

RECEIVED
JOINT PIPELINE OFFICE
2006 APR 24 AM 10 18

Theodore D.M. Bartko
P.O. Box 4206
Palmer, Alaska 99645

April 19, 2006

STATE PIPELINE COORDINATOR'S OFFICE
411 West 4th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

RE: Comments on the original and alternate proposed natural gas pipeline routes from Glennallen to Palmer and comments on the Commissioner's Analysis, Proposed Decision and Action for the conditional right-of-way lease, proposed by ANGDA.

First, the Coastal Project Questionnaire answered by Mr. Harold Heinze, is either fraudulent or ignorant beyond words, or he filled out the questionnaire looking only at a map, with no actual knowledge of the area, of the proposed route and the immense negative impact to the area in the Coastal Management District, here in the Matanuska-Susitna Valley.

Second, I believe the Coastal Management Plan for the State and Borough has been tampered with by special interests, through special interest politicians, in order for them to disregard and ignore the negative environmental impacts along the proposed spur line route and for any other environmentally sensitive projects proposed for now and in the future.

The proposed route is in a geophysical hazard area, it will be impacting countless streams and wetlands, by digging and or dredging, depending on the terminology used and the area is a critical habitat area for Moose, Caribou, Bears, Eagles, countless bird species and smaller wildlife species.

I always opposed the proposed spur route through Chickaloon Pass, into Palmer and even throughout the entire route from the Glennallen area to Palmer, and I always will. The route is a blatant disregard for the national scenic area that the proposed route, is mapped out through.

The Commissioner's Approval of the right-of-way lease, for the proposed Glennallen to Palmer route; is either incompetent, foolish, inconsiderate, and or disregards; State Statutes and Federal laws and Borough codes, in my opinion, regarding the Coastal Management District and environmental protection and environmental preservation policies, or all of the above. Rural clean drinking water source protection policies,

20060424-3



appear to be a bar room joke, to the Commissioner, by his approving of the proposed, Glennallen to Palmer Spur Route.

The proposed, gas line path, does go through a historical and culturally sensitive area, for the Athabascan Indians of Chickaloon Village also, contrary to Mr. Heinze's answers on the Coastal Project Questionnaire.

Certainly, it is false, that the proposed project will not use broadcast herbicides and or pesticides and or other chemicals, used on the pipeline, such as anti-corrosion chemicals, which will be a health hazard to the local people, our environment and riparian areas where our local water sheds and clean water supplies exist. Enforcement of Federal laws, State Statutes and Borough codes, should protect the riparian areas, this proposed pipeline project will so invasively desecrate, and force the project to be re-routed from Fairbanks, for example, running it south, into the south-central Alaska area.

I believe that the construction project will expose 5 or more acres of soil along the route area, contrary to Mr. Heinze's answers, in my opinion.

As I stated in my previous comment; the most practical and least invasive route, culturally, socially, and logically, is along the existing State Inter-tie, either from Fairbanks, or Fort Wainwright, or horizontally from the main proposed Alaska-Canada route, over to the State Inter-tie, and or along the Parks Hi-way, as some of the local people have suggested. Then the line could be routed, perhaps, directly to Port McKenzie.

Forget the Glennallen to Palmer proposed project. Save, State and Federal funds and don't attempt to bully or railroad your way with the proposed Glennallen to Palmer route; against environmentally and culturally aware Alaskan's and against common and reasonable sense.

Cost is not an issue, in my opinion, regarding the multi-billion dollar, political and corporate authorities, that have the resources and can afford to build the natural gas line along a more environmentally and culturally and socially acceptable, wiser and more reasonable and sounder route.

Starting with step one, Mr. Heinze's application should have been denied, due to ignorance or fraud, regarding his answers to the Coastal Project Questionnaire, in my humble opinion. With all due respect to Mr. Heinze personally, of course.

Respectfully submitted April 19, 2006.

Sincerely,

Theodore D.M. Bartko
Theodore D.M. Bartko