



**U.S. Department of Energy**



# **ALASKA LNG PROJECT**

## **Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

**January 2023**

**Summary**





# COVER SHEET

**Responsible Federal Agency:** U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)

**Cooperating Agencies:** None

**Title:** **Final** Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Alaska LNG Project  
(DOE/EIS-0512-S1)

**Location:** North Slope, Alaska

**Contact:**

*For further information about this Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, contact:*

Mark Lusk, NEPA Compliance Officer  
U.S. Department of Energy  
National Energy Technology Laboratory  
3610 Collins Ferry Road  
Morgantown, WV 26505  
(304) 285-4145 or [Mark.Lusk@NETL.DOE.GOV](mailto:Mark.Lusk@NETL.DOE.GOV)

*For general information on the DOE process for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), contact:*

Brian Costner, Director  
Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance (GC-54)  
U.S. Department of Energy  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585-0103  
(202) 586-4600 or [Brian.Costner@hq.doe.gov](mailto:Brian.Costner@hq.doe.gov)

**Abstract:**

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) prepared this **Final** Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with natural gas production on the North Slope of Alaska (North Slope) and life cycle greenhouse gas emissions associated with authorizing Alaska LNG Project LLC (Alaska LNG) to export liquefied natural gas (LNG) as part of the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation's proposed Alaska LNG Project (Project). DOE is in the process of rehearing DOE/Office of Fossil Energy Order No. 3643-A issued in August 2020 (Alaska LNG Order), which authorized export of LNG to non-free trade agreement (FTA) countries. This **Final** SEIS supplements the Final Environmental Impact Statement published by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, as adopted by DOE (DOE/EIS-0512) on March 16, 2020, and will support DOE's decision-making process. Following completion of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, DOE intends to issue an order under Section 3(a) of the Natural Gas Act in which DOE may exercise its authority to reaffirm, modify, or set aside the Alaska LNG Order.

DOE prepared this **Final** SEIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 United States Code 4321, *et seq.*) and in compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality implementing regulations (Title 40 *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR] Parts 1500 to 1508) and DOE NEPA procedures (10 CFR 1021). This **Final** SEIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with natural gas production in the North Slope and includes a life cycle analysis calculating the greenhouse gas emissions for LNG exported from the proposed Alaska LNG Project.

**Comment Period:**

DOE encourages public participation in the NEPA process. **On June 29, 2022, DOE published a Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register* announcing the availability of the Draft SEIS; presenting the date, time, and access information for a virtual public meeting; and initiating a 45-day public comment period that ran from July 1, 2022 until August 15, 2022 (*Federal Register* Volume 87, Number 124). DOE also placed notification advertisements in newspapers, sent notification letters, placed hard copies of the Draft SEIS at libraries, and placed an electronic version of the document on DOE's website.**

DOE held a virtual public meeting on July 20, 2022. The purpose of the meeting was to collect verbal comments on the Draft SEIS and to provide an opportunity for the public to learn more about the proposed Alaska LNG Project. During the public comment period, agencies, tribal governments, non-governmental organizations, and members of the public submitted verbal comments during the public meeting and written comments via mail, email, and [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov). DOE considered all comments received during the public comment period in preparation of this Final SEIS. Comments received after the close of the public comment period were considered to the extent practicable. The Comment Response Document (Appendix D to this SEIS) summarizes the public notification process and the public comments received during the comment period, along with DOE responses to the comments.

**Changes from the Draft SEIS:**

In this Final SEIS, bold text and vertical lines in the margin indicate where DOE has revised or supplemented the Draft SEIS (as exemplified by this paragraph). Deletions are not demarcated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### SUMMARY

S.1	INTRODUCTION.....	S-1
S.1.1	Background.....	S-1
S.1.2	Purpose and Need.....	S-2
S.1.2.1	DOE’s Purpose and Need.....	S-2
S.1.2.2	AGDC’s and Alaska LNG’s Purpose and Need.....	S-2
S.1.3	Scope of the Final SEIS.....	S-2
S.1.4	Public, Agency, and Tribal Involvement.....	S-3
S.1.5	Permits, Approvals, and Consultations.....	S-3
S.2	THE PROPOSED ACTION AND NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.....	S-5
S.2.1	Proposed Agency Action.....	S-5
S.2.2	No Action Alternative.....	S-6
S.3	IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION.....	S-10
S.3.1	Summary of Environmental Impacts in the Final SEIS By Resource Area.....	S-10

---

---

## LIST OF TABLES

Table S-1.	Comparison of Oil and Gas Production and Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions between the No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA “Business as Usual” Scenario 1) and Upstream Development Scenarios .....	S-8
Table S-2.	Comparison of Oil and Gas Production and Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions between the No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) and Upstream Development Scenarios .....	S-9
Table S-3.	Final SEIS Impact Terminology .....	S-10
Table S-4.	Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development .....	S-11

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure S-1.	Status of Federal Permits and Approvals for the Alaska LNG Project .....	S-4
-------------	--	-----

---

---

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>Acronym</b>	<b>Definition</b>
AGDC	Alaska Gasline Development Corporation
Alaska LNG	Alaska LNG Project LLC
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide
DOE	Department of Energy
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
E.O.	Executive Order
EOR	enhanced oil recovery
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FTA	free trade agreement
GHG	greenhouse gas
KRU	Kuparuk River Unit
LCA	Life Cycle Analysis
LNG	liquefied natural gas
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NGA	Natural Gas Act
PBU	Prudhoe Bay Unit
Project	Alaska LNG Project
PTU	Point Thomson Unit
ROW	right-of-way
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
U.S.	United States
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



## SUMMARY

### S.1 INTRODUCTION

#### S.1.1 Background

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) has prepared this **Final** Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with natural gas production on the North Slope of Alaska (North Slope) and a life cycle analysis (LCA) calculating the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for liquefied natural gas (LNG) exported from the proposed Alaska LNG Project (Project).

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) published a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in March 2020 to evaluate the Alaska LNG Project proposed by the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation (AGDC). **The 2020 EIS** assessed the potential environmental effects of the Project's construction and operation activities in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The 2020 EIS concluded that approval of the proposed Project would result in a number of significant environmental impacts. Implementation of the impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures proposed by AGDC, AGDC's commitments to additional measures, and mitigation measures recommended by FERC in the 2020 EIS would reduce the majority of impacts to less-than-significant levels. Based on findings of the 2020 EIS, FERC issued an Order on May 21, 2020 (FERC Order), granting AGDC authorization under Section 3(a) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) to site, construct, and operate the proposed Alaska LNG Project.

DOE participated as a cooperating agency in FERC's review of the proposed Alaska LNG Project **and adopted the EIS in March 2020**. Following **the** completion of the NEPA process, on August 20, 2020, DOE issued DOE/FE Order No. 3643-A (the Alaska LNG Order) to Alaska LNG Project LLC (Alaska LNG) under Section 3(a) of the NGA. Concurrently with its issuance of the Alaska LNG Order, DOE issued a Record of Decision under NEPA (DOE Docket No. 14-96-LNG). DOE authorized Alaska LNG to export LNG produced from Alaskan sources to non-free trade agreement (**non-FTA**) countries. DOE's Alaska LNG Order included the condition that Alaska LNG comply with the 165 environmental conditions adopted in the FERC Order. **Mitigation measures beyond those included in DOE/FE Order No. 3643-A that are enforceable by other federal and state agencies are additional conditions of DOE/FE Order No. 3643-A.**

Subsequently, on September 21, 2020, Sierra Club filed a Request for Rehearing of the Alaska LNG Order. Sierra Club argued that DOE violated NEPA by relying on an EIS that did not examine all of the reasonably foreseeable impacts of the proposed Alaska LNG Project. On April 15, 2021, DOE issued an Order on Rehearing<sup>1</sup>. In that Rehearing Order, DOE granted Sierra Club's Request for Rehearing for the purpose of conducting Alaska-specific environmental studies and related public process. DOE noted that, since the issuance of the Alaska LNG Order, the President had issued two Executive Orders (E.O.s) relevant to the Alaska LNG proceeding: E.O. 13990, *Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis*, and E.O. 14008, *Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad*.

---

<sup>1</sup> On December 16, 2020, after DOE had issued a tolling order but before DOE had issued any subsequent order addressing Sierra Club's Rehearing Request, Sierra Club filed a petition for review of the Alaska LNG Order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (D.C. Circuit). See *Sierra Club v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, Petition for Review, Case No. 20-1503 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 16, 2020). That case is currently being held in abeyance in light of DOE's ongoing rehearing proceeding involving this SEIS.

Consistent with these E.O.s and considering the arguments on rehearing, DOE stated that it was appropriate to further evaluate the environmental impacts of exporting LNG from the proposed Project to non-FTA countries. On July 2, 2021, DOE published its Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* to prepare a SEIS for the Alaska LNG Project (DOE/EIS-0512-S1).

## S.1.2 Purpose and Need

### S.1.2.1 DOE's Purpose and Need

Section 3(a) of the NGA requires DOE to conduct a public interest review and grant authority to export LNG to non-FTA countries unless DOE finds that the proposed exports would not be consistent with the public interest. Additionally, NEPA requires DOE to consider the potential environmental effects of its decisions regarding applications to export natural gas to non-FTA countries. DOE prepared this **Final** SEIS in furtherance of its Rehearing Order and to more fully evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with natural gas production on the North Slope and considering a LCA for GHG emissions of exporting LNG from the proposed Project to non-FTA countries. This also includes evaluation consistent with the two recent E.O.s regarding the climate crisis. Following completion of this SEIS, DOE intends to issue an order under Section 3(a) of the NGA in which DOE may exercise its authority to reaffirm, modify, or set aside the Alaska LNG Order.

### S.1.2.2 AGDC's and Alaska LNG's Purpose and Need

Alaska LNG's purpose and need for the Project was defined in their application to DOE. The proposed Project's purpose is to commercialize the natural gas resources of Alaska's North Slope, primarily by converting the existing natural gas supply to LNG for export by Alaska LNG and providing gas to users within Alaska. Specifically, the stated purpose and need for the proposed Project are to:

- commercialize natural gas resources on the North Slope during the economic life of the Prudhoe Bay Unit (PBU) and the Point Thomson Unit (PTU) and achieve efficiencies through the use of existing common oil and gas infrastructure and economies of scale;
- bring cost-competitive LNG from Alaska to foreign markets in a timely manner; and
- provide interconnections along the pipeline to allow for in-state gas deliveries, benefiting Alaskan gas users and supporting long-term economic development.

### S.1.3 Scope of the Final SEIS

This **Final** SEIS supplements the 2020 EIS<sup>2</sup> to consider additional potential Project impacts associated with LNG exported from Alaska over DOE's term of authorization. This **Final** SEIS also re-evaluates North Slope "non-jurisdictional" activities<sup>3</sup> discussed in the 2020 EIS related to upstream development that would support the proposed Project. This **Final** SEIS does not include projects that were analyzed in detail in the 2020 EIS as part of AGDC's proposed Project, such as the proposed 62.5-mile-long, 32-inch-diameter Point Thomson Unit Gas Transmission Line, which would be located in the North Slope. This **Final** SEIS **includes an analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with natural gas production on the North Slope of Alaska and a LCA calculating the GHG emissions for LNG exported from the proposed Alaska LNG Project.**

<sup>2</sup> The 2020 EIS is available for review and download from DOE's website: <https://www.energy.gov/nepa/articles/doeeis-0512-final-environmental-impact-statement>.

<sup>3</sup> FERC considered facilities to be "non-jurisdictional" in the 2020 EIS that do not fall under the jurisdiction of the FERC. Non-jurisdictional facilities may be integral to the project need or they may be associated as minor components that would be built as a result of the jurisdictional facilities.

#### S.1.4 Public, Agency, and Tribal Involvement

As part of FERC's NEPA process, FERC conducted extensive public involvement activities for its EIS, including 12 public scoping meetings in the Fall of 2015 and a 90-day public review/comment period for the Draft EIS starting in June 2019. As part of this SEIS process, DOE published a Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register* on July 2, 2021, announcing its intent to prepare an SEIS. DOE did not conduct public scoping as a public scoping process is not required for a DOE-issued SEIS (10 *Code of Federal Regulations* 1021.311(f)). DOE provided opportunities for public review and comments, including a **45-day public comment period and a virtual public meeting, on the Draft SEIS. Comments received during the public comment period were considered during preparation of this Final SEIS.**

The 2020 EIS identified FERC as that EIS's Lead Federal Agency with the following cooperating agencies: U.S. Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), U.S. Coast Guard, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, DOE, and National Marine Fisheries Service. Several of the cooperating agencies also had NEPA obligations in order to issue their respective permits on the proposed Project. DOE invited these agencies to be cooperating agencies as part of this SEIS; however, no agencies accepted the invitation.

DOE contacted each of the 78 Alaska Native Tribes involved in the 2020 EIS process, notifying them of DOE's decision to prepare an SEIS and to inquire about their interest. Additionally, DOE provided an opportunity for the Alaska Native Tribes to contribute any traditional knowledge regarding resources on the North Slope potentially affected by upstream development that was not included in the 2020 EIS. DOE has not received responses from any Alaska Native Tribes.

#### S.1.5 Permits, Approvals, and Consultations

Figure S-1 provides an update of actions or decisions made by agencies undertaking federal authorizations regarding the proposed Project since issuance of the 2020 EIS. As indicated in the figure, all permitting and approvals for the proposed Project are complete with the exception of DOE's preparation of this SEIS.

In addition to the federal permits and approvals summarized in Figure S-1, upstream development activities that would be led by other private entities on the North Slope and additional infrastructure development identified by DOE for this SEIS would require future federal approvals. This includes authorizations from the USACE and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and consultations with various resource agencies, such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. The USACE would determine whether to issue a permit for construction of these projects under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. In addition, the USACE would likely be the lead agency responsible for conducting an environmental review of these projects under NEPA.

Agency Action	Start Date	End Date	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	
Natural Gas Export Authorization (DOE)	7/18/2014	8/20/2020	[Blue bar]							✓	ROD and a Final Opinion and Order for long-term exports of LNG			
Section 10 Rivers and Harbor Act and Section 404 Clean Water Act (USACE)	4/4/2017	6/24/2020				[Blue bar]			✓	Permit Issued				
Section 106 Consultation (FERC)	4/17/2017	6/24/2020				[Blue bar]			✓	Programmatic Agreement				
Authorization for LNG Terminal Facilities, Onshore or in State Waters (FERC)	4/17/2017	5/21/2020				[Blue bar]			✓	Issuance of Decision for Permit and Approval				
Right-of-Way Authorization (DOI-BLM)	4/17/2017	8/21/2020				[Blue bar]			✓	Grant of Right-of-Way				
NEPA EIS Process (FERC)	5/1/2017	5/21/2020				[Blue bar]			✓	Issuance of ROD				
Marine Mammal Protection Act Incidental Take Authorization (NOAA)	3/14/2018	9/16/2020					[Blue bar]		✓	Issuance of Letter of Authorization for Incidental Take of Marine Mammals				
Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) Incidental Take Authorization (DOI-USFWS)	6/28/2018	5/4/2020					[Blue bar]			Issuance of Letter of Authorization for Incidental Take ( <i>action cancelled</i> )				
USCG Bridge Permit (USCG)	10/1/2018	9/18/2020						[Blue bar]		✓	Issuance of Coast Guard Bridge Permit			
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, Section 305 Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Consultation (NOAA)	5/23/2019	9/27/2019						[Blue bar]	✓	Issuance of EFH Conservation Recommendations				
Endangered Species Act Consultation (NOAA-NMFS)	6/28/2019	6/3/2020						[Blue bar]	✓	Issuance of Biological Opinion				
Endangered Species Act Consultation (DOI-USFWS)	7/11/2019	6/17/2020						[Blue bar]	✓	Issuance of Biological Opinion				
NPS Permit (DOI-NPS)	10/1/2019	7/23/2020						[Blue bar]	✓	Issuance of Right-of-Way Permit				
Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Permit (DOI USFWS)	1/22/2020	6/23/2020						[Blue bar]	✓	Issuance of Decision for Permit and Approval				
NEPA SEIS Process (DOE/FECM)	7/2/2021	3/30/2023								[Green bar]			Ongoing	

✓ = authorization/permit completed; BLM = Bureau of Land Management; DOE = Department of Energy; DOI = Department of Interior; EFH = Essential Fish Habitat; EIS = Environmental Impact Statement; FECM = Office of Fossil Energy and Carbon Management; FERC = Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; LNG = liquefied natural gas; MMPA = Marine Mammal Protection Act; NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act; NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service; NOAA = National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; NPS = National Park Service; ROD = Record of Decision; SEIS = Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; USACE = United States Army Corps of Engineers; USCG = United States Coast Guard; USFWS = United States Fish and Wildlife Service

**Figure S-1. Status of Federal Permits and Approvals for the Alaska LNG Project**

## S.2 THE PROPOSED ACTION AND NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

### S.2.1 Proposed Agency Action

DOE's Proposed Action is to meet its obligation under Section 3(a) of the NGA to authorize the export of natural gas, including LNG, unless it finds that the proposed import or export would not be consistent with the public interest. In considering this action, DOE is **reviewing** its existing Alaska LNG Order, Sierra Club's Request for Rehearing, and two recent Executive Orders: E.O. 13990, *Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis*, and E.O. 14008, *Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad*. DOE has conducted further evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with the action and is **considering** the findings contained in this **Final SEIS** concerning impacts associated with potential natural gas production on the North Slope and the LCA Study (see **discussion below**). Following completion of the NEPA process, DOE intends to issue an order under Section 3(a) of the NGA in which DOE may exercise its authority to reaffirm, modify, or set aside the Alaska LNG Order.

In this **Final SEIS**, DOE considers a range of "scenarios" regarding the potential upstream activities on the North Slope. These scenarios, as presented in the North Slope Production Study<sup>4</sup>, represent a range of activities that could occur in the North Slope and are also considered in the LCA Study:

- **Scenario 1 "Business as Usual"**. This scenario examines the remaining oil production potential from the PBU without Major Gas Sales and no Alaska LNG Project. The currently produced gas and its carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) content would continue to be reinjected into the PBU for pressure maintenance and miscible injection. This scenario essentially serves as the No Action case for **the LCA Study**, with no development of a pipeline or other means to export gas from the PBU and PTU. **Without construction of the Alaska LNG Project, the LCA Study recognizes the possibility that continued gas demand of foreign markets would remain and could be fulfilled from an alternate source (i.e., an equivalent LNG and oil energy service is provided to society), so DOE modeled GHG emissions associated with LNG produced and supplied from the global market using the U.S. average production from the Lower 48 as a representative proxy. For purposes of the GHG analysis presented in this Final SEIS, Scenario 1 is referred to as No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study "Business as Usual" Scenario 1, Equivalent Energy). This Final SEIS also includes No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline), which presents GHG emissions related to a baseline (see Section 4.19), that only considers the GHG emissions associated with the estimated production of oil from the North Slope and the associated emissions from the transport, refining, and use of the oil. The No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) accounts for only the life cycle GHG emissions directly attributed to the energy production from the North Slope that would be impacted by the Alaska LNG Project. The No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) intentionally excludes GHG emissions from energy production from non-North Slope operations to meet equivalent LNG (and crude oil) services as described above as "No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study "Business as Usual" Scenario 1, Equivalent Energy)". While presented in this Final SEIS and using data from the LCA, No Action Alternative 2 is not part of the LCA itself. Section 2.4 discusses these Alternatives further. Future net global changes in GHG emissions related to this Project, including those presented under Scenarios 2 and 3, would be driven by a range of factors, including, among others, future oil and gas market conditions, the adoption of policies and measures to limit GHG emissions, and the penetration of low-carbon energy sources.**

<sup>4</sup> DOE prepared a North Slope Production Study consisting of a series of three reports. The study evaluated the capacity of natural gas supply from the PBU and PTU on the North Slope to meet the authorized LNG export volumes over the proposed Project's operational lifetime.

- **Scenario 2 “Reduced Gas Reinjection”.** This scenario examines the reduction in oil production from the PBU given the decreasing volumes of gas injection and the steady decline in reservoir pressure due to the Alaska LNG Project. The start of a Major Gas Sales project at the PBU would switch the priority of operations from oil production to gas production. As a result, reservoir pressure would steadily decrease as gas is extracted for Major Gas Sales, reducing the volume of oil produced from the PBU. This scenario assumes that by-product CO<sub>2</sub> is not used in enhanced oil recovery (EOR) and is stored in saline formations beneath the PBU.
- **Scenario 3 “Use and Storage of By-product CO<sub>2</sub>”.** This scenario examines the potential for utilization and storage of the by-product CO<sub>2</sub> using CO<sub>2</sub> EOR. **Production Report 2 models the injection of the by-product CO<sub>2</sub> into the nearby Kuparuk River Field to examine the KRU’s capacity to store CO<sub>2</sub> and obtain an incremental increase in oil production.** DOE has identified the Kuparuk River Unit (KRU) as a likely candidate for EOR due to its proximity to the PBU and its reservoir capacity for utilizing CO<sub>2</sub>. EOR activities have occurred within KRU in the past; however, broader application of these activities has been constrained by the limited supply of miscible injectant (e.g., natural gas liquids or CO<sub>2</sub>). The volume of oil produced from PBU and from EOR activities at KRU related to Project-produced CO<sub>2</sub> is modeled to be slightly higher than the amount of oil produced under Scenario 1. **However**, these modeled estimates suggest **that** in practice the two scenarios have the potential to produce similar volumes based on known variability in future reservoir performance. **Section 2.3 compares oil and gas production among the scenarios.** Scenario 3 would require an approximately 30-mile CO<sub>2</sub> pipeline to transfer the separated CO<sub>2</sub> from the proposed Alaska LNG Project Gas Treatment Plant within the PBU to the KRU gas-handling operations. The CO<sub>2</sub> transportation pipeline would **be expected to** utilize the existing or adjacent right-of-way (ROW) to the maximum extent possible.

**Table S-1 compares oil and gas production and life cycle GHG emissions of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study “Business as Usual” Scenario 1). Table S-2 compares oil and gas production and life cycle GHG emissions of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline). These oil and gas production and GHG emissions estimates are based on the North Slope Production Study and the LCA Study, which are provided in Appendix B, North Slope Production Study, and Appendix C, Life Cycle Analysis Study, of this Final SEIS. The results of the LCA Study and potential related environmental effects from GHG emissions under each Alternative are further discussed in Section 4.19, Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change.**

### S.2.2 No Action Alternative

**The No Action Alternative considered in this Final SEIS assumes that the Alaska LNG Project would not be constructed and the associated environmental impacts from the proposed Project would not occur. The commercial prospects of an alternative project to the Alaska LNG Project are unclear. North Slope natural gas is challenged by the remote location of the gas supply and high estimated cost of bringing the gas to market. As a result, the natural gas supply is stranded on the North Slope without the infrastructure for transport to market. As with the Alaska LNG Project, infrastructure for an alternative project would also require the development of new natural gas production in an extreme environment, gas treatment, and construction of hundreds of miles of pipeline from the North Slope to a liquefaction facility and export point in southern Alaska. Therefore, if the Alaska LNG Project was not constructed, DOE considers it unlikely that an alternative LNG export project would be constructed to access natural gas reserves on the North Slope in the foreseeable future. Thus, the opportunity to commercialize North Slope natural gas would not be realized, and in-state deliveries of natural gas through interconnections would not be achieved. DOE, therefore, defines the No Action Alternative as lacking the potential environmental impacts, and potential benefits, that could occur through development and operation of the proposed Project.**

In this Final SEIS, specifically for the GHG analysis (see Section 4.19.2), the No Action Alternative includes two different perspectives for assessing the cumulative GHG effects in comparison to the Proposed Action Scenarios 2 and 3 results, presented as No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study "Business as Usual" Scenario 1), which represents the same amount of LNG being supplied to the market, and No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline), which only presents GHG emissions associated with the estimated production of oil from the North Slope and the associated emissions from the transport, refining, and use of the oil. No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) accounts for only the life cycle GHG emissions directly attributed to the energy production from the North Slope that would be impacted by the Alaska LNG Project. No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) intentionally excludes GHG emissions from energy production from non-North Slope operations to meet equivalent LNG (and crude oil) services. This Final SEIS takes no position on whether there will be a market demand for the LNG produced by the Alaska LNG Project. The analysis presented in this Final SEIS examines the impacts that could occur if the LNG demand for the volumes associated with the Alaska LNG Project exist. Future net global changes in GHG emissions related to this Project, including those presented under Scenarios 2 and 3, would be driven by a range of factors, including, among others, future oil and gas market conditions, the adoption of policies and measures to limit GHG emissions, and the penetration of low-carbon energy sources. No Action Alternative 1 compared to the Proposed Action scenarios summarizes the GHG effects based on the global perspective that if LNG and oil were not produced from this Project, they would be produced from another global source and result in GHG emissions. No Action Alternative 2 provides an estimate of GHG emissions that does not include any emissions associated with alternatives that could be used to provide the equivalent service to society that would be provided by the Project's LNG and oil. This SEIS presents these two No Action Alternatives because there is inherent uncertainty regarding the particular present or future supply and demand responses that would lead to net changes in production and consumption, and associated emissions, of LNG and oil that would be produced on the North Slope in association with the Project.

**Table S-1. Comparison of Oil and Gas Production and Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions between the No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA “Business as Usual” Scenario 1) and Upstream Development Scenarios**

Activity	No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA “Business as Usual” Scenario 1)	Proposed Action Scenario 2 (PBU Storage)	Proposed Action Scenario 3 (KRU EOR)
<b>Oil Production</b>			
Oil Production (MMbbl)	1,402 (Total) 1,356 (PBU) 47 (Lower 48)	1,402 (Total) 849 (PBU) 554 (Lower 48)	1,402 (Total) 849 (PBU) 512 (KRU) [120 – 600] <sup>a</sup> 42 (Lower 48)
Change in Oil Production (MMbbl) from No Action	0	0 (Total) -507 (PBU) +507 (Lower 48)	0 (Total) -507 (PBU) +512 (KRU) [120 – 600] <sup>a</sup> -5 (Lower 48)
<b>Major Gas Sales to GTP</b>			
Major Gas Sales Production (Tcf) <sup>b</sup>	0	36.7	36.7
Change in Gas Production (Tcf) from No Action	0	+27.3 (PBU) +9.4 (PTU)	+27.3 (PBU) +9.4 (PTU)
<b>Available Gas for LNG Export</b>			
Available Gas for LNG Export (Tcf) <sup>b</sup>	27.83 (Lower 48)	27.83 (PBU + PTU)	27.83 (PBU + PTU)
Change in Gas Production (Tcf) from No Action	0	0 (Total) +27.83 (PBU+PTU) -27.83 (Lower 48)	0 (Total) +27.83 (PBU+PTU) -27.83 (Lower 48)
<b>Carbon Dioxide Storage on North Slope of Alaska</b>			
CO <sub>2</sub> Storage (Tcf)	0	3.84	3.84
CO <sub>2</sub> Storage (MMmt)	0	202	202
<b>Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions<sup>c</sup></b>			
End Use Power Generation (without CCS) in Receiving Destination			
Cumulative Life Cycle GHG Emissions (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	3,011 to 3,023	2,737 to 2,797	2,737 to 2,797
Change in Life Cycle GHG Emissions Relative to No Action (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	–	-274 to -226	-274 to -226
End Use Power Generation (with CCS) in Receiving Destination			
Cumulative Life Cycle GHG Emissions (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	1,714 to 1,728	1,443 to 1,519	1,443 to 1,519
Change in Life Cycle GHG Emissions Relative to No Action (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	–	-271 to -209	-271 to -209

<sup>a</sup> The range of 120 – 600 million barrels reflects uncertainty surrounding CO<sub>2</sub>-EOR performance (see Table 4.19-3, footnote a). For modeling purposes, the DOE LCA Study used a volume of 512 million barrels.

<sup>b</sup> The PBU and PTU have available natural gas resources to provide essentially all – 27.83 Tcf of the 27.87 Tcf – of the natural gas resources authorized for export (Wallace et al. 2022). Given the conservative nature of the natural gas resources portion of the study, the recently recognized improved operating practices at the PBU (not included in the natural gas resources study), and inherent uncertainties during the authorized export term, the study determines that sufficient natural gas resources will be available to meet the authorized volumes of LNG exports. The difference between Major Gas Sales to the GTP and Available Gas for LNG Export is the reduction in 8.8 Tcf for extraction of CO<sub>2</sub> and fuel use of pipeline grade natural gas to support the GTP, gas pipeline, and liquefaction operations.

<sup>c</sup> GHG emissions for power generation with and without CCS are provided for comparison only. CCS may be implemented by the end users of exported LNG and would not be related to oil and gas production on the North Slope. CCS = carbon capture and sequestration; CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide; CO<sub>2</sub>-eq= carbon dioxide equivalent; EOR = enhanced oil recovery; GHG = greenhouse gas; GTP = Gas Treatment Plant; KRU = Kuparuk River Unit; LNG = liquefied natural gas; MMbbl = million barrels of oil; MMmt = million metric tons; PBU = Prudhoe Bay Unit; PTU = Point Thomson Unit; Tcf = trillion cubic feet

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.



**Table S-2. Comparison of Oil and Gas Production and Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions between the No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) and Upstream Development Scenarios**

Activity	No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline)	Proposed Action Scenario 2 (PBU Storage)	Proposed Action Scenario 3 (KRU EOR)
<b>Oil Production</b>			
Oil Production (MMbbl)	1,356 (PBU)	849 (PBU)	1,360 (Total) 849 (PBU) 512 (KRU) [120 – 600] <sup>a</sup>
Change in Oil Production (MMbbl) from No Action	0	-507 (PBU)	+4 (Total) -507 (PBU) +512 (KRU) [120 – 600] <sup>a</sup>
<b>Major Gas Sales to GTP</b>			
Major Gas Sales Production (Tcf) <sup>b</sup>	0	36.7	36.7
Change in Gas Production (Tcf) from No Action	0	+27.3 (PBU) +9.4 (PTU)	+27.3 (PBU) +9.4 (PTU)
<b>Available Gas for LNG Export</b>			
Available Gas for LNG Export (Tcf) <sup>b</sup>	0	27.83	27.83
Change in Gas Production (Tcf) from No Action	0	+27.83	+27.83
<b>Carbon Dioxide Storage on North Slope of Alaska</b>			
CO <sub>2</sub> Storage (Tcf)	0	3.84	3.84
CO <sub>2</sub> Storage (MMmt)	0	202	202
<b>Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions<sup>c</sup></b>			
End Use Power Generation (without CCS) in Receiving Destination			
Cumulative Life Cycle GHG Emissions (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	853	2,440 to 2,501	2,714 to 2,775
Change in Life Cycle GHG Emissions Relative to No Action (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	–	1,587 to 1,648	1,861 to 1,922
End Use Power Generation (with CCS) in Receiving Destination			
Cumulative Life Cycle GHG Emissions (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	853	1,146 to 1,223	1,420 to 1,496
Change in Life Cycle GHG Emissions Relative to No Action (MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq)	–	293 to 369	567 to 643

<sup>a</sup> The range of 120 – 600 million barrels reflects uncertainty surrounding CO<sub>2</sub>-EOR performance (see Table 4.19-3, footnote a). For modeling purposes, the DOE LCA Study used a volume of 512 million barrels.

<sup>b</sup> The PBU and PTU have available natural gas resources to provide essentially all – 27.83 Tcf of the 27.87 Tcf – of the natural gas resources authorized for export (Wallace et al. 2022). Given the conservative nature of the natural gas resources portion of the study, the recently recognized improved operating practices at the PBU (not included in the natural gas resources study), and inherent uncertainties during the authorized export term, the study determines that sufficient natural gas resources will be available to meet the authorized volumes of LNG exports. The difference between Major Gas Sales to the GTP and Available Gas for LNG Export is the reduction in 8.8 Tcf for extraction of CO<sub>2</sub> and fuel use of pipeline grade natural gas to support the GTP, gas pipeline, and liquefaction operations.

<sup>c</sup> GHG emissions for power generation with and without CCS are provided for comparison only. CCS may be implemented by the end users of exported LNG and would not be related to oil and gas production on the North Slope. CCS = carbon capture and sequestration; CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide; CO<sub>2</sub>-eq = carbon dioxide equivalent; EOR = enhanced oil recovery; GHG = greenhouse gas; GTP = Gas Treatment Plant; KRU = Kuparuk River Unit; LNG = liquefied natural gas; MMbbl = million barrels of oil; MMmt = million metric tons; PBU = Prudhoe Bay Unit; PTU = Point Thomson Unit; Tcf = trillion cubic feet

Note: Totals may not add up due to rounding.

### S.3 IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

#### S.3.1 Summary of Environmental Impacts in the Final SEIS By Resource Area

No changes to the proposed Project have occurred since issuance of the 2020 EIS that affect the analysis or conclusions presented within the 2020 EIS. The analysis in this **Final SEIS** considers the additional impacts from potential upstream development along with the GHG emission estimates contained within the LCA Study. Table S-3 defines the terms used in this **Final SEIS** to describe potential impacts. Table S-4 summarizes the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action by environmental resource area. As previously stated, the No Action Alternative assumes the Project would not occur and no impacts as part of the Proposed Action described in the 2020 EIS and in Table S-4 would occur.

**Table S-3. Final SEIS Impact Terminology**

Impact Type	Definition
<b>Beneficial</b>	Impact would improve or enhance the resource.
<b>Adverse</b>	Impact would negatively affect the resource.
<b>Negligible</b>	No apparent or measurable impacts are expected, and may also be described as “none,” if appropriate.
<b>Less-than-Significant</b>	The action would have a noticeable or measurable adverse impact on the resource. This category could include minor to moderate impacts or potentially significant impacts that could be reduced by the implementation of mitigation measures.
<b>Significant</b>	The action would have obvious and extensive adverse impacts that could result in potentially significant impacts on a resource despite mitigation measures.
<b>Temporary</b>	Temporary, short-term impacts generally occur during construction with the resource returning to its preconstruction condition almost immediately afterward. A short-term impact could continue for up to 3 years following construction. A subset of temporary impacts would include areas that would be disturbed intermittently for shorter periods during a construction or maintenance phase.
<b>Permanent</b>	Permanent, long-term impacts could occur as a result of any activity that modifies a resource to the extent that it would not return to preconstruction conditions during the life of the portion of the proposed project. An impact is considered long-term if the resource would require more than 3 years to recover.

SEIS = Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Geologic Resources and Geologic Hazards</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to surficial levels of disturbance for majority of construction and dredging activities; no new quarrying necessary. Permanent impacts from drilling of new production wells. Plans and permits for development of wells subject to ADNR approval.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Permanent impacts due to extraction and diminishment of natural gas resources. Plans and permits for operation of wells subject to ADNR approval.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> : Temporary impacts due to surficial levels of disturbance for majority of construction, and permanent impacts from drilling new production and injection wells. Granular fill would be sourced outside of PBU. Plans and permits for development of wells subject to ADNR approval. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Permanent impacts due to extraction and diminishment of natural gas resources and from injection of by-product CO <sub>2</sub> into saline formation under Scenario 2. Volume of oil production would decrease from baseline conditions under Scenario 2. Plans and permits for operation of wells subject to ADNR approval.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible</u> : Impacts due to surficial levels of disturbance for majority of construction; permanent impacts from drilling new wells. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Permanent impacts due to extraction and diminishment of natural gas resources and from using by-product CO <sub>2</sub> for CO <sub>2</sub> EOR under Scenario 3, which would alter subsurface composition and pressure. <b>While potential adverse impacts exist from indirect seismic activity due to CO<sub>2</sub> EOR injections, the potential risk is minimized due to the geological properties and location of the storage reservoir in the KRU.</b> Volume of oil production would increase from baseline conditions under Scenario 3. Plans and permits for operation of wells subject to ADNR approval.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to geologic resources as described in Section 4.1 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include increases or decreases in oil production and would depend on scenario selection, as identified in the North Slope Production Study. Cumulative impacts from regional projects on existing mineral resources and/or future mineral development and ongoing oil and gas exploration and production would be less-than-significant. Impacts would be mitigated by monitoring, regulation compliance, adherence to project-specific plans, and implementation of mitigation measures.  Cumulative impacts from geologic hazards, such as seismicity and mass wasting would be less-than-significant; development of projects would be designed and constructed in accordance with required design standards to mitigate impacts from geologic hazards.

Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Soils and Sediments</b>		
PTU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to disturbance of permafrost and permafrost degradation.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to permafrost degradation.
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to disturbance of permafrost and permafrost degradation. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipeline under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to permafrost degradation.
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to disturbance of permafrost and permafrost degradation. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to permafrost degradation.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to soil and sediments as described in Section 4.2 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include: local increases in soil erosion, sedimentation, and compaction; and permafrost degradation. Due to sensitivity of permafrost from development, cumulative impacts from regional projects on permafrost degradation could be significant, leading to increased soil erosion and sedimentation. Impacts could be mitigated to less-than-significant with implementation of construction mitigation measures and environmental plans.
<b>Water Resources</b>		
PTU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to degradation of water quality from increased erosion and sedimentation; increased sedimentation from dredging; and water use for ice construction.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts arising from hydrostatic testing of new pipelines due to water use and disposal of water into injection wells.
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to degradation of water quality from increased erosion and sedimentation; risk of accidental release of product during pipeline construction; and water use for ice construction. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts arising from hydrostatic testing of new pipelines due to water use and disposal of water into injection wells.

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts due to degradation of water quality from increased erosion and sedimentation. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> : Impacts arising from hydrostatic testing of new pipelines due to water use and disposal of water into injection wells.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to water resources as described in Section 4.3 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include: increases in withdrawal rates groundwater and surface waters, leading to temporary drawdown; and discharges to water. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant as activities would be subject to state regulatory requirements. Surface water withdrawals would be subject to permitting limits and reporting to protect aquatic resources; discharges would also be subject to permitting requirements and environmental plans.
<b>Wetlands</b>		
PTU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> . Impacts due to ground disturbance resulting in increased erosion and sedimentation and degradation of wetland water quality and vegetation. Some permanent fill or temporary or permanent alteration of hydrology or vegetation may occur due to the prevalence of wetlands throughout the area.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible</u> . Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations.
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> . Impacts due to ground disturbance resulting in increased erosion and sedimentation and degradation of wetland water quality and vegetation. Some permanent fill or temporary or permanent alteration of hydrology or vegetation may occur due to the prevalence of wetlands throughout the area. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible</u> . Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations.
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> . Impacts due to ground disturbance resulting in increased erosion and sedimentation and degradation of wetland water quality and vegetation. Potential adverse impacts would be similar between Scenarios 2 and 3, but with the additional potential impacts from pipelines construction required under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible</u> . Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to wetlands as described in Section 4.4 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include: permanent loss of wetlands or conversion of wetland types; increased turbidity and sedimentation; changes to wetland values and functions; and increased likelihood of the release of hazardous materials and fuel to wetlands. Cumulative impacts from regional projects could result in significant impacts from permanent loss of wetlands. Implementation of construction BMPs and mitigation permitting requirements should offset potential wetland impacts.
<b>Vegetation</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to ground disturbance and the clearing of existing vegetation within construction areas.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to ground disturbance and the clearing of existing vegetation within construction areas. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to ground disturbance within an existing ROW and placement of vertical support members and horizontal support members to support the proposed pipeline. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts confined to previously disturbed and approved locations.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to vegetation as described in Section 4.5 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include ground disturbance and clearing of existing vegetation. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant due to the existing developed oil and gas infrastructure within the ROI and the likely locations of proposed activities within and directly adjacent to developed areas. Additionally, impacts could be reduced from implementing mitigation measures and plans during and after construction.
<b>Wildlife Resources</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to noise, disturbance, or displacement of local wildlife and surrounding habitat. There is the potential for limited mortality of terrestrial wildlife due to use of the ice road; however, this is unlikely to affect wildlife on a species level, especially due to the limited timeframe of ice road use.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations and similar to ongoing activities currently conducted at the Central Pad.

Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to noise, disturbance, or displacement of local wildlife and surrounding habitat. There is the potential for limited mortality of terrestrial wildlife due to presence of heavy machinery to construct the pipeline and vehicles using the ice road; however, this is unlikely to affect wildlife on a species level, especially due to the limited timeframe of ice road use. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations and similar to ongoing activities currently conducted at the CGF Pad.
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts within existing ROW; therefore, no native habitat would be altered, and the elevated pipelines would not represent new barriers to wildlife movement through the area. There is the potential for limited mortality of terrestrial wildlife due to presence of heavy machinery to construct the pipelines; however, this is unlikely to affect wildlife on a species level. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations and similar to ongoing activities currently conducted at the KRU.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to wildlife as described in Section 4.6 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include: increased disturbance, displacement, injury, or mortality of wildlife; and temporary/permanent alteration or reduction in suitable habitat. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant due to existing developed oil and gas infrastructure within the ROI and the likely locations of proposed activities within and directly adjacent to developed areas. Additionally, impacts could be reduced from implementing mitigation measures and plans during and after construction.
<b>Aquatic Resources</b>		
PTU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to ground disturbance resulting in increased erosion and sedimentation to nearby freshwater and marine waterways; drawing water from surface waterbodies for creation of the ice pad and ice road, impinging fish on intake structures; and new impacts to marine species from dredging.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations and similar to ongoing activities currently conducted at the Central Pad.
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to ground disturbance resulting in increased erosion and sedimentation to nearby freshwater and marine waterways; and drawing water from surface waterbodies for creation of the ice pad and ice road, impinging fish on intake structures. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts from activities confined to previously disturbed and approved locations and similar to ongoing activities currently conducted at the CGF Pad.

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to ground disturbance and associated increase in erosion and sedimentation into surface waters during emplacement of vertical support members. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts confined to previously disturbed and approved locations and similar to ongoing activities currently conducted at the KRU.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to aquatic resources as described in Section 4.7 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include degradation of water quality, leading to increased disturbance, displacement, injury, or mortality of fish. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant as standard BMPs, adherence to project-specific plans, and implementation of mitigation measures would minimize impacts.
<b>Threatened, Endangered, and Other Special Status Species</b>		
PTU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts to polar bear critical habitat and spectacled eider nesting habitat due to land development and indirect impacts to sensitive species from noise disturbances. There is the potential for impacts due to dredging activities, but these are not likely to adversely affect species protected by the NMFS.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts due to noise and mortality of a limited number of individuals due to minor increases in human activity and use of ice roads along new routes. Operational activities generally confined to limited areas in existing disturbed/approved locations and unlikely to adversely affect sensitive species or their habitat.
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to noise and the incidental take of a limited number of individuals through increased number of vehicles during construction and use of the proposed ice road; and direct impacts due to disturbance of existing habitat for protected species, including polar bear critical habitat during pipeline construction. Construction activities may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect, federally protected species that may be present in the ROI, including the spectacled eider, Steller's eider, and polar bear. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts due to noise and mortality of a limited number of individuals due to minor increases in human activity and use of ice roads along new routes. Operational activities generally confined to limited areas in existing disturbed/approved locations and unlikely to adversely affect sensitive species or their habitat.
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to disturbance of existing habitat for protected species, including polar bear critical habitat, during pipeline construction. Indirect effects due to construction-related noise. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts due to noise and mortality of a limited number of individuals due to presence of heavy machinery during construction of new pipelines. Operational activities generally confined to limited areas in existing disturbed/approved locations and unlikely to adversely affect sensitive species or their habitat.



**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to threatened, endangered, and other special status species as described in Section 4.8 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include the “take” of special status species or the alteration or destruction of critical habitat of ESA-listed, NMFS-protected, or Alaska SGCN species. Cumulative impacts would be less-than-significant and mitigated through consultation efforts with appropriate federal and state agencies, surveys for protected species, and avoidance.
<b>Land Use, Recreation, and Special Interest Areas</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to permanent conversion of open land to developed land for oil and gas industrial use during expansion of the Central Pad, drilling of four new production wells, and drilling of a new underground injection control Class I disposal well.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to permanent land use conversion of open land to developed land for oil and gas industrial use.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to permanent land use conversion of open land to developed land for oil and gas industrial use, though final locations of proposed facilities, including the expansion of the CGF Pad, drilling of new wells, and construction of pipelines are not yet known. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to permanent land use conversion of open land to developed land for oil and gas industrial use, though final locations of proposed facilities, including the expansion of the CGF Pad, drilling of new wells, and construction of pipelines are not yet known.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to permanent land use conversion of open land to developed land for oil and gas industrial use, though proposed distribution pipelines would be constructed within KRU and potentially in developed areas, and the CO <sub>2</sub> pipeline would be constructed within an existing ROW. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to permanent land use conversion of open land to developed land for oil and gas industrial use.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to land use, recreation, and special interest areas as described in Section 4.9 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include conversion of open land or open water to developed land. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant. Land use changes would not occur where portions of a project would lie within existing ROWs, roads, or drill pads.

Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Visual Resources</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to occurrence of machinery, supplies, land-clearing, artificial nighttime lights, and placement of dredged materials. The setting is already industrial in nature and is not open to the general public.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts due to the introduction of new structures, though activities would be within the PTU. The setting is already industrial in nature and is not open to the general public.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to the occurrence of machinery, supplies, land-clearing, and artificial nighttime lights. The setting is already industrial in nature and viewshed for general public is limited. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts from the introduction of new structural elements to the viewshed. The setting is already industrial in nature and viewshed for general public is limited.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to occurrence of machinery, supplies, land-clearing, and artificial nighttime lights. The setting is already industrial in nature and is not open to the general public. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts from the introduction of new structural elements to the viewshed. The setting is already industrial in nature and is not open to the general public.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to visual resources as described in Section 4.10 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include increased visual contrast with existing or desired landscape conditions. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant as most projects are located within or adjacent developed settings, having similar visual characteristics and, therefore, would have little to no change in visual contrast.
<b>Socioeconomics</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to beneficial.</u> Impacts due to slight, temporary increases in population, purchases of local materials/products and services, employment opportunities across most local industries and sectors, and in state/local government revenues from increased taxes. No changes expected in demand/supply of housing and public services.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to beneficial.</u> Impacts similar to construction phase, but extent and level would be less as activities unlikely to increase permanent population. No changes expected in demand/supply of housing and public services.

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to beneficial</u> . Impacts due to slight, temporary increases in population, purchases of local materials/products and services, employment opportunities across most local industries and sectors, and in state/local government revenues from increased taxes. No changes expected in demand/supply of housing and public services.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to beneficial</u> . Impacts similar to construction phase, but extent and level would be less as activities unlikely to increase permanent population. No changes expected in demand/supply of housing and public services.
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to beneficial</u> . Impacts due to slight, temporary increases in population, purchases of local materials/products and services, employment opportunities across most local industries and sectors, and state/local government revenues from increased taxes. No changes expected in demand/supply of housing and public services.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to beneficial</u> . Impacts similar to construction phase, but extent and level would be less as activities unlikely to increase permanent population. No changes expected in demand/supply of housing and public services.
<b>No Action</b>		Effects to socioeconomics as described in Section 4.11 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. Since construction and operations of the proposed Project would not occur, no changes to the existing socioeconomic conditions. Beneficial impacts to the local economy as described for upstream development under Scenarios 2 and 3 would not occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts related to population growth include increased tax revenues, employment, and spending. Cumulative impacts from regional projects could result in beneficial to negligible effects; however, change in local residences and spending activity is not expected to be substantial due to rotational work schedules and on-site work camps.
<b>Environmental Justice</b>		
PTU	<b>Construction</b>	<b>Potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities.</b>
	<b>Operations</b>	<b>Potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities.</b>
PBU	<b>Construction</b>	<b>Potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities.</b>
	<b>Operations</b>	<b>Potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities.</b>
KRU	<b>Construction</b>	<b>Potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities.</b>
	<b>Operations</b>	<b>Potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities.</b>

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>No Action</b>		<b>The potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities, would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed.</b>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		<b>Potential for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on environmental justice communities, primarily due to potential for impacts to subsistence users of the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities.</b>
<b>Transportation</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts on roads due to increased traffic delays and congestion though limited to near/within PTU footprint and limited to roads for industrial use; majority of equipment, material, and modules would be transported via marine vessels and impact marine traffic due to increased congestion, delays, and hazards at/near Thomson Marine Facilities; and increases in delays at Deadhorse Airport and Point Thomson airstrip due to transport of workers at beginning and end of construction cycles.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts on roadways limited to industry-used roads; volume of equipment and material deliveries via marine vessels would be minimal; personnel use of Deadhorse Airport and Point Thomson airstrip would be minimal.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts on roads due to increased traffic delays and congestion on Dalton Highway, Spine Road, and local roads, though limited to routes leading to construction camps and work sites within industrial areas; shuttle buses would transport workers between camps and work sites; equipment, material, and modules would be transported via marine vessels and impact marine traffic due to increased congestion, delays, and hazards at/near West Dock Causeway in Prudhoe Bay; increases in delays at Deadhorse Airport due to transport of workers at beginning and end of construction cycles.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts on roads due to minimal increases in traffic delays and congestion on Dalton Highway, Spine Road, and local roads; minimal increases in marine vessels; minimal increases in delays at Deadhorse Airport from transporting personnel.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts on roads due to increased traffic delays and congestion on local roads, though limited to routes leading to construction camps and work sites within industrial areas; equipment, material, and modules would be transported via marine vessels and impact marine traffic due to increased congestion, delays, and hazards at/near West Dock Causeway in Prudhoe Bay; increases in delays at Deadhorse Airport due to transport of workers at beginning and end of construction cycles.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible.</u> Impacts on roadways limited to industry-used roads; volume of equipment and material deliveries via marine vessels would be minimal; personnel use of Deadhorse Airport would be minimal.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to transportation resources as described in Section 4.12 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include increases in traffic volumes leading to increased congestion, delays, and safety risks for road, marine, and air transportation. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would mainly occur during construction and be less-than-significant. Location and magnitude of impacts would depend on timing of projects. Transportation resources that would overlap with use by general public within ROI primarily include Dalton Highway and Deadhorse Airport.
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> . Impacts limited to archaeological resources due to ground disturbance; no documented historic structures exist within vicinity of Central Pad and docking facilities. Project proponent for the PTU Expansion would conduct the necessary surveys to identify any historic properties within the APE. Permits for well drilling issued by the AOGCC would require review/approval by the ADNR, which includes the Office of History and Archaeology regarding protection of cultural resources.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible</u> . Impacts unlikely as operational activities would be confined to existing disturbed/approved locations.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant</u> . Impacts limited to archaeological resources due to ground disturbance; no documented historic structures exist within vicinity of CGF Pad and potential location of new wells and pipelines. Project proponent for the PBU MGS Project would conduct the necessary surveys to identify any historic properties within the APE. Permits for well drilling issued by the AOGCC would require review/approval by the ADNR, which includes the Office of History and Archaeology regarding protection of cultural resources. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible</u> . Impacts unlikely as operational activities would be confined to existing disturbed/approved locations.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant</u> . Impacts limited to archaeological resources due to ground disturbance; no documented historic structures exist within vicinity of existing injection well sites at KRU or along the existing Kuparuk Pipeline and Kuparuk Extension Pipeline. Project proponent for the KRU EOR would conduct the necessary surveys to identify any historic properties within the APE. Permits for well drilling issued by the AOGCC would require review/approval by the ADNR, which includes the Office of History and Archaeology regarding protection of cultural resources. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible</u> . Impacts unlikely as operational activities would be confined to existing disturbed/approved locations.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to cultural resources as described in Section 4.13 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts could include: destruction or damage to all, or a portion, of a historic property; alteration of a property including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, or stabilization inconsistent with federal standards; removal of the property from its historic location; change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance; and introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features. As a large portion of Alaska, including the North Slope, remains unsurveyed, significant cumulative adverse effects could occur if present in areas of the regional projects. Coordination with SHPO and interested tribes, as applicable in accordance with the NHPA, could avoid or mitigate adverse effects.
<b>Subsistence</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to decreased availability and accessibility of resources (wildlife, vegetation, aquatic); potential for contamination in vegetation and wildlife/aquatic habitats; increased costs and greater travel to harvest resources; increased competition for resources; and changed migration patterns for large terrestrial mammal and aquatic species. Terrestrial subsistence impacts would primarily occur to the Kaktovik community as their subsistence area overlaps with PTU, PBU, and KRU. Impacts to marine harvests, however, could occur to both the Kaktovik and Nuiqsut communities as both communities conduct marine mammal harvests in marine waters of the ROI.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to decreased availability and accessibility of resources (wildlife and vegetation); potential for contamination in vegetation and wildlife habitat.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to decreased availability and accessibility of resources (wildlife, vegetation); potential for contamination in vegetation and wildlife habitat; increased costs and greater travel to harvest resources; increased competition for resources; and changed migration patterns for large terrestrial mammal species. Terrestrial subsistence impacts would primarily occur to the Kaktovik community as their subsistence area overlaps with PTU, PBU, and KRU. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to decreased availability and accessibility of resources (wildlife and vegetation); potential for contamination in vegetation and wildlife habitat. Greater impacts would occur for locations where new pipeline could not be placed in an existing ROW.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to decreased availability and accessibility of resources (wildlife, vegetation); potential for contamination in vegetation and wildlife habitat; increased costs and greater travel to harvest resources; increased competition for resources; and changed migration patterns for large terrestrial mammal species. Terrestrial subsistence impacts would primarily occur to the Kaktovik community as their subsistence area overlaps with PTU, PBU, and KRU. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to decreased availability and accessibility of resources (wildlife and vegetation); potential for contamination in vegetation and wildlife habitat. Greater impacts would occur for locations where new pipeline could not be placed in an existing ROW.

**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to subsistence as described in Section 4.14 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts could include: decrease in resource availability; increase in competition for local resources and supplies; and decrease in availability of wildlife resources, specifically caribou for regional communities. Cumulative impacts from regional projects could result in significant adverse impacts to specific subsistence users in the ROI; however, it is assumed that communities as a whole would use other areas within the region for subsistence, away from oil and gas development activities.
<b>Air Quality</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased air emissions from ground-disturbing activities, vehicles transporting equipment/materials, and operation of drilling, dredging, and general construction equipment.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased emissions from operation equipment.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased air emissions from ground-disturbing activities, vehicles transporting equipment/materials, and operation of drilling and general construction equipment. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased air emissions from operation equipment, including new valve module heating and fugitive emissions of organic compounds emitted from piping components and connectors. Reduction of net PBU emissions as PBU turbine usage for gas reinjection would be reduced.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased air emissions from ground-disturbing activities, vehicles transporting equipment/materials, and operation of drilling and general construction equipment. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts from increased air emissions from operation equipment. Operation of new pipeline compressor stations would result in air emissions, in addition to emissions from well operations and maintenance.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to air quality as described in Section 4.15 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.

Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		<p>Potential impacts during construction include increases in air pollutants resulting from fugitive dust, equipment, and other stationary sources and mobile-source emissions. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant given the temporary and localized nature of the dust emissions, <b>and activities would be subject to state regulatory requirements and</b> the ability to mitigate as needed.</p> <p>Potential impacts during operation include increases in air pollutants resulting from: mobile-source emissions; indirect emissions from electrical power plants; and fugitive emissions at well sites and facilities. To reduce emissions, operators could develop a fugitive dust control plan to minimize fugitive dust.</p>
<b>Noise</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to intermittent, localized increases in noise levels from use of construction and drilling equipment; increased underwater noise levels from dredging activities; and increased noise levels from transporting equipment and materials along ice roads.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased noise levels from maintenance and monitoring activities.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to intermittent, localized increases in noise levels from use of construction and drilling equipment; increased noise levels from transporting equipment and materials along regional roads. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased noise levels from maintenance and monitoring activities.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to intermittent, localized increases in noise levels from use of construction and drilling equipment; increased noise levels from transporting equipment and materials along regional roads. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased noise levels from maintenance and monitoring activities.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to noise as described in Section 4.16 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		<p>Potential impacts include increased noise levels, which would mainly occur during construction and be temporary. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be minor as construction noise would be intermittent, temporary, and generally managed in conformance with federal, state, and local codes and ordinances, and manufacturer-prescribed safety procedures and industry practices.</p> <p>Long-term perceptible increases in ambient noise levels to sensitive receptors would be negligible as development of projects would occur at separate locations and, therefore, would not contribute to cumulative impacts.</p>



**Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development**

Unit		Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Public Health and Safety</b>		
<b>PTU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased transmission rate of disease and increased strain on healthcare system from increase in workforce; community access to water and sanitary systems not expected to change.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts from rates of infectious diseases, increased strain on healthcare resources, and community access to water and sanitary systems not expected to change. Impacts from increasing chronic respiratory conditions to sensitive populations could result from air emissions from operation activities.
<b>PBU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased transmission rate of disease and increased strain on healthcare system from increase in workforce; community access to water and sanitary systems not expected to change. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts from rates of infectious diseases, increased strain on healthcare resources, and community access to water and sanitary systems not expected to change. Impacts from increasing chronic respiratory conditions to sensitive populations could result from air emissions from operation activities.
<b>KRU</b>	<b>Construction</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts due to increased transmission rate of disease and increased strain on healthcare system from increase in workforce; community access to water and sanitary systems not expected to change. Potential adverse impacts similar between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3, with the exception of the proposed injection wells under Scenario 2 and the proposed pipelines under Scenario 3.
	<b>Operations</b>	<u>Negligible to less-than-significant.</u> Impacts from rates of infectious diseases, increased strain on healthcare resources, and community access to water and sanitary systems not expected to change. Impacts from increasing chronic respiratory conditions to sensitive populations could result from air emissions from operation activities.
<b>No Action</b>		Adverse effects to public health and safety as described in Section 4.17 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>		Potential impacts include: increase in accidents (from transportation- or workplace-related activities) resulting in fatal injuries; increase in chronic respiratory conditions to sensitive populations; and increase in transmission of diseases. Cumulative impacts from regional projects would be less-than-significant. BMPs to reduce emissions, enforcement of required safety training, and implementation of safety plans would minimize accidents and safety risks to general public health.

Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development

Unit	Summary of Potential Impacts	
<b>Reliability and Safety</b>		
PTU	Construction	N/A
	Operations	Negligible. Impact due to increased risk of a potential release from new wells.
PBU	Construction	N/A
	Operations	Negligible. Impact due to increased risk of a potential release from new wells.
KRU	Construction	N/A
	Operations	Negligible. Impact due to potential for spill incident (total of 49 miles of proposed new CO <sub>2</sub> pipeline results in anticipated incident rates of approximately 0.037 small spill per year, 0.01 medium spill per year, 0.004 large spill per year, and 0.001 catastrophic spill per year along the new pipelines).
No Action	Adverse effects to reliability and safety as described in Section 4.18 of the 2020 EIS would not occur as the proposed Project would not be constructed. In addition, upstream development impacts within the PTU, PBU, and KRU under Scenarios 2 and 3 would be unlikely to occur.	
Cumulative Impacts	For spills or releases to have cumulative effect, incidents would need to affect two or more pipelines, and resulting spills or releases would need to occur near and within timeframes so that plumes from releases would overlap. While each new well or pipeline would introduce a new potential location of a release, this slight increase in risk represents a negligible adverse impact on cumulative reliability and safety.	
<b>Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change</b>		
No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study “Business as Usual” Scenario 1, Equivalent Energy) <sup>a</sup>	Life cycle GHG emissions under No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study “Business as Usual” Scenario 1, Equivalent Energy) would depend on the destination country where LNG is ultimately consumed and on whether CCS technology is in use at the destination facility. If CCS is assumed to be in use at the destination facility, cumulative GHG emissions under No Action Alternative 1 would be approximately 1,714 to 1,728 MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq; without CCS, cumulative emissions would be approximately 3,011 to 3,023 MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq. Note that this alternative would provide an equivalent energy service to society through production of natural gas and crude oil.	
No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) <sup>a</sup>	Cumulative life cycle GHG emissions under No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline) would be approximately 853 MMmt CO <sub>2</sub> -eq. LNG would not be produced and exported from the North Slope, and GHG emissions would be associated only with ongoing oil and gas production activities on the North Slope. Under this alternative, energy service provided to society through production of natural gas and oil would not be equivalent to the Proposed Action.	

Table S-4. Summary of Environmental Impacts from North Slope Development

Unit	Summary of Potential Impacts
<b>Proposed Action (Scenario 2: Reduced Gas Injection)</b>	<p>Life cycle GHG emissions under the <b>Proposed Action</b>, Scenario 2 would depend on the destination country where LNG is ultimately consumed and on whether CCS technology is in use at the destination facility. If <b>CCS is assumed to be in use at the destination facility</b>, cumulative GHG emissions under Scenario 2 would be approximately 1,443 to 1,519 MMmt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq; without CCS, cumulative emissions would be approximately 2,737 to 2,797 MMmt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When compared to <b>No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study “Business as Usual” Scenario 1, Equivalent Energy)</b>, Scenario 2 is estimated to result in 7 to 9 percent lower emissions without the use of CCS, and 12 to 16 percent lower emissions with CCS. Exporting LNG from the North Slope under Scenario 2 would not increase GHG emissions when providing the same services to society (through production of natural gas and crude oil) as No Action Alternative 1.</li> <li>• When compared to <b>No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline)</b>, Scenario 2 is estimated to result in 186 to 193 percent higher GHG emissions without the use of CCS, and 34 to 43 percent higher emissions with CCS. Exporting LNG from the North Slope under Scenario 2 would increase GHG emissions as compared to the No Action Alternative 2, due to the difference in LNG volumes delivered to end-users.</li> </ul>
<b>Proposed Action (Scenario 3: Use and Storage of By-Product CO<sub>2</sub>)</b>	<p>Life cycle GHG emissions under the <b>Proposed Action</b>, Scenario 3 would depend on the destination country where LNG is ultimately consumed and on whether CCS technology is in use at the destination facility. If CCS is assumed to be in use at the destination facility, cumulative GHG emissions under Scenario 3 would be approximately 1,443 to 1,519 MMmt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq; without CCS, cumulative emissions would be approximately 2,737 to 2,797 MMmt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When compared to <b>No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study “Business as Usual” Scenario 1, Equivalent Energy)</b>, Scenario 3 is estimated to result in 7 to 9 percent lower emissions without the use of CCS and 12 to 16 percent lower emissions with CCS. Exporting LNG from the North Slope under Scenario 3 would not increase GHG emissions when providing the same services to society (through production of natural gas and oil) as the No Action Alternative 1.</li> <li>• When compared to <b>No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Baseline)</b>, Scenario 3 is estimated to result in 218 to 225 percent higher GHG emissions without the use of CCS, and 66 to 75 percent higher emissions with CCS. Exporting LNG from the North Slope under Scenario 2 would increase GHG emissions as compared to the No Action Alternative 2, due to the difference in LNG volumes delivered to end-users.</li> </ul>
<b>Cumulative Impacts</b>	<p>Potential impacts include: increase in GHG emissions from construction- and operation-related equipment, vehicles, and facilities. Cumulative impacts from development of projects would contribute incrementally to global climate change, which is a significant phenomenon that is inherently cumulative in nature and is occurring as a result of human activities across the globe. Environmental effects from climate change include changes to temperature and precipitation, ice cover and sea level rise, ocean temperatures and chemistry, land-based ecosystems, extreme weather events, and impacts to human health and society.</p>

<sup>a</sup> As detailed in Section 4.19.3, specific to the GHG analysis, the No Action Alternative analysis related to GHG considers two conditions under the No Action, including an equivalent energy and a non-equivalent energy service to society. To distinguish between these two conditions in the GHG analysis, the Final SEIS refers to these as No Action Alternative 1 (DOE LCA Study “Business as Usual” Scenario 1) and No Action Alternative 2 (SEIS Non-equivalent Energy Case).

ADNR = Alaska Department of Natural Resources; AOGCC = Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission; APE = Area of Potential Effect; BMP = best management practice; CCS = carbon capture and sequestration; CGF = Central Gas Facility; CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide; CO<sub>2</sub>-eq = carbon dioxide equivalent; EIS = Environmental Impact Statement; EOR = enhanced oil recovery; ESA = Endangered Species Act; GHG = greenhouse gas; KRU = Kuparuk River Unit; LNG = liquefied natural gas; MGS = Major Gas Sales; MMmt = million metric tons; N/A = not applicable; NHPA = National Historic Preservation Act; NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service; PBU = Prudhoe Bay Unit; PTU = Point Thomson Unit; ROI = region of influence; ROW = right-of-way; SGCN = Species of Greatest Conservation Need; SHPO = State Historic Preservation Office

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



