3. CONNECTED ACTIONS

3.1 CONNECTED ACTIONS LISTED IN THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) listed as a Connected Action:

> *"…the construction and operation of four aboveground pipelines that would connect the Prudhoe Bay Central Gas Facility to the Gas Conditioning Facility (GCF) for supply of natural gas and natural gas liquids (NGLs), and return of bi-products …"* (USACE, 2012)

The Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline (ASAP) design has advanced to a level that the concept of the aboveground connecting lines between the GCF and Central Gas Facility (CGF) has been assimilated into the Project Description. As discussed in Section 2, above, and in recent ASAP documents, the NGL line has been eliminated in the current ASAP Project design plans (AGDC, 2015, 2014). A single natural gas feed line containing lean gas will be transported between the CGF and the GCF, where it will be conditioned and waste products will be returned via the two return lines (one for Carbon Dioxide [CO_2] and one for liquids). This element of the project should no longer be considered a Connected Action, but as part of the ASAP Project design (see Section 2.3, Design Refinements). The environmental effects of these actions are described in Section 3 of the FEIS and in Section 5, Environmental Analysis, in this EED.

3.2 CONNECTED ACTIONS IN THE REVISED ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE DESIGN

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has indicated that a sales tap, or valve, cutting into the Mainline or Fairbanks Lateral would be considered a Connected Action. Since there are no valves, there is no Connected Action associated with the conceptual design change of transporting gas that is not enriched with NGLs. As discussed previously, the ASAP Mainline will terminate at its connection and tie-in to a local distribution system, the existing ENSTAR Natural Gas pipeline near Big Lake. The Fairbanks Lateral will end west of the University of Alaska Fairbanks campus. The scope of the project does not include any community infrastructure (offtake valves, decompression stations, or local distribution infrastructure for communities along the line); however, the Project does expect that communities will want access to the gas. The pipeline system will be designed to transport natural gas having a composition that would potentially make it available to and useable by communities, government entities, and natural resource development projects.

3.3 REASONABLY FORESEEABLE ACTIONS IN THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The FEIS (USACE, 2012) discussed the following as reasonably foreseeable actions:

- A distribution system of gas for the Fairbanks region
- Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) export and processing
- Distribution of NGLs from a Cook Inlet NGL Extraction Plant (NGLEP)

The first two of these items remain as reasonably foreseeable actions in the future under ASAP; however the third is no longer foreseeable under the revised project design.

3.4 REASONABLY FORESEEABLE ACTIONS IN REVISED ASAP DESIGN

The Project has undergone a conceptual design change to transport readily usable natural gas that will be more accessible to communities along the route. Therefore, it is a reasonably foreseeable action that some communities, as well as government entities or forthcoming projects within reasonable proximity to ASAP may want to access gas from the pipeline as a source of fuel. Depending on cost and feasibility, these communities, entities, and projects may decide to develop the infrastructure required to access ASAP gas and distribute it for residential, governmental, or commercial use.

Section 5.12 Socioeconomics of this document provides information about the potential opportunities, costs and details for communities within 60 miles of the ASAP Pipeline route to access gas. An example of the initial infrastructure that a community, entity, or project would be responsible for installing to access gas from the ASAP Mainline would be a buried 4-inch sales tap, a service line, and an above-ground sales tap site facility. This facility would receive gas from the service line and direct it through strainers and a metering station. The gas would then be heated, depressurized, and odorized before leaving the facility into a community or local distribution system. Other possibilities include the transport of compressed natural gas (CNG), as described in the POD (AGDC, 2014), and in Section 5.12, Socioeconomics, of this document.

3.5 REFERENCES

Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC). 2015. *Alaska Stand Alone Gas Pipeline/ASAP – Joint Application for Permit, Revised*.

Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC). 2014. *Alaska Stand Alone Gas Pipeline/ASAP – Plan of Development*. Revision 3. June. http://asapgas.agdc.us/pdfs/documents/pod2014/POD%20Rev%203_Final_07-22-2014_COMBINED.pdf. Accessed October 9, 2014.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2012. *Final Environmental Impact Statement. Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline*. October. http://asapgas.agdc.us/documents.html. Accessed October 9, 2014.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2014. *Alaska Stand-Alone Pipeline Project Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Public Scoping Report*. http://www.asapeis.com/docs.html. Accessed January 27, 2015.