that the above areas are involved with the newly emerging economic
21 and political infrastructures, the North Slope Borough, the
22 Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, these areas are in a unique
23 balance between protection, enhancement at one end and serious
24 jeopardy on the other. Page 112 and 115 state some of the details
25 of these infrastructures as well as the Arctic Slope Native

1 Association, the Inupiat community of the Arctic Slope and Village
2 Government. To the Western eye, these institutional infrastructures
3 are taken at face value. In fact, discussing these institutions
4 with Inupiat is sure to generate a lively discussion of the
5 value of the particular organizations. Its role as a association,
6 corporation or government and whether it functions properly.
7 At a deeper level, these infrastructures serve as boundary maint-
8 enance mechanisms and function to keep the bulk of the concerns
9 of Western society away from most of the Inupiat; while allowing
10 for participation when they choose to participate and to have
11 a voice in impinging areas that are important to them. This
12 is a very important function. It allows the Western, outside
13 world a touch point with the Inupiat in terms of government,
14 businss, services and any other areas; at the same time, it
15 serves to keep the Western world out of the Inupiat's cultural
16 hair. Interference with the deeper structures of the Inupiat
17 cultural, social and economic life are blunted by these buffer
18 institutions, which function partially in a fashion similar
19 to language, ceremonial or ritual activites in maintaining the
20 unity and solidarity of the community, while also serving to
21 partially exclude outsiders. To the extent that these roles
22 are effectively filled by buffer institutions and boundary maint-
23 enance mechanisms, the Inupiat will, as a group, make successfull
24 adjustments from impinging changes, while maintaining their
25 uniqueness as a distinct cultural group. The danger is always

1 present that these mechanisms, buffer institutions and boundary
2 maintenance mechanisms will be overloaded and lose their capacity
3 to fulfill either role to the satisfaction of the Inupiat. The
4 impinging forces must then be dealt with directly by the individ-
5 uals who then did not have the protection of a collective response.
6 This situation then leaves deep cultural and social values open
7 to direct attack from often antithetical and impinging forces
8 at the level of the individual, the basic unit of society. A
9 chain of stress, over stress and breakdown then is followed.
10 First at the level of the institutions, then at the level of
11 the individual. It is at this level, where the individual and
12 his or her social and cultural adaptations and values are stressed,
13 that the most obvious and tragic responses of stress occur.
14 However, the real tragedy is that this disrupts, totally and
15 permanently, that continuity which allows a society or culture
16 to continue its existence. There must be a distinction made
17 between biological extinctions and cultural extinctions. In
18 this regard, we are certainly talking about the latter. Cultural
19 extinction, which can occur in the absence of biological ex-
20 tinction. Much of the literature regarding modernization contains
21 reference to such a process and the attending disruptions which
22 will result when change occurs too rapidly and too berase of
23 a manner for these systems to adapt. Particularly dangerous
24 is altered relationships to physical and biological environments
25 which directly provide the necessities of life, food, shelter

1 and transportation. There are two basic ways in which interference
2 in the network can occur. One, political and legal interdiction
3 in the interrelationship between man and the environment and;
4 two, biological disruption of the environment in itself, which
5 decreases its capacity to meet the needs of man for those life
6 sustaining necessities. Events in the last few years have in-
7 creasingly served to remove that biological and social link
8 between the Inupiat and the environment, which sustains them
9 physically and culturally and as an end result, will challenge
10 each individual to an extreme that is seldom felt by man outside
11 the boundaries of war or large scale natural disaster. The
12 coping strategies and responses are all too similar to ignore.
13 In that sphere of man's continued fight to adapt, to change,
14 which is the joint perview of anthropology, psychiatry and medicine,
15 mental, physical and cultural health, the concepts and conditions
16 described above, constitute a situation of, quote, "gross stress."
17 John Kotey, a psychiatrist who's specific field of study has
18 been areas which have undergone significant alteration of the
19 interrelationship between man and environment and the ensuing
20 alterations in human relationships and pathology, has, perhaps,
21 given us the best insight into such areas. Kotey tells us that
22 gross stress came into vogue as a medical category in World
23 War II to refer to illnesses of combat personell which could
24 not fairly be described in terms of existing psychiatric categories
25 and use in civilian life. The syndrome was officially called

1 reaction to acute and special stress, gross stress reaction.
2 Gross stress, as a casual category is also applied to situations
3 other than combat, especially the community disasters. It may
4 take the form of chronic, indeed, life long syndromes expressed
5 by apathy, hostility, or current inhostility. Observers, social
6 scientists, psychiatry, medecine, have neglected the concept,
7 gross stress, from ecologocal privation. Observers have failed
8 to give the concept due weight, in part, because of their in-
9 sensitivity to the power of physical factors of chronic ill
10 health, anemia, subnutirtion and overcrowding; and of the psycho-
11 logical features of high anxiety levels that are expressed in
12 various ways. Kotey's analysis presents a picture of the process
13 which could well effect a large portion of the Inupiat in the
14 North Slope, particularly those whos relationships with the
15 traditional way of life, subsistence activity, is most direct
16 and intense. It is this group, and I might point out that these
17 are those who are unemployed, those who are older and many of
18 those who are yet too young to enter into the job market. It
19 is this group who will be the first victims of stress, which
20 when set in motion, will result in a depressive pattern which
21 results when ecological disturbance comes first, interpersonal
22 disturbances follow and intrasight disturbances complete a cycle
23 of pathological sequence which then reverberates throughout
24 the society. Kotey concludes, as have many other authors, that
25 in rapid situations, that this resultant trauma to

1 individuals will have far reaching effects on the family and
2 then on society itself. And we've heard a number of testimonies
3 in the past which would direct our attention to exactly this
4 process. When we're talking about the tremendous increase in
5 the number of detentions, not arrests, detentions for alcohol
6 abuse and uh, one thing that was not brought out was the..when
7 this detention program was instituted, there was a decline
8 in the number of actual crimes requiring arrests and prosecution.
9 In this community here, which occurred along with this process.

10 CHAIRMAN: Bob, excuse me. You've been going some twenty
11 to twenty-five minutes and if you can summarize--

12 BOB WORL: I only have about two more minutes here.

13 CHAIRMAN: All right.

14 BOB WORL: One of the things I want to point out was that
15 changes that occur with great rapidity and encompass a large
16 segment of the population leads to severe disruption, while
17 changes that occur at a slower pace result in less disturbance.
18 I have here, as documents which contain some of the statistics
19 which I was talking about in the program and effects of those
20 programs, done by the Department of Public Safety at the Borough,
21 which I'll leave with you. I might also point out that the
22 kinds of psychological and community stresses which are discussed,
23 which I've discussed earlier, and which are, by the way, well
24 documented in literature and that becomes a major project just
25 to trot out a bibliography, which, if anybody's interested,

1 I can certainly do rather quickly. Result and I'd just like
2 to reiterate the points, depressive pattern and also the points
3 of the interaction of these things which lead to apathy and
4 hostility and turned in hostility, which you would associate
5 if you want to translate that into what's going on today. Look
6 at the statistics in here on suicide. Look in here at the statis-
7 tics on violent crimes within a community that, until very recently,
8 never had any violent crimes requiring medical attention, police
9 attention and uh, I think that you'll understand what the point
10 of this is. And uh, I think that any summary of what has already
11 been presented to you is almost a moot point because I think
12 that there's been, the people who've testified have done an
13 excellent job. I'd just like to say that uh, one more thing.
14 In relationship to the way we Outsiders view this community
15 and the, by this community, I don't mean just Barrow, I mean
16 the North Slope, uhm, it's been pointed out that subsistence
17 is a year around activity that provides the bulk of their nutri-
18 tion and that there is no freezing capacity except for the ice
19 hours, that many of the communities cannot store the commercial
20 foods that are brought in and that they require the continued
21 activity, which is periodic in nature, to keep their ice box
22 or their stomachs full. It should be apparent that much of
23 the misunderstanding comes from our own Western bias. Subsistence
24 is a demanding, full time occupation, leaving little time for
25 staying home. In fact, much of the idleness, people not working

1 in town stems from the problem of developing a strategy of
2 integrating cash and subsistence activities. Points spoken
3 to in the Worl Associates Reports and not spoken to at all in
4 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Certain cash jobs
5 are more conducive to such a blending than others. Construction
6 trades, laboring offer better opportunities than office jobs
7 associated with business or government. Our Western bias is
8 getting in the way both of understanding and accepting this
9 Arctic reality. Another important point to make is that sharing
10 and mutual support which occurs among the Inupiat. Subsistence
11 resources, unlike case in our Western economy are shared through
12 out elaborate social networks within the community. Cash earned
13 at a job often flows back or proceeds along from the same network
14 so that an unemployed hunter may appear to have cash in excess
15 of his actual work and an office worker or a disabled person
16 may appear to have subsistence foods on excess of their apparent
17 participation in such activities. Often related to this system
18 of redistribution of money and food is apparent, quote, "poor
19 money management on the part of the Inupiat." It is NOT poor
20 management except that it does not do the things that we Westerners
21 believe cash should do such as going into bank accounts and building
22 nest eggs. Cash to many Inupiat is treated as if it were an
23 available subsistence resource and much of it is allocated and
24 reallocated along the same social networks. In both communities
25 and Barrow, there were extensive testimony regarding these points.

1 I just try to put it into a little bit more formalistic network
2 so that you can see it for what I believe is actually being
3 presented. Cash employment opportunities may increasingly separate
4 families for extended periods of time as well as deprive people
5 taking such jobs from engaging in subsistence activities as
6 the North Slope Borough large scale capital improvement projects,
7 housing, schools, etc. are completed and some individuals are
8 forced to look outside the community for employment. History
9 has shown that few will engage in long term outside employment
10 and fewer still will relocate their families to take advantage
11 of these opportunities. At this juncture, participation and
12 importance of subsistence activities will be highly visible
13 to the outside viewer. Historically, there will be no significant
14 employment of the Inupiat in the oil and gas related industries.
15 Nor will the State or Federal Government be overconcerned with
16 the needs or desires for such employment in local or proximal
17 communities within the region. In fact, contractors responsible
18 for many projects within the context of the North Slope Borough
19 and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation are frequently hampered
20 in such attempts through problems with unions, time schedules,
21 personal and company biases and the afore mentioned needs of
22 the Inupiat, to be more than just a wage earner and a myriad
23 of other details which interdict effective local hire programs.
24 As I said, I'll have more information to present to you in a
25 written form after this hearing.

1 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Bob. Are you submitting that statement?

2 BOB WORL: Well, I'm going to hang on to this and give
3 you these two books. I'll give you these chunks along with
4 my written statement.

5 (Above mentioned booklets are included in Attachment)

6 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I'd like to state that
7 I'd like to soon close the hearing. Perhaps we have time for
8 one or two more people.

9 GEORGE EDWARDSON: My name is George Edwardson and my ed-
10 ucation is, I've gone to college taking mining and petroleum
11 and went further into geology and I've worked for the oil in-
12 dustry for over seven and a half years. In Kenai on the oil
13 platforms I was an operator. In Prudhoe Bay, I was one of
14 the operators for the test loop which studied the properties
15 for Prudhoe Bay oil and from that study right there, what I've
16 learned was, the bottom temperatures of the wells drilled are
17 around 205 degrees and what was coming out on the top of the
18 well, when the wind was blowing, was coming out starting around
19 120 to 140 degrees. I have a real big problem with the industry's
20 technology which they are going off shore with. Bottom pressure,
21 being 205, top being 120, 85 degrees being lost from the bottom
22 to the top. And this loss here is being lost into a permafrost
23 zone which is 27 degrees to 31 degrees Fahrenheit. The perma-
24 frost, this heat is being lost inside the permafrost. The perma-
25 frost being only about five degrees below freezing. This is

1 the technology the oil companies are going off shore with. Do
2 you understand the properties of steel? How steel conducts
3 heat and then transfers it up? You flow the oil, you increase
4 this heat transfer coming from the bottom to the top into less
5 than two thousand feet of permafrost zone. In this permafrost
6 zone, water is solid, frozen, expanded when it melts it, you
7 know, it shrinks back. It loses its increase it's made. And
8 this loss, at times, has broken the pipes. If you want to see
9 documents of this, take a look at all the navy wells that were
10 drilled in the early days. Look at the data on some of the
11 wells they looked back in there. You'll find most of the navy
12 wells have collapsed, have broken. Steel's property to conduct
13 heat, if not flowing, will take a longer period of time. What
14 you have created is time bombs. You have set up a conductor
15 that absorbs the heat from the bottom and brings it up to the
16 permafrost. Now, if there happens to be high pressure in that
17 area, then if the line is broken in the shallow area, then that
18 high pressure is being exposed to the low pressure area with
19 no means of containing it. And with the industry gone after
20 they're finished with their work, the well shut down, no means
21 of checking to see if, you know, there's any leakages on their
22 well or any breaks, everytime you drill a well in the permafrost
23 you set up this conductor which is bringing the heat out of
24 the ground. This is the technology the industry is proposing
25 to go off shore with. All we have heard here is ice problems,

1 animal problems. No one has even bothered to take a look at
2 that problem right there. And if, just, and in Prudhoe Bay,
3 I spent three and a half years there working for ARCO. Working
4 with them, I was a crane operator and as a crane operator, when
5 this test loop was being tested, on the discovery well in Prudhoe
6 Bay, I had to take this crane and hook it on to the pipe. I
7 had to hook it on to the christmas tree because the pipe was
8 starting to sink and I sat there with that crane for a couple
9 of weeks waiting for the permafrost to refreeze again. This
10 is their technology they're going off shore with. This hearing
11 right here is the third hearing I've gone to where the industry
12 attempted to go off shore drilling. First one being Point Thomp-
13 son, right on the right hand side of your map back there. And
14 that didn't work. Then a few months later came the land casters
15 out in Canada. I was invited over, paid for by the Bathan Islands
16 community to explain some of the impacts the industry had done
17 to our people with their development. Over there, when we showed
18 the industry how unsafe they were with their technology, Norland's
19 Petroleum walked out of the hearings three hours before the
20 hearing was over and the results of that hearing was, Landcaster
21 drilling did not occur and, in fact, last word I heard was the
22 Canadian Government removed all the oil leases off shore. So,
23 we have Canada here, we have us over here, Alaskans saying,
24 no. The new Greenland Government states it does not recognize
25 any off shore leases. We have three Countries of the same race

1 saying, no. Over the same problems, the environmental problems,
2 the ice problems, the animals. Excuse me. I get tongue tied
3 here sometimes. (Pause) I'd better stop here. I can't get
4 my thoughts straight here.

5 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, George. Does the panel
6 have any questions of George from this heat transfer problem?

7 HOYLE HAMILTON: George, I'd like to just address that
8 for a moment. I'm Hoyle Hamilton with the Oil and Gas Conservation
9 Commission with the State. There's been considerable amount
10 of work done on cementing through the permafrost.

11 GEORGE EDWARDSON: Cementing through the permafrost, but
12 that does not solve your heat transfer from the higher temperatures
13 subsurface to within the permafrost. And if you want documents
14 on what happens to the permafrost when it melts, we have people
15 here in town who have almost walked into a hole five feet diameter
16 around a christmas tree, one hundred fifty feet deep in Prudhoe
17 Bay.

18 HOYLE HAMILTON: I won't argue with you.

19 GEORGE EDWARDSON: And this is the workers themselves.
20 This is the technology going off shore. I was also with Pan
21 American Petroleum in Kenai in charge of their first skimmer
22 boat that ever came up to Alaska. The way it was explained
23 to me then was, it had to be, the skimmer boat had to be put
24 in the water to operate in order to satisfy the public. It
25 wasn't really important if it worked or not; but you have to

1 at least an attempt into making it work.

2 HOYLE HAMILTON: I'll just say this. We do have casing
3 designs that DO work in Prudhoe Bay field that ARE safe and
4 there've been many years of study gone into that. We only approve
5 certain types of steel to be used to be cemented through that
6 permafrost.

7 GEORGE EDWARDSON: Do you understand steel's property to
8 absorb heat?

9 HOYLE HAMILTON: Yes, I do and that's one of the considerations
10 in the design.

11 GEORGE EDWARDSON: We have never heard nothing about that
12 design to see how it works. It's like the same way, your air
13 guns for off shore are explained to us as being safe. Yet,
14 when a air gun goes off, on land if you're standing on solid
15 ground, you can feel it nineteen miles away. This is your safe
16 technology.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, George. One more Gentleman,
18 there.

19 RIGGS PETER: I don't know how to say this but I'm not
20 trying to be a professional. I'm just speaking what is on my
21 mind and what I've learned and what I've seen here even though
22 I have not stayed up here all my life. I'm Riggs Peter and
23 I'm from Barrow and I come up here to talk about the problems
24 up here. I have a sudden urge to help my Eskimo relatives and
25 I feel that they are getting robbed of what they need, in a

1 way. If it wasn't for hunting, I think that there'd be very
2 many problems. Even in the middle of the winter when the Fish
3 and Game thing is going back and forth looking for poachers.
4 I was out visiting winter of 1978 and I have starved a lot out
5 there. Even though there is food, it's hard to get that food
6 because you need money and there aint that many jobs. In Barrow
7 I have starved. I don't have a job right now. I'm looking
8 for a job. I've been looking for a job pretty hard and I think
9 that it would be good for some people to try to help us instead
10 of try to go against us. It will just make us resent people
11 that are trying to do what they want and it will just make it
12 worser. I think that Eskimos should be allowed to hunt all
13 year around on what they need. During the hunting season, that
14 isn't the only time they need food. They need food in winter
15 and that's a very hard time to get food. I would like to say
16 that drilling off the shore will not help us either because
17 we would not get that many jobs. They would probably get people
18 from down in the states that are experienced and that they are
19 willing to try to train us as good as they have trained people
20 down in the states. I think that I would like to help my people
21 by becoming a so called attorney, I guess. I would like to
22 be, in the future. Anyway, I don't like seeing them get ripped
23 off and I shouldn't do nothing about it. And I would like to
24 say to you guys, that I'm not prejudiced. I just don't like
25 people who are hungry for money and for gas and for things that

1 they need some where else; that they don't care for the people
2 around here or for the animals. I might just be saying that
3 right now. You guys might be caring for the animals but not
4 as good as we would like it. It's just making it harder for
5 us to live. Right now, I'm trying to be accepted in a college
6 so that I may go to law school so that I may come back and help
7 my family and my people. My family has a very hard time getting
8 food, even though there is income in this area, there's a lot
9 of people in my family, which is that there is in a lot of families.
10 Families up here are pretty big compared to down where people
11 usually come from that come up here and invest in their oil
12 and start their rigs up anywhere they can to get oil. And I
13 would like to say that it would be nicer if you guys would help
14 us instead of doing things your way. Maybe if we compromise
15 in some way, that it would work out in the future. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Riggs. I would like to
17 close the hearing now, but before I do, I would like to say
18 on behalf of myself and I'm sure, my colleagues here on the
19 panel, with the help of Molly, that we certainly appreciate
20 all your testimony and irrespective of what Bob said, we are
21 going to assure you that this information will be used in trying
22 to make a decision one way or the other. In improving the Impact
23 Statement and also in having the Secretary and the Governor
24 decide whether we should or should not have a lease sale. Again,
25 I want to thank you. Thank you very much. The hearing is closed.

(Hearing closed at 4:00 a.m.)