

March 14, 2015

Testimony ~ HB 132

Chairman Nageak, Co-Chair Talerico and members of the Resource Committee, thank you for allowing us to finally speak to HB 132.

My name is Alan LeMaster. I am President of Gakona Junction Village, Inc. located in the Copper Valley on the Richardson Highway about 15 miles north of Glenallen. Unfortunately I was unable to get to our LIO to testify today so I am submitting my testimony posthumously.

I must say that after listening to three sessions on this bill and not being able to testify, it has been an arduous task for those of us that, by necessity, are donating their time and treasure to speak to this important issue.

In the first session, all the time was taken by the members of the committee asking a myriad of questions for over the two hours, leaving no time for public testimony. Probably because no one was allowed to testify on day one, some of us were discouraged and only one came prepared to testify on day two.

The third day we never did hear the report from AGDC, again because even before the presenters were allowed to speak, Representative Hawker interrupted and asked for a quick moment to ask a question. That question obfuscated the issue with an abundance of questions levied by Representative Hawker and others on the committee, again leaving your constituents floating in the wind as time ran out.

Please understand that many of us, across the state, are limited by time and distance to be able to come to our LIO's to speak to the issues, for which we all have concerns, and it would be prudent on the part of the committee chairs to make ample time for us to testify if you are calling a session for that purpose.

Now, having taken this moment to vent a bit, I would like to quickly speak in opposition to HB 132.

As I read the bill, it seems that its prime purpose is to deny any work that would allow the state to consider an alternative plan to AK-LNG. If, as you all seem to agree, AK-LNG is the definitive and only proper line to give Alaskans the best and lowest cost in natural gas, there is little about which you should be concerned. But if something happens in ongoing of negotiation and studies over the next two years, that would preclude AK-LNG from

progressing, is it not wise to have a plan to which you can defer, so as to not lose time and money by gearing up from the beginning, once again?

We know there is ample natural gas to power the Anchorage Bowl and its neighbors for decades at their current levels. So the question is which plan will best serve the people of Alaska and allow us to market our gas to end users in the Pacific Rim. Of course, there is an economy in size so the larger the pipe the more product can be sold. That is pretty simple but seems to be lost by some in the legislature.

With a 3.5 billion dollar short fall of funds available to run the state for the foreseeable future, is it not a sensible plan to back up our work in designing a pipe with as many alternatives as possible to insure that we Alaskans see the benefits of gas over diesel and wood to heat and power our homes and businesses should AK-LNG fail to meet the level of economics need to proceed?

I ask that, given these issues and the fact that the Governor has publicly stated to Veto the bill should it reach his desk, are there not a host of more important issues to which you can turn your attention that will benefit the state far greater than playing with these seemingly politically motivated, delaying tactics?