

## KENAI PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

May 11, 2009  
4:00pm – 7:30pm

Alaska Challenger Learning Center  
Kenai, AK

### Attendees

#### Public Attendees:

Trent Dodson  
Gabrielle LeDoux  
Dave Carey

#### State Agency Project Team Attendees:

Ira Rosen  
Allison Iverson  
Tim Robertson (Nuka Research)

#### Project Team Attendees:

Bettina Chastain  
Gretchen Grekowicz

### 1. Introductions

A total of 8 individuals were in attendance including members of the project team, members of the State Agency Oversight Team (SAOT), and the public. The meeting began with an introduction by Ira Rosen, ADEC Project Manager, on the project background and status. Tim Robertson of Nuka Research communicated the objectives and ground rules for the meeting, and began introductions of those in attendance. The purpose of the meeting was to obtain input from the public on the Proposed Risk Assessment Methodology released in March 2009. The report describes the methodology inputs, infrastructure scope, technical methodology and a description of how the risk assessment results will be analyzed and compiled into a risk profile.

A presentation was given by Bettina Chastain. The meeting was scribed by Gretchen Grekowicz. Opportunity was given to meeting participants to provide oral comments during the meeting or written comments via email, fax, and mail. It was conveyed that all comments are due no later than June 2, 2009.

### 2. Proposed Risk Assessment Methodology Presentation

#### Overview Presentation

Bettina Chastain, the EMERALD Project Manager, gave an overview of the background, objectives, and current status of the project, including an overview of the scope of the infrastructure included in the risk assessment, a summary of the stakeholder consultation process and other inputs to the Proposed Methodology, and other details of the Proposed Methodology developed for the Alaska Risk Assessment.

The presentation is available on the project website at:

[http://www.dec.state.ak.us/spar/ipp/ara/documents/0905GeneralPublicOverview\\_ProposedRiskAssessmentMethodology\\_v002\\_3.pdf](http://www.dec.state.ak.us/spar/ipp/ara/documents/0905GeneralPublicOverview_ProposedRiskAssessmentMethodology_v002_3.pdf)

## KENAI PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

### 3. Questions, Answers, and Comments

Questions were taken both throughout the presentation and following the presentation. Questions asked and comments from public attendees are denoted by a “Q” or a “C” in the following discussion, while “A” represents the State or Project Team’s effort to address the question or comment.

**Q:** How does the safety consequence scale intersect with OSHA regulations?

**A:** The scale presented is customized for this project and is independent of OSHA and other regulatory thresholds. The types of events regulated by OSHA are already heavily scrutinized. This risk assessment is looking at the potential for significant events that may not already be on the radar of regulatory agencies.

**Q:** Is it acceptable for industry to cause the death of even one worker?

**A:** No, but industry operates in an inherently dangerous world, and as such, they spend significant resources ensuring that injuries or an individual death does not occur. Industry has its own risk tolerances, which typically address events such as single fatalities, near misses, and injuries, however; this project is looking at potential major events that may be deemed an appropriate focus for additional State of Alaska resources.

**Q:** Will government money be used to mitigate risks or will additional requirements be imposed on the owners of infrastructure?

**A:** It may be a combination of resources from the state as well as resources from the owner/operators of the infrastructure.

**A:** Additionally, PSIO is conducting a gap analysis of regulatory oversight of the infrastructure. An analysis of the jurisdiction of individual state and federal agencies has already been completed and now PSIO is looking at how each of these agencies implements its authority. The purpose of this effort is to focus the state’s resources by reducing redundancies and filling gaps.

**Q:** Does the State of Alaska have a mining related risk assessment as well?

**A:** No, this project is a capitally funded project set up specifically to address existing oil and gas infrastructure; however, it is possible that this effort could lead to future efforts in other areas. For example, a study of vessel traffic has been commissioned and an Aleutian Islands Risk Assessment is also in the works.

**A:** Another issue that has come to light as a result of this project is how important secondary and socioeconomic impacts are, such as loss of jet fuel to the Anchorage Airport or loss of heat in the City of Anchorage. This may be an area of future study.

**Q:** Will you also be holding other meetings with individuals while you are here to solicit their feedback?

**A:** No, that was done during the initial stakeholder consultation in Fall 2008, but this time only public meetings are being held.

**C:** There are not many people present at this meeting. That is why I was wondering if other meetings are being held.

**C:** The CIRCAC staff tried to get the word out about this meeting. Also, during the initial stakeholder consultation period the ADEC Project Manager, Ira Rosen, came to Kenai and gave the CIRCAC Board of Directors a full presentation. Representatives from Emerald also came to Kenai in the fall and met with the CIRCAC at our office.

## KENAI PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

**A:** The State of Alaska actually assisted people in traveling to Anchorage to participate in the day long detailed workshop as well.

**C:** Even if people did not attend this meeting, it is important for the project team to make an effort to solicit input in places like Kenai and to hold meetings such as this so people have an opportunity to participate if they choose to.

### **Attachments**

[Proposed Risk Assessment Methodology Overview Presentation](#)