

Status keys	Closed	Item identified in a past report from the Federal Coordinator's office, but later resolved and not a concern at this time.
	Monitoring	Item that the Federal Coordinator's office will continue to monitor but, with continued coordination, is not likely to affect the project negatively.
	Priority	Item requires attention and has a moderate likelihood of affecting the project negatively.
	Critical path	Item with high potential to affect the project negatively if timely action is not taken.
	Next step	Recommendations for moving ahead.

Issue:		Air Quality/Non-Attainment/ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
Air quality remains a large area of concern for the project, with significant federal regulatory changes proposed. Federal air quality regulations continue to change and will likely remain a dynamic issue nationwide throughout the permitting of this project. Several proposed changes include the tailoring rule (requiring large emitters to use best-available control technology to reduce greenhouse gas emissions) that went into effect in January 2011; more stringent sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide emission requirements; emission limitations for construction equipment; and the potential to revise air quality regulations specifically affecting the oil and natural gas industry (draft regulations are anticipated in fall 2011). The effects of potential, proposed and new regulations on the Alaska gas pipeline project continue to be assessed.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Priority	The Environmental Protection Agency has determined that Fairbanks is a non-attainment area for particulate matter in the air, and a general conformity analysis of the project's affect on Fairbanks will need to be conducted.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	Air quality data has not been collected at the proposed gas treatment plant location at Prudhoe Bay or at any of the proposed compressor station locations along the pipeline route. This information will be needed for National Environmental Policy Act analysis and/or permitting. Additionally, the EPA in August 2011 issued draft proposed amendments to air-quality regulations for the oil and natural gas industry.	
November/ December 2011	Priority	The applicant held a series of air quality meetings in late 2011 with the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Environmental Protection Agency and FERC to discuss data needs for the project's environmental impact statement versus data needs for state air quality permits and the timing of permit applications. The applicant is planning to use existing air quality data from Prudhoe Bay Unit monitoring sites as representative baseline data for the project's gas treatment plant in its October 2012 application to FERC (the proposed gas treatment plant would be in the vicinity of existing Prudhoe Bay air quality monitoring sites). For the rest of the pipeline project and compressor station sites, there is a little to no baseline air quality data outside of the Fairbanks North Star Borough. The applicant will not have actual baseline data from specific, proposed project sites available for its application to FERC in 2012. The applicant will address site-specific baseline data needs for permits separately from its application to FERC; it is planning to conduct permit application work in 2013. FERC is reviewing the issue, the availability of adequate data, and the timing of submissions.	Draft Resource Report 9 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	Current federal regulatory issues may not be resolved by the time the project sponsor submits an application to FERC. Regardless, the Federal Coordinator suggests that the applicant sit down with FERC, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation far in advance of submitting a project application to discuss the current state of regulations relevant to the project and provide an updated project design. It will be critical for the applicant to continue discussing baseline data needs with the agencies and to discuss if modeling is needed where collected data does not exist, as well as addressing concerns raised in agency comments to the draft resource reports.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act	
		No purposeful killings of eagles will be authorized under the act; however, regulations under the act may permit other forms of take, such as disturbing eagles or destruction of inactive nests. Project applicants will be required to avoid and minimize the potential for take. It will be necessary to perform eagle surveys along the pipeline route and in areas of support facilities to identify the location of nests and to determine if management practices can be implemented to avoid a take. An applicant should engage the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding this issue and identifying data collection needs and future mitigation options, as this issue could influence pipeline routing considerations. Coordination with the service regarding this issue is a separate process from Section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Priority	Issue was first identified and reported in the Federal Coordinator's February Attention Items Update for the pipeline project.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	The project applicant does not plan to conduct raptor surveys until closer to actual permitting and is currently reviewing existing literature. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will consider the applicant's literature review to ensure that adequate information will be submitted with the FERC application. It is possible that there may be gaps within the existing data that will require actual surveys before submittal of the FERC application. (The project applicant plans to complete new surveys along the route before pipeline construction to provide current information in its permit application to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.) This issue remains a priority as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service may identify data gaps following the literature review that will need to be filled in spring 2012.	
February 2012	Monitoring	The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service met with the project applicant to review the data collected to date and to determine whether additional field studies would be required. Fish and Wildlife will soon clarify whether additional field studies might be necessary for a minor portion of the project area. Additional details regarding the information collected to date are provided in Draft Resource Report 3. This issue has been downgraded from priority status to monitoring due to cooperation and efforts on behalf of the parties to ensure information will be sufficient for the NEPA process and subsequent permit review, and this issue will be monitored to minimize issues later on.	Draft Resource Report 3 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service identified in response to the January 2012 draft resource reports that it needs the applicant to provide coordinates of each nest location identified by the applicant and clear identification of areas planned for winter and summer construction. The Fish and Wildlife Service was able to verify that the applicant has a fair amount of survey data that would be applicable for a National Environmental Policy Act review. However, additional data (including surveys) will likely be needed to support permitting each year before construction or operations that have the potential to disturb eagles could begin. The Federal Coordinator recommends further discussions between the applicant and Fish and Wildlife Service as the eagle permitting program and mitigation measures are determined for bald and golden eagles.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Bridges	
		The U.S. Coast Guard has identified 79 potential major waterways that require navigability determinations in order to decide its jurisdiction associated with permitting activities under the General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended, for the pipeline. U.S. Coast Guard approvals will be required for crossings of all navigable waters under the act. These determinations will require data collection, and staffing resources could be a constraint.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	As of October 1, 2010, the U.S. Coast Guard had compiled and/or collected sufficient data for all 79 waterways. Data analysis and processing is an ongoing activity that should be completed by June 2011.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	No change in status. Data and analysis should be ready for agency distribution in September 2011.	
February 2012	Monitoring	The navigability study is expected to be released within the next couple of months. The U.S Coast Guard expects to use the draft resource reports to begin its initial review of which bridges may require a permit. The applicant met with the U.S. Coast Guard regarding the timing and steps of the permitting process in November 2011. The Federal Coordinator's Office will continue to monitor the issue.	Draft Resource Reports (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	After the project sponsor finalizes its route and crossing methods for water bodies, the Coast Guard will be able to verify which will require permits. Additional navigability determinations may be required if the project sponsor decides to proceed with a pipeline to Southcentral Alaska, terminating at an LNG export facility.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Climate Change	
		The Council on Environmental Quality in February 2010 released draft guidance with respect to the role of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in federal agency decisions. The draft guidance suggests ways in which federal agencies can strengthen their consideration of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in evaluating proposals for federal actions under the National Environmental Policy Act. The council proposes to advise federal agencies to consider, in scoping their NEPA analyses, whether analysis of direct and indirect emissions from proposed actions would provide meaningful information to decision makers and the public. The comment period for this draft guidance ended in May 2010; however, the council has yet to issue its final guidance. In addition, the Interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force submitted a progress report to the White House on October 5, 2010, summarizing recommended actions for the federal government to take to address climate change issues. It is uncertain if or when the recommendations from the council or the task force will be put forth as final guidance.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Priority	With the lack of federal guidance, it is not clear to what extent climate change needs to be addressed in the project's EIS or to what extent the project applicant needs to collect data to support this analysis. The issue remains a priority.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	No change in status since the last update. The Council on Environmental Quality has not published its final guidance on the issues.	
February 2012	Priority	No change in status since the last update. The Council on Environmental Quality has not published its final guidance on the issues.	
September 2012	Next step	No recommendations at this time.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Coastal Zone Management (Currently not applicable, see August 2011 update)	
		The state of Alaska had a federally approved coastal management program, but the program ended July 1, 2011. The program's jurisdiction included activities occurring within the North Slope Borough District, and required completion of a coastal project questionnaire by the applicant. The questionnaire process allowed for a multidisciplinary review of components within coastal districts. The review was coordinated by the Alaska program office and state Division of Coastal and Ocean Management. The management office would determine whether the proposed project was consistent with the state's coastal management policies.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	State and federal agency coordination is required; however, the process should not result in delays in the project permitting.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	The Alaska Coastal Management Program expired July 1, 2011, lacking state legislative approval of its renewal. Unless Alaska reinstates its coastal zone management program, the Coastal Zone Management Act consistency provision will no longer apply in the state. Therefore, this issue is currently not relevant to the project. The Federal Coordinator's office will monitor that status of the program in Alaska.	
February 2012	Monitoring	The program has not been reinstated.	
September 2012	Next step	No recommendations at this time.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Contaminated Sites	
A contaminated site is an area affected by petroleum products or other hazardous substance releases. Contamination can be found on lands due to activities conducted at that site or through migration of the contaminants from other sources. Every contaminated site along the project route and near associated facilities should be identified early to ensure they are properly addressed in the project's environmental impact statement and do not cause a delay for permitting or construction activities.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Critical path	In addition to contaminated sites along the line in general, additional permitting complications could arise if unexpected contamination is encountered on military bases. If the pipeline route crosses unanticipated contaminated sites on military bases, the full Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act process could be required. This process could add years to the schedule before construction could begin. Coordination with EPA, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, the military bases and the project applicant is critical to address unknown contamination encountered during construction and to determine the level of investigation that should be conducted prior to construction.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Critical path	The project applicant is conducting a literature review to determine known contamination along the potential pipeline route. Additionally, the applicant has begun working with Eielson Air Force Base and Fort Wainwright on routing considerations. However, it is still unknown if contaminated sites will be encountered on military bases. The item remains a critical-path item due to the prevalence of contamination historically identified on both Fort Wainwright and Eielson and the potential delay to the project if it encounters contaminated sites. The applicant needs to explain to Alaska land managers on the military bases how this issue has been handled for other pipeline projects around the country.	
October 2011	Priority	Officials of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, Environmental Protection Agency, Fort Wainwright, Eielson Air Force Base, the Office of the Federal Coordinator and the State Pipeline Coordinator's Office met to discuss the implications of encountering unknown contamination during construction of the pipeline in the vicinity of the Fairbanks-area military bases. It was agreed in concept that the applicant should develop a soil-handling plan outlining the procedures that would be followed in the event that unknown contamination was encountered. This approach would vary depending on the land owner and land status (i.e. military land versus state land). The soil-handling plan would also allow for an approach that would keep construction of the pipeline moving while cleanup could be performed at a later date by the responsible party.	
January 2012	Monitoring	The agencies have provided a roadmap in the event unknown contamination is encountered during project construction, as well as examples of soil-handling plans. The agencies reassured the applicant that the process is well established and that communication protocols in the soil-handling plan will be key. The applicant has committed to developing a draft soil-handling plan by spring 2012, and also is preparing a plan for unanticipated hazardous waste discovery which it will provide with its final resource reports to FERC in October 2012. The applicant also stated it has completed a literature review of known or potential contaminated sites and included this information in Draft Resource Report 8. The report also restated that the proposed pipeline routing does not cross any known contaminated sites on military bases. The applicant has asked agencies to review and comment on the list to verify if any known sites are not included. Because of the efforts, this item has been downgraded from priority status to monitoring.	Draft Resource Report 8 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	All contaminated sites should be investigated to determine whether they are of environmental concern. Additionally, the project applicant should investigate suspected and known contaminated sites identified by residents near the project area. The applicant will need to conclude its work with agencies to develop a plan for dealing with unanticipated contaminated sites. The project's environmental impact statement will need to fully address these issues to avoid delays in permitting or construction activities.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:	Cultural Resources/ Prehistoric and Historic Properties		
	Identification of cultural resources along the pipeline route will be critical for routing and construction activities. FERC is the lead agency for purposes of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and has initiated consultation with the Alaska State Historic Preservation Office. FERC will coordinate development of a programmatic agreement, if necessary, to document topics such as the Section 106 review process, approved field survey protocols and an unanticipated-discovery plan. This document requires coordination between agencies, the applicant and outside stakeholders, and it can be a time-consuming process. It is critical that the development of a programmatic agreement be initiated early enough to gain consensus between all parties.		
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Priority	The project applicant has begun field surveys; however, confirmation that survey protocols were reviewed and approved by the state office is pending.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	The project applicant continues to collect cultural resource data; however, the area of potential effect has not been defined with the agencies. Additional coordination with the agencies regarding when they will receive survey data is recommended. Meanwhile, the applicant has petitioned FERC to write a programmatic agreement for this project; it can be a long lead time item for such an agreement.	
December 2011	Priority	The project applicant met with state and federal agencies to review the data collected to date and data collection plans for 2012 through construction of the project. The project applicant would like to have a programmatic agreement in place by early 2014 that would remain in effect through construction. The applicant would like the programmatic agreement to address unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources as well as minor route modifications during construction. FERC will be the lead agency for this effort and will work with the appropriate agencies. Due to the numerous parties that could potentially be involved with the programmatic agreement, this item could require a significant amount of time to complete; therefore, the issue remains a priority. Preliminary information regarding cultural resources is presented in Draft Resource Report 4.	Draft Resource Report 4 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	The path forward will require collaboration between the agencies and applicant regarding the programmatic agreement, additional survey needs and a plan for dealing with unanticipated discoveries.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Data Collection and Field Season Plans	
		The applicant published a data gap analysis and field sampling plan April 2, 2010, outlining the project's data needs and a timeline for collecting the data. Very little information has been shared with federal agencies since that date regarding specific details on the data collected and the data still to be collected for the FERC filing in October 2012. APP says it is on schedule for collecting sufficient data for the FERC application, the National Environmental Policy Act analysis and agency authorizations, but the applicant needs to share the information in detail with the agencies for verification.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
August 2011	Critical path	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's Attention Item Update. The applicant has agreed to work with the Federal Coordinator's office to put together meetings with individual federal agencies in Alaska in September to share more detailed permit-related information in an effort to resolve these issues.	Attention Item Update (August 2011)
February 2012	Critical path	The project applicant held a series of meetings in the fall with state and federal agencies to discuss the data that has been collected to date and to determine whether additional information would be required (and when) for either the NEPA analysis or permitting. To date, the data needs -- which information is needed for the NEPA "bucket" and which data can wait until the post-NEPA permitting "buckets" -- have not been fully resolved between the applicant and agencies for the majority of the major federal approvals. The applicant has committed to meeting again with pertinent federal agencies in early March to discuss this issue, and FERC expects alignment between the applicant and the agencies by October 2012. The applicant says agency comments and reviews of the draft resource reports will help it determine the necessary scope of its 2012 field work. The Federal Coordinator's Office believes this issue deserves a critical-path designation until the applicant and federal agencies are in agreement on data submission needs and schedules.	
September 2012	Next step	The applicant should clearly communicate to each agency with permitting authority what information will be provided and when with respect to the NEPA review and permitting process.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Efficient Use of Government Resources	
		Some federal agencies are authorized to enter into cost-recovery and/or reimbursable-service agreements with public and private entities while others are not. Agencies are conducting thorough examinations of their budgetary needs for regulatory work on the project as well as their options for cost reimbursement.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	Agencies have begun entering into cost-reimbursable service agreements.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	No change since the last update. The Federal Coordinator's office will continue to engage the agencies to identify potential resource/budgetary constraints that could affect the project.	
February 2012	Monitoring	The Office of the Federal Coordinator sustained a significant budget cut for Federal Fiscal Year 2012, necessitating several layoffs in the Washington office. However, the agency has sufficient unspent funds from previous years' appropriations that it expects will enable it to maintain an adequate, though reduced staffing level at this time and complete its assignments without hindering the project. The office's spending plan assumes that the applicant continues to provide a reasonable level of cost reimbursement (as it has done the past two years), and that Congress imposes no further budget cuts on the office.	
September 2012	Next step	No recommendations at this time.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Emergency Response Plan	
		The oil and gas industry's emergency response capabilities are under increasing federal and public scrutiny following the April 2010 deep-water drilling rig disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. Although this project does not include any offshore development, the capability of response teams in Alaska's Beaufort and Chukchi seas is of concern, especially to Native organizations and local governments in the region. It is uncertain whether changes in regulatory requirements would affect this project.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	Issue first identified and reported in the February 2011 Attention Items Update.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	No status change since the last update. To date there have not been any additional emergency response requirements enacted that would be applicable to this project. The Federal Coordinator's office will continue to monitor this issue.	
February 2012	Monitoring	No status change since the last update.	
September 2012	Next step	Final plans should be developed in collaboration with local, federal and state agencies, as well as other interested stakeholders, to prepare for any incidents that could affect public or personnel safety or environmental protection.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Fish Habitat	
		Fish habitat is protected by two different agencies (the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and Alaska Department of Fish and Game), depending on the location and type of the habitat. Essential fish habitat, as defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, requires NMFS to coordinate with and provide information to other federal agencies regarding the conservation and enhancement of essential fish habitat, which has been identified for several federally managed species along the project route. Based on the current project information, NMFS has identified essential fish habitat encompassing streams that support salmon runs. If the lead federal agency (FERC) determines that an action will adversely impact essential fish habitat, an assessment and consultation with NMFS is required.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	Data was collected in 2010 based on a protocol developed with assistance of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Over 300 streams were surveyed for types of fish present, habitat and water-quality parameters.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	During the 2010/2011 winter season, studies were conducted in lakes likely to provide overwintering fish habitat. Subsequently, the project applicant met with National Marine Fisheries Service and Alaska Department of Fish and Game to discuss its proposed 2011 field programs. Additional lake and stream surveys are planned to occur during the 2011 field season.	
February 2012	Monitoring	Essential fish habitat was addressed with the National Marine Fisheries Service during the permitting plan meetings held with the applicant. Data collection activities are under way and coordination is occurring with the appropriate agencies. Information for marine and freshwater essential fish habitat areas is provided in Draft Resource Report 3.	Draft Resource Report 3 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	In preparation of the project's final resource reports, the applicant will need to ensure that data have been collected for fish habitat areas for the entire scope of the project, particularly for essential habitat areas. Analysis of the potential impacts of the project should include all construction and operation activities, as well as possible conservation or mitigation measures.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Floodplains	
Floodplains are addressed in Executive Order 11988, in which federal agencies are required to avoid adverse impacts to floodplains and/or limit authorizations to develop in these areas to the extent practical. After the project applicant shares its preferred pipeline route with federal agencies, the agencies will evaluate the routing in relation to floodplain potential. As part of its evaluation of the project's effects, FERC will seek to avoid the placement of aboveground facilities in designated floodplains.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	Data is being collected to support this analysis. Floodplain considerations are being taken into account during routing of the pipeline.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	The U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration issued an advisory bulletin on July 27, 2011, alerting owners and operators of gas pipelines of the dangers of severe flooding on pipeline routes. Although the bulletin is geared toward existing pipelines, PHMSA describes actions to prevent and mitigate damage to pipeline facilities and ensure public and environmental safety in areas affected by flooding, which could be helpful to the applicant during project design.	PHMSA advisory bulletin
February 2012	Monitoring	Information regarding floodplain concerns was provided in the draft resource reports. The Office of the Federal Coordinator will review the reports and continue to monitor progress on this issue.	Draft Resource Reports (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	The applicant will need to provide appropriate mitigation measures for those project facilities located within the 100-year floodplain or subject to other potential flooding hazards. Federal agencies will evaluate the project design and mitigation measures to determine compliance with Executive Order 11988 as they move forward with the NEPA review and permitting process.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Geological Studies	
Geological concerns such as active faults, earthquake ground movement/motion, subsidence and landslides are prevalent along the proposed line. In June 2010, Canadian and U.S. personnel met in Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, to review geological studies along the pipeline route and identify concerns of different agencies. Coordination and communication between these groups continues. In general, consensus is needed between the project applicant and agencies, particularly between the U.S. Geological Survey, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, FERC and the Alaska Division of Geological & Geophysical Surveys, over the location of the geohazard areas and the appropriate construction practices (including mitigation measures) that will be allowed in these areas.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Critical path	Construction techniques and required mitigation are currently unknown. Data sharing among agencies will be critical. (This issue was inadvertently classified as Critical path in the February update when it should have remained a priority issue.)	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	The status of this item has been downgraded as the project applicant is working with applicable agencies regarding these hazards and is actively collecting data to address concerns.	
February 2012	Monitoring	Information regarding geological concerns was provided in the draft resource reports. The Office of the Federal Coordinator will review the reports and continue to monitor progress on this issue.	Draft Resource Reports (January 2012)
May 2012	Monitoring	Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys released lidar data that had been collected along the possible pipeline route.	DGGs Lidar Report
September 2012	Next step	Consensus will be needed between the project applicant and agencies, particularly the U.S. Geological Survey, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, FERC and Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, over the potential risks of geologic hazard areas and construction practices (including mitigation measures) appropriate in these areas.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue: Government-to-Government Consultation			
	Government-to-government consultations with federally recognized tribal governments are an essential component of effective federal agency decision making. FERC, as the lead agency for the National Environmental Policy Act process, will coordinate the government-to-government consultations for the project. Many agencies are required to perform such consultations before issuing authorizations and permits. All agencies with a government-to-government requirement have agreed to coordinate with FERC on all government-to-government consultations for this project. Coordination between federal agencies will be critical to ensure that each agency's requirements for consultation have been met and meaningful involvement with the tribes is achieved.		
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
April 2010	Priority	FERC sent all federal cooperating agencies a draft of its Alaska Native Consultation Plan.	
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
July 2010	Priority	FERC sent a letter to all the federally recognized tribes in the state, providing project updates and information regarding NEPA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and government-to-government consultation processes	FERC letter
February 2011	Monitoring	The status of this issue has been downgraded as FERC is working with federal agencies on the government-to-government consultation process and has begun engaging tribal governments.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
June 2011	Monitoring	FERC sent a letter to federally recognized tribes to gauge the level of involvement they would like to have in the project.	FERC letter
August 2011	Monitoring	No change since the last update. This is currently not a concern, as FERC continues to engage the tribes.	
November 2011	Monitoring	FERC sent out letters to affected tribes requesting feedback on how best to conduct government-to government consultation. FERC worked with the tribes to set up government-to government consultation.	FERC letter
February 2012	Monitoring	FERC has initiated government-to-government consultation on behalf of the federal agencies and held another round of government-to-government meetings in January, and will continue the consultation process throughout the project.	
July 2012	Monitoring	FERC continued their consultation efforts with federally recognized tribes and provided a project update via letter on July 30, 2012. FERC also forwarded concerns and comments expressed by the tribes to the applicant on July 31, 2012 for future discussion.	Example FERC letter to tribes FERC letter to APP
September 2012	Next step	Consultation with the federally recognized tribes will continue as the project changes and/or develops.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Human Health	
Evaluation of human health impacts from development projects is gaining increasing concern across Alaska. Several large-scale projects in the state have received comments from stakeholders that potential human health impacts are a major concern. Therefore, it is likely that human health impacts will need to be addressed in the National Environmental Policy Act process for this project.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Priority	Federal guidance does not currently exist. The state of Alaska is working on preparing guidance; however, how this is incorporated into the National Environmental Policy Act analysis still needs to be determined.	
August 2011	Priority	The project applicant has been working with the state of Alaska to collect the data necessary to conduct this assessment, and FERC intends to evaluate these potential impacts in the environmental impact statement.	
February 2012	Priority	The human health impact assessment effort has been initiated and community surveys are ongoing concurrent with the applicant-funded subsistence survey effort being conducted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. This issue continues to remain a priority as the schedule for the collection of the data must be maintained to ensure consideration by FERC in the project's environmental impact statement. The applicant will submit the human health impact assessment information to FERC in October 2012, along with its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity.	Draft Resource Report 5 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	Any data gaps will need to be filled and analysis prepared after the applicant decides to proceed with further project design. Discussion among key government agencies should occur before completion of the environmental impact statement to ensure that sufficient analysis is provided for the agencies' evaluations under NEPA.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Infrastructure Projects and Challenges	
Infrastructure needs must be continuously addressed in order to expeditiously construct the project. All necessary support systems must be in place before construction can begin; inadequate road, port or railroad conditions could slow down construction and increase costs. Based on the current permitting and construction timelines, there are limited construction seasons until the gas pipeline construction is scheduled to commence. Necessary infrastructure projects include upgrading bridges, highways, material sites and maintenance camps. Infrastructure routes can be categorized in two ways: (1) The route parallel to the pipeline; and (2) Logistical routes that may move freight, pipe, people and modules to construction areas.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	The applicant has been working with the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities and is confident it can conduct the project with the existing infrastructure, with the exception of West Dock at Prudhoe Bay, which will require modification for the large-volume sea lifts of modules.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	APP described a need for material sites, camps and upgrades to West Dock near the gas treatment plant in its preliminary draft Resource Report No. 1, submitted to FERC in April 2011. Once the project applicant shares its pipeline and transportation logistics plans with agencies, additional analysis by the state Transportation Department and the applicant will likely be performed to ensure that ports, airports and harbors have sufficient capacity to handle the freight load.	Preliminary draft Resource Reports Nos. 1 and 10
February 2012	Monitoring	Information regarding the applicants logistics plan was provided in the draft resource reports. The Office of the Federal Coordinator will review the reports and continue to monitor progress on this issue.	Draft Resource Reports (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	With a final project design, the applicant will be able to share details of its transportation logistics plan. Agencies will then be able to evaluate the information to ensure all potential impacts can be determined and mitigated.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Landowner and Land Access Issues	
		<p>Until the exact route of the pipeline is determined, a full analysis of landowner and access issues cannot be completed. In general, Native allotments, Native land conveyances, mining claims, military bases, private land and conservation system units (e.g., wildlife refuges, wild and scenic rivers) are the landowner issues of potential concern. If the pipeline will cross Native allotments that have been conveyed, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has trust responsibilities and has to approve the right-of-way. This process can take a significant amount of time (approximately one to two years), especially if there are multiple owners. Therefore, early coordination with the bureau will be critical. Also, access to military bases, mining claims and private land for field studies or pipeline routing can be difficult to coordinate. If any portion of the pipeline will cross a conservation system unit, Title XI under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act may impose additional requirements on FERC, the Bureau of Land Management or other agencies. Continued coordination and analysis of this issue will be required if a pipeline is routed through a conservation system unit or crosses a wild and scenic river.</p>	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Priority	Issue first identified and reported in February 2011 Attention Items Update.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Critical path	The project applicant's current route map filed with FERC shows the pipeline crossing the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge to reach the Canadian border, which would require the applicant and federal agencies to follow the provisions of Title XI of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. The applicant has determined that the multi-agency approval process required by ANILCA is too complex and conflicts with APP's permitting plan for the project, and therefore is pursuing other options for either staying with the proposed pipeline route or an alternative to reaching the pipeline connection point at the border with Canada. Because this decision could change permitting requirements and timelines for the project, the status has been updated to critical path.	Attention Item Update (August 2011)
February 2012	Priority	The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is pursuing an option that could benefit the project. The applicant had evaluated various options for routing the pipeline to its connection point with an existing easement at the Canadian border. The preferred routing through about two miles of the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge would be along the right of way of the former Haines-to-Fairbanks oil pipeline built for the U.S. military and decommissioned during the 1970s. A non-governmental organization (The Conservation Fund) is currently pursuing a land transfer with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for 400 acres within the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge that would include that two-mile stretch of previously disturbed land. In exchange for title to the 400 acres in the Tetlin refuge, The Conservation Fund would provide Fish and Wildlife with \$500,000 for land purchases to add to the Tetlin refuge or other national wildlife refuges in Alaska, plus transfer to Fish and Wildlife 515 acres of property to add to the Neches River National Wildlife Refuge in Texas. Public meetings for the land exchange environmental assessment were held in Tok and Northway, in the area of the Tetlin refuge, in February. If the pipeline is routed through the land obtained by The Conservation Fund, the project applicant would work with the new land owner regarding access and a right-of-way lease. This issue has been downgraded from critical path to priority, as routing the pipeline through an easement granted by The Conservation Fund would be a less cumbersome process than permitting the right of way through national wildlife refuge lands. Because of this effort, the Office of Federal Coordinator has downgraded this item from critical-path status to priority.	Draft Resource Report 8 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	The applicant will need to complete its refinement of the project route to determine the scope of potential landowner and land access issues. While that process continues, the applicant should maintain its dialogue with likely affected landowners to gain access to their lands for field studies and to address long-term needs for the success of the project.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Native Land Conveyances	
<p>Currently, there are 28 pending Alaska Native or Alaska Native veteran allotment applications for property near the proposed gas pipeline route. Some of these applications encompass land conveyed to the state by the Bureau of Land Management prior to the bureau receiving the allotment application. The bureau must determine that these allotment applications are valid before requesting that the state reconvey the land back to the federal government for transfer to the allotment applicants. When the state is asked to voluntarily reconvey land in such cases, it must make a best-interest determination that includes agency review and public notice. Once it is determined to be in the state's best interest to reconvey the land, the land is quitclaimed to the Bureau of Land Management. In the particular cases near the proposed pipeline route, a best-interest determination cannot be made at this time as the location of the pipeline is uncertain. Until the route is determined, the state cannot proceed with the necessary best-interest findings. Allotments not on state land near the pipeline route are in various stages of processing for conveyance and the bureau continues to adjudicate those applications accordingly.</p>			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Critical path	The project applicant is optimizing the proposed pipeline routes and intends to avoid Native allotments to the extent possible.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	This issue has been downgraded as a right-of-way through these properties could proceed, as the state of Alaska currently holds the title to the land. This issue will likely not impact the project itself, but lack of resolution on the pending conveyances is of local concern.	
February 2012	Priority	Information regarding the pipeline route was provided in the draft resource reports. The Office of the Federal Coordinator will review the reports and continue to monitor progress on this issue.	Draft Resource Reports (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	After the project route is determined, all parties should work together to quickly determine if the project crosses any of these areas in order to reach a timely resolution of issues.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Ocean Dumping of Dredged Material	
<p>The modules constructed for the North Slope gas treatment plant will likely be larger and heavier than any modules previously brought into the existing dock facilities on the North Slope. The area's deepest docking facility is West Dock. To meet the needs of these larger modules, dredging may be required. The volume of material dredged to accommodate the modules may exceed the amount feasible to use for fill or other beneficial purposes, so the excess material may need to be disposed of in ocean waters. If the material is transported and dumped in ocean waters, the activity would be subject to the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act under the jurisdiction of Environmental Protection Agency and/or U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. Coast Guard.</p>			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Critical path	The project applicant begins working with the Army Corps of Engineers and EPA regarding permitting strategy and data collection needs.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	In the applicant's April preliminary draft Resource Report No. 1, the project applicant noted that dredging will be required at West Dock. The applicant has begun data collection activities and has increased communication with regulatory agencies. The status of this item has been downgraded as work has been conducted to address the issue; however, it is uncertain if all of the required data for this issue will be available for the applicant's FERC filing in October 2012.	Attention Item Update (August 2011)
February 2012	Priority	Discussions continue between the project applicant and regulatory agencies to identify the data-collection needs and permitting path. Some information regarding the dredging and disposal activity was included in the draft resource reports filed in January 2012. As the data-collection needs and permitting path are still unresolved, this issue remains a priority.	Draft Resource Reports (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	Federal agencies will need to review sampling data from the proposed dredge and disposal sites to ensure completeness and determine the next step in permitting. Additional sampling may be required, so the timing for data collection and submission to federal agencies should be discussed and agreed upon by the applicant and agencies. Permitting for ocean disposal of dredged material could be lengthy and complex, requiring close communication between the applicant and federal agencies.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Permitting Plan	
		The applicant has indicated it will use a phased approach to permitting this project. This would consist of submitting data sufficient for the application to FERC and the FERC-led NEPA analysis in October 2012, and then submitting additional data needed for other federal reviews and approvals sometime later (such as permits required for actual construction). The applicant has committed to explaining its permit plan in detail to FERC and each individual federal agency later this summer and early fall 2011. Those discussions are essential to ensure a complete project application is submitted to FERC and contains sufficient data for the environmental impact statement and NEPA analysis. The Federal Coordinator's office added this issue to its Attention Items Update over concerns that the applicant had not fully explained its permit plan.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
August 2011	Critical path	The applicant has acknowledged this issue and will meet with the agencies early this fall to discuss in detail its plan for data collection, data submission, and its permitting approach. This remains a critical-path item until the applicant, FERC and federal permitting agencies have met and reached consensus on how the applicant's permit plan will work for this project.	Attention Item Update (August 2011)
February 2012	Critical path	The applicant conducted a series of meetings with state and federal agencies in late 2011, and the project applicant has committed to schedule additional follow-up meetings for March 2012. These additional discussions with multiple agencies are needed to resolve the issue of a permitting plan for the project, and the applicant says it is committed to resolving the issue with each agency. This will remain a critical-path issue until the project applicant is able to present agencies with a mutually acceptable path forward for a permitting plan and schedule.	Draft Resource Report 1 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	If the applicant wants to pursue a phased permitting approach for the project, the details on timing and data submission must be agreed upon by the applicant and agencies. The comments provided by agencies in March 2012 should be carefully considered to ensure no delays in project permitting.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration Special Permits	
		If the applicant proposes to construct the pipeline under different specifications than those specifically allowed in federal regulations (49 CFR 192), a special permit would be required by the U.S. Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Some parameters that could be different from those specified in the regulations include: spacing of crack arrestors, pressure testing, strain-based design, mainline valve spacing and depth of cover. Additionally, changing regulations regarding pipeline safety could impose additional requirements for consideration under a special permit. The pipeline agency's staff has said they will need at least 12 months to review the information submitted under a special-permit application and may require additional testing or data before a special permit could be issued. Project applicant communication with the pipeline agency and FERC must occur to ensure that the application submitted to FERC is complete regarding information needed for any such special permits and is adequately represented in the environmental impact statement.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
March 2010	Priority	The pipeline agency sent a letter to the project applicant, outlining information required for a special permit application and National Environmental Policy Act review.	PHMSA letter
February 2011	Priority	PHMSA is still concerned about when information will be received and review timelines. APP has been meeting with PHMSA on a regular basis and continues to work with PHMSA on a data delivery plan.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
March 2011	Priority	PHMSA sent a letter to APP, stating that the agency has determined that special-permit applications are needed for external load design, crack arrestor spacing and shielding coatings.	PHMSA letter
August 2011	Priority	APP and PHMSA met several times to discuss an information delivery plan to provide data to PHMSA for its special permits analysis. APP acknowledges that a special permit for strain-based design is necessary. This issue remains a priority as a request for a special permit and the associated data has not been delivered to PHMSA and the review is a long lead time item.	
February 2012	Monitoring	The applicant has initiated testing of steel pipe from multiple suppliers to better understand how the pipe will react under different loading conditions. The applicant has shared the results of this effort with PHMSA through an information delivery plan and the results will be incorporated into the design and permitting for the project. The applicant in January 2012 provided a special-permit application to PHMSA, which the agency is reviewing. Technical discussions continue between the applicant and PHMSA. Based on the level of information exchange, and the applicant providing a special-permit application to PHMSA, this item has been moved to the monitoring level. This item has been downgraded from priority status to monitoring.	Draft Resource Report 11 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	The pipeline agency has said it will need at least 12 months to review the information submitted under a special-permit application and may require additional testing or data before a special permit could be issued. Technical discussions between the applicant and PHMSA regarding project design should proceed as expeditiously as possible so that PHMSA has the information needed for its review before development of an environmental review document for the project.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:	Scope of Project Alternatives/Statement of Purpose and Need		
	The purpose and need developed for a project define the sideboards within which the National Environmental Policy Act analysis is conducted. Congress defined the purpose and need of the project in Section 103 of the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act. This purpose and need will also be used to evaluate alternatives to the project in accordance with NEPA. The environmental impact statement will address each of the alternatives with a brief discussion explaining whether they are deemed reasonable or if they will be eliminated from further consideration. The analysis of each alternative will be commensurate with the associated impacts and will continue until a clear determination as to whether the alternative is environmentally preferable to the proposed action can be made.		
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
March 2010	Priority	FERC provided the cooperating agencies with a draft Purpose and Need and Scope of Alternatives Statement in accordance with Section IV C (5) of the Memorandum of Understanding Related to an Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Project.	
May 2010	Priority	Issue highlighted in the Federal Coordinator's initial implementation plan for the pipeline project.	2010 Implementation Plan
February 2011	Monitoring	The status of this item has been changed to monitoring, as FERC is working with federal agencies on the purpose and need statement and the applicant is tracking route alternatives and working on developing project alternatives.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
April 2011	Monitoring	The applicant submitted preliminary drafts of Resource Reports Nos. 1 and 10, outlining their purpose and need and project alternatives.	Preliminary draft Resource Reports Nos. 1 and 10
August 2011	Monitoring	Agencies commented on the purpose and need as defined by the applicant in the resource reports. FERC issued the notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the project.	Notice of intent
February 2012	Monitoring	Additional discussion of the project alternatives/state of purpose and need was provided in the draft resource reports in January 2012. The Office of the Federal Coordinator will review the reports and continue to monitor progress on this issue.	Draft Resource Reports (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	Federal agencies provided comments on the scope of alternatives and the purpose and need provided in the draft resource reports. These comments should be considered and incorporated into the next version of the project's environmental documents to provide substantive information for agency review so as to eliminate any need for further requests for information. Also, agencies will need to work together to craft the appropriate range of alternatives for inclusion in the environmental impact statement to ensure the document meets each agency's requirements for an alternatives analysis.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Subsistence	
		Effects on subsistence along the pipeline route will be considered during the National Environmental Policy Act process. The environmental impact statement will evaluate the project's potential effects on subsistence in two ways: (1) The term refers to the Alaska Native way of living; and (2) The government definition that involves the use of and access to sources of wild foods. The Bureau of Land Management will use the environmental impact statement to prepare the required finding under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act on the project's potential to restrict subsistence activities. In order to evaluate effects to residents' subsistence way of life and resources, data will need to be collected along the length of the pipeline corridor. Although agencies have been collecting hunting and fishing data for several other energy projects in the state through the years, there has not been recent data gathered for all subsistence uses and needs in all of the communities along the gas line route.	
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Critical path	Issue first identified and reported in February 2011 Attention Items Update.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
February 2011	Critical path	FERC issued a letter outlining detailed specifications for subsistence data to be included in the project application.	FERC letter
August 2011	Critical path	The applicant has contracted with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to collect this data; however, not all of the communities will be surveyed in time for the FERC filing in October 2012.	Attention Item Update (August 2011)
September 2011	Priority	The project applicant met with state and federal agencies to develop a data collection and delivery plan. The agencies agreed to a phased data delivery approach due to the time constraints in data collection for the upcoming October 2012 application to FERC under the Alaska Gasline Inducement Act license deadline. Data collection activities have been initiated and a preliminary analysis based on available data was submitted to FERC in January 2012. This issue has been downgraded to a priority as the applicant and agencies have come to an agreement on a data collection and delivery plan.	
February 2012	Priority	In accordance with the plan, subsistence surveys for 15 communities are planned for the first quarter of 2012. The survey activities began in January 2012 and are anticipated to be completed by mid-March 2012. Additional communities will be surveyed in early 2013. The applicant will provide the initial survey results to FERC in 2012 (in time for the start of the environmental impact statement process) and then the final results in 2013 (to be added to the EIS process while it is under way). Data collection activities are on schedule.	Draft Resource Report 5 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	Depending which project the applicant selects, in addition to completing the subsistence community survey work started in 2011 subsistence data collection may be necessary for areas where use and user data do not exist or is out of date. Discussions regarding the appropriate amount of data collection and analysis needed, as well as timing for delivery of the information must occur between the agencies and the applicant to avoid delays in the NEPA or permitting processes.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Threatened and Endangered Species	
There must be careful consideration and coordination of how the project may affect listed species. The current threatened and endangered species lists are subject to change. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service share responsibilities for the Endangered Species Act. In all, there are 14 species and one plant listed for Alaska. In addition, consideration should be given to conservation of species on the candidate species list.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Priority	On November 24, 2010, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service designated critical habitat for the threatened polar bear, and on December 6, 2010, the National Marine Fisheries Service published notice of a public comment period ending February 8, 2011, for the listing of four subspecies of ringed seals found in the Arctic Basin and North Atlantic and two population segments of bearded seals in the Pacific Ocean as threatened.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Priority	National Marine Fisheries Service extended the public comment period for the listing of the seals through March 25, 2011, and held public hearings within the state of Alaska, but a decision on listing has not yet been published.	
October 2011	Priority	The applicant met with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service to discuss how the consultation under the Endangered Species Act will proceed, with follow-up meetings to occur.	
December 2011	Priority	The National Marine Fisheries Service released an update on Dec. 12, 2011, that it is seeking a six-month delay in deciding the status of ringed seals and two populations of bearded seals. The National Marine Fisheries Service also will begin a new status review of ribbon seals to determine whether they should be listed.	NOAA Fisheries Ice Seals Information
February 2012	Priority	Follow-up meetings have not occurred with the agencies and the status of certain species are still uncertain; therefore, this issue remains a priority. Information on threatened and endangered species is presented in Draft Resource Report 3.	Draft Resource Report 3 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	Federal agencies provided several comments and questions on the applicant's discussion of threatened and endangered species in the January 2012 draft resource reports that will need to be addressed. Discussion and coordination will need to occur between federal agencies and the applicant as early as possible in the process to assist with writing of a draft biological assessment as required for Section 7 consultation. Initiation of the informal consultation process early can prevent delays and help identify whether formal consultation will be necessary.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:		Water Quality Certificate	
If an activity may involve a discharge of fill and/or dredged material into waters of the United States, requiring a Section 404 of the Clean Water Act permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), a water-quality certificate of reasonable assurance under Section 401 of the act must be obtained from the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation before issuance of a Section 404 permit. Through the application and public notice process, the Department of Environmental Conservation will gather the information it needs to certify that the project will likely be able to meet Clean Water Act and state water-quality standards.			
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	Coordination between the agencies when the Corps issues a public notice will be critical to ensure the review processes are concurrent and both agencies have adequate information for timely reviews.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	No change since the last update, but the issue is not a concern at this time as the applicant is collecting data.	
October 2011	Monitoring	State and federal agencies met with the project applicant in October 2011 to discuss the data needs for the certificate and associated timing considerations. Coordination between the applicant and agencies is ongoing, but the data needs and timing have not yet been finalized. This issue will continue to be monitored and may be moved to a priority level if alignment is not achieved. Draft Resource Report 2 contains information regarding water quality for the project.	Draft Resource Report 2 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	Once the applicant has a clearer picture of permitting needs, discussions should occur with the state and federal agencies to arrive at agreement of what authorizations will be necessary and the timing of each.	Summary Report (September 2012)

Issue:	Wetlands		
	A significant portion of the pipeline route will cross jurisdictional wetlands. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) will require complete maps from the applicant delineating waters of the United States, including wetlands, out to a specified pipeline corridor width. The Corps has approved a desktop study of aerial photography and existing information followed by field studies to verify results of the desktop work for input into the delineation maps. FERC requires complete field verification of wetlands and will also review the preliminary desktop protocol. Coordination with FERC, the Corps and EPA will be critical to ensure that sufficient data is collected to meet Clean Water Act Section 404 and FERC's National Environmental Policy Act requirements.		
Date	Status	Notes	Additional Information (if available)
February 2011	Monitoring	Coordination between the Corps, EPA and FERC has occurred to establish field survey protocols and data required for Section 404 permitting and National Environmental Policy Act analysis. A procedure for validating the accuracy of the results generated without additional field verification has been proposed by FERC, but has not been adopted by the project applicant.	Attention Item Update (February 2011)
August 2011	Monitoring	The applicant has completed 2010 field activities and has been in communication with agencies regarding 2011 activities. The validation procedure has not yet been approved by FERC, but is anticipated to be approved prior to the end of the 2011 field season. This issue will continue to be monitored but it not seen as a priority currently.	
February 2012	Monitoring	FERC reviewed the project applicant's validation procedure and is reviewing the data provided in the draft resource reports. Alignment has not been achieved between FERC and the applicant; however, upcoming meetings between the applicant and appropriate agencies prior to field work is intended to ensure that the information necessary will be ready for the environmental impact statement and permitting. The Office of the Federal Coordinator will continue to monitor this activity. Wetlands mapping and discussion of the potential impacts are located in Draft Resource Report 2.	Draft Resource Report 2 (January 2012)
September 2012	Next step	The applicant should review with federal agencies the wetland mapping data collected to guarantee it has met the appropriate requirements and addressed concerns outlined in comments on the draft resource reports, in particular impacts and mitigation measures. Depending on the timing of the project, the Army Corps of Engineers and EPA should be able to discuss their latest guidance with the applicant to ensure that expectations on jurisdiction are the same between all parties.	Summary Report (September 2012)