

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

BRADWOOD LANDING LNG PROJECT
FERC DOCKET NUMBERS CP06-365 and 366

PUBLIC MEETING
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

* * *

Monday, November 5, 2007

6:30 p.m.

Clatskanie Middle/High School

471 S.W. Belair Drive

Clatskanie, Oregon

* * *

BEFORE: Mr. Paul D. Friedman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Office of Energy Projects

* * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3 MR. FRIEDMAN: I want to apologize for
4 standing up here in the dark, but the reason is
5 18:38:08 by having it dark up here, the slides show
6 up -- show clearer. So, hopefully, you'll see
7 the slides and you'll hear me, and we'll find
8 the custodian, maybe after the slide show we'll
9 turn the lights on and actually see. One of
10 18:38:26 the artifices of coming to a new place that
11 you've never been before is figuring out light
12 switches and things like that.

13 I want to welcome you all here tonight.
14 Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a
15 18:38:37 public meeting to take comments on the draft
16 Environmental Impact Statement or DEIS, issued
17 by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
18 also referred to as FERC, F-E-R-C, or just the
19 Commission, for the Bradwood Landing liquefied
20 18:38:54 natural gas -- liquefied natural gas, often
21 abbreviated as LNG, and that's how I'll refer
22 to it for the rest of the meeting, for the
23 Bradwood Landing LNG project.

24 Let the record show that this meeting was
25 18:39:10 called to order at about -- my watch says 6:38

1 18:39:15 p.m., on Monday, November 5th, 2007, at
2 Clatskanie Middle/High School Auditorium, 471
3 S.W. Belair -- Belair Drive, Clatskanie, Oregon
4 97016.

5 18:39:37 My name's Paul Friedman, and I work in the
6 environmental branch of the Office of Energy
7 Projects, OEP, at the FERC. I am the
8 environmental team leader for the Bradwood
9 Landing LNG project for the FERC. On behalf of
10 18:39:54 the FERC, I would like to welcome you all here
11 tonight. You may notice that there is a court
12 reporter sharing the stage with me up here.

13 Robin, please wave.

14 She is transcribing this meeting. This is
15 18:40:08 so we can have an accurate record of tonight's
16 comments. Within a few weeks a copy of the
17 transcript will be placed in the public record
18 for this proceeding and will be available
19 through the Internet via the FERC's Web site.

20 18:40:22 We can switch slides now, Pat.

21 The FERC is an independent agency within
22 the U.S. Department of Energy. We regulate the
23 interstate transportation of electricity,
24 hydropower, and natural gas. The Commission is
25 18:40:41 regulated by five Commissioners appointed by

1 18:40:43 the President of the United States and approved
2 by the United States Congress. The FERC staff
3 are civil servants.

4 Next slide.

5 18:40:52 On June 5th, 2006, Bradwood Landing LLC
6 filed an application with the Federal Energy
7 Regulatory Commission requesting permission to
8 construct and operate an LNG import terminal
9 under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, or

10 18:41:08 abbreviated as NGA, in docket number
11 CP06-365-000. NorthernStar Energy LLC filed a
12 companion application or under section 7 of the
13 NGA under docket number CP06-366-000.

14 Hereafter, I will refer to Bradwood

15 18:41:36 Landing LLC and NorthernStar Energy LLC
16 collectively as just NorthernStar since they
17 are, in reality, two subsidiaries of the same
18 company.

19 Next slide. Pat, next slide.

20 18:42:04 The FERC is the lead federal agency for
21 this project, and we took the lead in producing
22 the EIS in order to comply with the National
23 Environmental Policy Act of 1969, better known
24 as NEPA. Our EIS also summarizes activities

25 18:42:21 relating to compliance with the Endangered

1 18: 42: 23 Species Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery
2 Conservation and Management Act, the Marine
3 Mammal Protection Act, the National Historical
4 Preservation Act, the Clean Water Act, Clean
5 18: 42: 33 Air Act, and Coastal Zone Management Act.
6 Next slide.
7 As part of its decision-making process,
8 the FERC considered environmental impacts of
9 the project as disclosed in the EIS. The
10 18: 42: 49 production of the DEIS was a collaborative
11 effort involving FERC staff, a third-party
12 contractor, which is Natural Resources Group --
13 again, I'll refer to them as by their initials,
14 NRG -- and cooperating agencies.
15 18: 43: 05 Let me introduce some of the people here
16 tonight who played major roles in writing the
17 DEIS. Representing our environmental
18 contractor, NRG, is Patricia Terhaar. Pat is
19 down there doing the slide show. And at the
20 18: 43: 19 back, at the sign-in table is, Janelle Rieland.
21 For those of you who live in this area, I want
22 to point out that Pat's mother was born and
23 raised in Longview, Washington. We consider
24 our contractors to be an extension of the FERC
25 18: 43: 33 staff.

1 18:43:39 The federal agencies that cooperated in
2 the production of the DEIS includes the U.S.
3 Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard,
4 and the U.S. Department of Transportation. A
5 18:43:50 cooperating agency has jurisdiction by law or
6 special expertise related to project-specific
7 environmental impacts, and those agencies may
8 adopt the EIS to meet their own regulatory
9 obligations for compliance with the NEPA.

10 18:44:06 Next slide.

11 We issued a notice of availability, or
12 NOA, for the DEIS on August 17th, 2007, which
13 gave a closing date for comments as December
14 24th, 2007. The U.S. Environmental Protection
15 18:44:21 Agency noticed the issuance of our DEIS in the
16 Federal Register on August 24th, 2007.

17 Next slide.

18 We mailed almost 1300 copies of the DEIS
19 to various elected officials, federal, state,
20 18:44:39 and local governmental agencies, landowners,
21 and interested members of the public. In
22 addition, copies were sent to local newspapers
23 and libraries, and copies of the DEIS are
24 available at the public reference room at the
25 18:44:54 FERC in Washington, D.C., and can be viewed

1 18:44:59 electronically on the FERC's Internet Web site
2 under the eLibrary link.

3 In addition, NRG will be receiving some
4 additional hard copies. So if you want a hard
5 18:45:09 copy, you may give your name and address to Pat
6 or Janelle, and they'll make sure they mail you
7 a copy.

8 The DEIS described the proposed action.
9 The purpose of the project is to provide a new
10 18:45:24 source of natural gas to the Pacific Northwest
11 by importing LNG. LNG is natural gas that has
12 been cooled to about minus 260 degrees
13 Fahrenheit for shipping and storage as a
14 liquid. It can be transported in specially
15 18:45:41 designed ships to its point of origin.

16 Next slide.

17 This is acknowledge LNG export facility, I
18 believe. This is in Alaska, and that's LNG
19 ship.

20 18:45:51 Next slide.

21 Another view of LNG ship.

22 In summary, the Bradwood Landing LNG
23 project would consist of the following key
24 elements:

25 18:46:04 An LNG import, storage, vaporization, and

1 18:46:07 sendout facility located at Bradwood Landing in
2 Clatsop County, Oregon, about 38 miles up the
3 Columbia River from its mouth.

4 The terminal would include a 58-acre
5 18:46:19 maneuvering area adjacent to the existing
6 Columbia River navigation channel, and a single
7 berth capable of handling LNG ships up to
8 2,000 -- up to 200,000 cubic meters in
9 capacity.

10 18:46:34 The waterway for LNG marine traffic would
11 extend from 12 nautical miles off the Oregon
12 coast, up the Columbia River to Bradwood
13 Landing. The upland portion of the terminal
14 would include two full-containment LNG storage
15 18:46:48 tanks with a capacity of 160,000 cubic meters
16 each.

17 Next slide.

18 A nonjurisdictional 1.5-mile-long,
19 115-kilovolt power line to be built, owned, and
20 18:47:02 maintained by Pacifi Corp, that would extend
21 from the existing Bonneville Power
22 Administration system to the Bradwood Landing
23 LNG terminal. The LNG terminal would have a
24 maximum sendout capacity of 1.3 billion cubic
25 18:47:17 feet per day of natural gas.

1 18: 47: 18 Next slide.

2 A 36.3-mile-long natural gas sendout

3 pipeline would extend from the Bradwood Landing

4 LNG terminal to an intersection with the

5 18: 47: 30 existing Williams Northwest Pipeline

6 Corporation interstate natural gas system near

7 Kelso, Washington. This would include 18.9

8 miles of 36-inch diameter pipeline across

9 portions of Clatsop and Columbia counties,

10 18: 47: 43 Oregon, and 17.5 miles of 30-inch pipeline

11 mostly in Cowlitz County, Washington.

12 Next slide.

13 Associated with the pipeline would be a

14 sendout meter station located within the LNG

15 18: 47: 53 terminal tract, four delivery meter stations,

16 and interconnections with the Georgia-Pacific

17 Wauna mill at milepost, or MP, 3.7, Northwest

18 Natural Pipeline at MP 11.4, PGE Beaver power

19 plant at milepost 18.9, and Williams Northwest

20 18: 48: 13 pipeline at milepost 36.3, six main line block

21 valves along the pipeline, pig launchers at the

22 terminal meter station and at the Beaver meter

23 station, and pig receivers at Beaver and

24 Williams Northwest meter stations.

25 18: 48: 29 Next slide.

1 18: 48: 31 Short, nonjurisdictional pipeline laterals
2 would be built, operated, and maintained by the
3 gas customers to interconnect with the
4 NorthernStar pipeline at Wauna mill, Northwest
5 18: 48: 42 Natural pipeline, and Beaver power plant.

6 I want to clarify that the Federal Energy
7 Regulatory Commission is not a sponsor of this
8 project. This is a project proposed by
9 NorthernStar. The FERC is a licensing or
10 18: 48: 57 regulatory body, and we take no position on
11 this project until after we have completed the
12 full review of NorthernStar's applications.
13 Before the FERC makes a decision about the
14 project, there are several steps that must be
15 18: 49: 12 taken.

16 Next slide.

17 One of those steps includes public input.
18 So first we will consider comments from the
19 public on the DEIS, and that's the purpose of
20 18: 49: 27 tonight's meeting.

21 Because the Commission has the
22 responsibility to treat all parties to a
23 proceeding equally, we must first make sure
24 that our process is open and public. For this
25 18: 49: 37 reason, we are constrained by our own ex parte

1 18:49:41 rules. This means there can be no
2 off-the-record discussions or correspondence
3 between the FERC staff and interested parties
4 regarding the merits of this case. Therefore,
5 18:49:50 I encourage you to either speak tonight on the
6 record, or to send us your comments in writing.
7 Next slide.
8 You can use the Internet through the
9 FERC's Web page at www.ferc.gov to have access
10 18:50:08 to public records in this proceeding and to
11 post your comments. You may file -- you may
12 follow filings -- you may file -- you may
13 follow filings in this proceeding through the
14 FERC's eSubscription service. You may view all
15 18:50:22 filed documents of the public record through
16 our eLibrary link, and you may send comments in
17 electronically via our eFiling link, or you can
18 send in written comments the old-fashioned way
19 through the U.S. mail. Written comments should
20 18:50:38 be sent to:
21 Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.
22 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
23 888 First Street, Northeast, Room 1a.
24 Washington, D.C. 20426.
25 18:50:52 Please reference on anything you send to

1 18:50:54 us the docket numbers CP06-365 and CP06-366,
2 and send one original and two copies of these
3 written comments submitted. Label one copy for
4 the attention of the FERC Office of Energy
5 18:51:10 Projects, Division of Gas-Environment and
6 Engineering, Gas Branch 3, PJ-11.3, which is
7 our internal mail stop.

8 The FERC will address comments on the DEIS
9 in a final EIS, or FEIS. Copies of the FEIS
10 18:51:28 will be sent to all parties on our mailing
11 list.

12 After we have issued the FEIS, the FERC
13 staff will analyze both the environmental
14 impacts of proposed project and all
15 18:51:39 nonenvironmental issues, including markets and
16 rates. The FERC staff would then make
17 recommendations about the project to the five
18 Commissioners who head our agency. It is those
19 Commissioners who make the final decision about
20 18:51:53 whether or not to authorize this project.

21 Next slide, please.

22 If the FERC decides to approve the
23 project, the Commissioners would issue an order
24 to NorthernStar. If the Commission issues a
25 18:52:07 Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity

1 18:52:09 for the pipeline, under Section 7H of the NGA,
2 that certificate would convey to NorthernStar
3 the power of eminent domain for nonfederal and
4 nontribal lands along the pipeline route.

5 18:52:22 If NorthernStar is unable to negotiate an
6 easement agreement with property owners, it may
7 acquire its right-of-way of easement through
8 the local courts. We urge NorthernStar to
9 negotiate in good faith with all landowners to
10 18:52:37 reach agreements. The LNG terminal is under
11 Section 3 of the NGA, which does not include
12 the power of eminent domain.

13 It is likely that a Commission order
14 authorizing the project would include our
15 18:52:54 recommended environmental conditions as
16 outlined in the EIS. One of those conditions
17 in the DEIS is that NorthernStar should develop
18 and fund a third-party environmental monitoring
19 program to be implemented during construction.

20 18:53:09 In addition to this, the FERC staff will
21 also monitor the project through construction
22 and restoration, performing on-site inspections
23 for compliance with the environmental
24 conditions of the order, and the U.S.

25 18:53:21 Department of Transportation would also monitor

1 18:53:23 the project design and construction.

2 Next slide, please.

3 Other agencies must also issue various
4 permits before the project can go forward to

5 18:53:36 construction. The Coast Guard will issue a
6 letter of recommendation indicating whether or
7 not the waterway is suitable for LNG marine
8 traffic. The Corps of Engineers will issue a
9 permit under the Rivers and Harbors Act and

10 18:53:52 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The
11 Washington Department of Ecology and Oregon
12 Department of State Lands and Oregon Department
13 of Environmental Quality would issue permits
14 under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

15 18:54:06 The Oregon Department of Environmental
16 Quality would also issue a federally delegated
17 permit under the Clean Air Act, and the Oregon
18 Department Land Conservation and Development
19 would make a determination on whether or not

20 18:54:18 the project is consistent with the Coastal Zone
21 Management Act.

22 Let me emphasize that this meeting is not
23 a hearing on the merits of the NorthernStar
24 proposal. As I said earlier, the purpose of

25 18:54:29 this meeting tonight is to give you, the

1 18:54:32 public, an opportunity to comment on the draft
2 Environmental Impact Statement.

3 While you may want to declare that you are
4 either for or against this project, those kinds
5 18:54:41 of subjective statements are not particularly
6 useful to the FERC staff when we have to do an
7 environmental analysis. The type of comments
8 that we do find useful are those that address
9 data gaps in the DEIS or point out factual
10 18:54:57 errors that need to be corrected. And we make
11 those corrections in the final Environmental
12 Impact Statement.

13 Next slide.

14 Before we take public comments, let's run
15 18:55:07 through some general rules of decorum. I know
16 that some of you find these issues to be
17 extremely emotional, and I ask you to try to
18 remain calm and present your views in a
19 reasoned manner. Please show respect to all
20 18:55:21 speakers. Do not interrupt or yell out from
21 the audience, and wait patiently for your turn
22 to speak.

23 I will call speakers in the order that
24 they are on the sign-up sheet. However, I do
25 18:55:32 typically allow public officials to go first.

1 18:55:35 I will call several people up at a time so they
2 can go up here in the front row and be ready to
3 speak. Each speaker will be limited to three
4 minutes, and if there's time at the end of the
5 18:55:48 meeting, you may be allowed to speak for a
6 second time. But if you have more to say than
7 can be said in three minutes, I urge you to
8 send in detailed written comments to the FERC.
9 I'd like everyone to be civil, treat all
10 18:56:08 speakers with respect. Personal attacks and
11 name-calling are not acceptable.
12 This is a meeting for you, the public, to
13 comment on the draft Environmental Impact
14 Statement. It is not a question-and-answer
15 18:56:25 forum. Because many of your concerns are
16 complex and the FERC staff would need to do
17 additional research before addressing those
18 issues in a final Environmental Impact
19 Statement, therefore I would not be able to
20 18:56:37 give you accurate or complete responses tonight
21 from the podium. However, I will answer
22 questions that I do know the answers to,
23 specifically questions relating to
24 administrative or process.
25 18:56:50 Before we start this hearing, I would --

1 18:56:53 before we start hearing from the speakers, I
2 suggest we take a short, five-minute break.
3 That will allow anyone who has not signed up to
4 go back to Janelle and signed up on the sign-up
5 18:57:05 sheet. So we'll take a five-minute break, and
6 we'll reconvene, and I'll call the speakers
7 from the list. Thanks.

8 (Recess.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Thank you for
10 19:02:57 waiting. Now is -- I'll open the floor to
11 individual comments. I ask that each speaker
12 clearly state their name for the record, speak
13 clearly in the microphone, spell your name for
14 the transcriber, identify any organization that
15 19:03:13 you may represent. If you are a landowner
16 along the pipeline route, please indicate where
17 your property is located according to mile
18 marks, if you know them.

19 So the first speaker tonight is the mayor
20 19:03:27 of Clatskanie, Diane Pohl.

21 MS. DIANE POHL: Good evening, and thank
22 you for giving me this opportunity to welcome
23 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission staff
24 and everyone else that has come to participate
25 19:03:51 in this process. I just wanted you to know

1 19:03:54 that the City of Clatskanie is delighted that
2 you're here. If we can be of any help while
3 you're here, please let us know. But welcome
4 to our community.

5 19:04:06 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. And for those
6 of you who do not know, we're going to do
7 another meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m.
8 at the Clatskanie River Inn. So we'll do
9 actually two meetings here in Clatskanie.

10 19:04:19 I'm going to call three names, if I can
11 read them, and have those people ready to just
12 come up and speak. It's still dark in here
13 because we weren't able to figure out how to
14 turn the lights up.

15 19:04:45 We think the first speaker is Carol
16 Carver, Duncan MacKenzie is next, and then
17 Gayle Kiser. Remember that you are limited to
18 three minutes so everyone gets an opportunity
19 to speak.

20 19:05:14 MS. CAROL CARVER: Are you ready?

21 Mr. Friedman, FERC staff, in general, I'm
22 gravely concerned that many issues are simply
23 recommended in the DEIS and/or postponed for
24 accomplishment until well after the surveying

25 19:05:27 or the construction. For example, in section

1 19:05:31 4.1 -- sorry -- 4.11.6, emergency response, the
2 emergency response plan, in our opinion, should
3 be completed and approved prior to issuing the
4 permit rather than, as written in the DEIS,
5 19:05:46 prior to initial site preparation.

6 FERC is considering approving a permit for
7 a large LNG facility that will be located
8 within a half mile of people's residences, not
9 to mention the maneuvering zone that will
10 19:05:59 follow the ship 38 miles up the river. The ERP
11 should be written and approved, including
12 evacuation plans, before permitting takes
13 place. FERC's use of the word "recommendation"
14 should be replaced by "shall." I really
15 19:06:13 think it needs to be stronger than a
16 recommendation.

17 In section 4.11.4, thermal exclusion zone
18 is described using the on-land tanks as the
19 center from which distances are calculated.

20 19:06:26 FERC should also require that similar
21 calculations occur using a docked ship as the
22 center. Until the ship is offloaded and after
23 it is docked, it is, in effect, a storage tank
24 that is located much closer to the residences
25 19:06:39 on Puget Island than are the on-land storage

1 19:06:42 tanks.

2 Section 4.3.2.3, page 4-75, NorthernStar

3 references the City of Portland storm water

4 management manual for calculating storm water

5 19:06:55 runoff volumes. We have at least twice the

6 amount of rain as Portland. FERC should check

7 to be sure the rainfall is in the neighborhood

8 of 60 to 90 inches a year in the calculation

9 that was used and not Portland's rainfall.

10 19:07:08 Section 4.8.2.4, property values,

11 concludes that the presence of an LNG facility

12 does not have significant positive or negative

13 impact on property values. Why is the research

14 done by Clarkswell Bain, by Professor George

15 19:07:23 Tolley of the University of Chicago and RCF

16 Economic & Financial Consulting not quoted, in

17 which he finds a dramatic negative impact on

18 property values in proximity to the LNG

19 terminals?

20 19:07:39 Lastly, section 4.1.3.3, geologic hazards,

21 this section delineates that the soil will

22 liquify in the event of a large seismic event

23 to the depth of 85 feet. However, there's no

24 recommendation in relation to the soil level

25 19:07:55 actually dropping after such an event.

1 19:07:58 Professor Atwater at the University of
2 Washington has documented a three-foot drop in
3 soil levels very close to the Bradwood site
4 after the last major seismic event that
5 19:08:10 occurred in the 1700s, which, by the way, he
6 feels we're long overdue for another one.

7 We would like to see in the DEIS what the
8 consequence of a three-foot drop in soil level
9 after soil liquefaction would be, and this is
10 19:08:25 not currently addressed in the DEIS. Also,
11 does the conclusion that soils will liquify to
12 85 feet include the fill that is planned for
13 this site?

14 Thank you.

15 19:08:41 MR. FRIEDMAN: Miss Carver, I want to
16 compliment you on those comments. Those are
17 the kind of comments we're looking for, very
18 specific in terms of resources, and comments
19 that we can address in the DEIS. I appreciate
20 19:08:53 those comments.

21 I want to make one clarification. You
22 asked about why we used the term "recommended"
23 and not the word "shall." Staff can only
24 recommend. The Commissioners will make the
25 19:09:03 final decision, and in the Commission order

1 19:09:05 you'll see the word "shall" replaced with the
2 word "recommend."

3 MS. CAROL CARVER: Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next up to speak is Duncan
5 19:09:12 MacKenzie.

6 MR. DUNCAN MacKENZIE: Good evening. My
7 name is Duncan MacKenzie. M-A-C-K-E-N-Z-I-E.

8 Noted in the DEIS on page 4-346 and again
9 on 4-416 is the fact that the Portland
10 19:09:28 Willamette railroad tracks are adjacent to the
11 facility. Also noted on page 4-111 and 4-112
12 is the provision of a five-foot impoundment
13 dike surrounding the LNG storage tanks.

14 The applicant's resource report 13,
15 19:09:41 section 13.13, details specific codes of
16 regulation that are applicable to aspects of
17 the terminal's physical design. On page 13-60
18 of resource report 13, the applicant notes
19 compliance with only one aspect of structural

20 19:09:54 requirements is found in 49 CFR 190.2155,
21 indicating that the LNG storage tanks cannot be
22 sited near an airport runway.

23 However, far more applicable aspect of
24 this site regulation is found in the paragraph
25 19:10:09 immediately prior to the one sited by the

1 19: 10: 13 applicant. 49 CFR 193.2155 (a) (5) (ii)
2 states: "The structural members of an
3 impoundment system must be designed and
4 constructed to prevent impairment of the
5 19: 10: 18 system's performance reliability and structural
6 integrity as a result of the following." And
7 under sub 5: "If applicable, the potential
8 impact and loading on the dike due to," under
9 sub (ii), "If the LNG facility adjoins the
10 19: 10: 35 right-of-way of any highway or railroad,
11 collision by or explosion of a train, tank car,
12 or tank truck that could reasonably be expected
13 to cause the most severe loading."
14 As seen in the proposed site plans, the
15 19: 10: 51 impoundment dike surrounding the LNG storage
16 tanks is directly adjacent to the railroad
17 right-of-way. However, not found in any of the
18 design criteria considerations for the
19 impoundment dike contained in the applicant's
20 19: 11: 02 resource reports one, 11, or 13, the DEIS or
21 any other publicly available materials does not
22 make any mention for the need to conform to the
23 requirements found in 49 CFR 193.2155 (a) (5)
24 (ii). While this information may appear in
25 19: 11: 20 table 13.13-1, this table has been designated

1 19:11:24 CEII and therefore is unavailable for public
2 review.

3 It is understood that the applicant's
4 design of the facility is not finished and that
5 19:11:33 the facility design must be compliant with the
6 applicable aspects of 49 CFR 193 and FNPA 59-A.
7 However, the apparent lack of acknowledgment or
8 appreciation for what seems to be a standard
9 safety requirements is most troubling. In view
10 19:11:45 of the needs to ensure public safety a request
11 for Commission review and comment is
12 appropriate in the FEIS or other documents
13 regarding this currently perceived lack of
14 address by the applicant to this specific
15 19:11:57 aspect.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacKenzie.
17 And, again, I appreciate your very detailed,
18 very specific comments on very specific
19 resource topics that we can address in the
20 19:12:11 DEIS.

21 Next speaker is Gayle Kiser. After
22 Mrs. Kiser -- having difficulty reading without
23 a light up here.

24 Gloria MacKenzie is up next. Sorry for
25 19:13:00 that delay. We're having trouble reading this.

1 19:13:07 MS. GAYLE KISER: I am Gayle Kiser.

2 That's K-I-S-E-R.

3 (Reporter requests clarification.)

4 MS. GAYLE KISER: My written comments will

5 19:13:23 be submitted directly to FERC in Washington,
6 D.C., as they are too lengthy to address in the
7 three minutes that we have been given.

8 I find greatly inconsistency and
9 disappointment best describe this DEIS. Under

10 19:13:37 "inconsistency," we need an independent needs
11 assessment, not figures taken from industry-
12 friendly sources. The very fact that Northwest
13 Natural Gas just cut their gas rates to
14 residential customers should be a hint that we
15 19:13:49 don't need any more gas in the area.

16 Land use laws: By FERC's own reckoning,
17 the proposed project is not consistent with the
18 existing plans and guidelines that have been
19 established for land use development in the
20 19:14:02 project area. The professional planners hired
21 by Clatsop County agreed only to watch the
22 politically appointed Commissioners on the
23 planning commission disagree. Take the word of
24 the professionals.

25 19:14:13 Alternatives have not been fully

1 19:14:15 developed. Why was the pipeline route through
2 Cowlitz County chosen? The Williams pipeline
3 is fully subscribed at this time. In the
4 Oregon JPA it is stated that the preferred
5 19:14:25 route would be to this storage area. We now
6 know of the Palomar pipeline proposal, which
7 would intersect the Bradwood Landing. It would
8 be appear that the Cowlitz routed is extraneous
9 at this time. Jobs have been promised, yet the
10 19:14:40 DEIS shows only 10 percent of the construction
11 jobs will come from Cowlitz and Wahkiakum
12 County.

13 Disappointments: We need to eliminate our
14 dependence on foreign fossil fuels. If we
15 19:14:53 don't move towards renewable fuels, we will
16 continue to be at the mercy of unfriendly
17 nations and we will continue down the path
18 toward catastrophic climate change. Section
19 3.1.1.2, entitled increased efficiency and
20 19:15:03 conservation of natural gas makes the title,
21 very title, sound like that's a bad idea.

22 Secrecy: The citizens of the affected
23 area deserve to know what is being done to
24 protect their safety. Instead, we are not
25 19:15:17 allowed to know what the emergency response

1 19:15:19 plan is in the event of an accident or
2 intentional attack on the pipeline, tankers, or
3 facilities. Indeed, we pipeline victims are
4 not supposed to know if our property will be on
5 19:15:28 the final route. That's not right. Everyone
6 is left with uncertainty. Our government owes
7 its citizens more than that.

8 Effects on shipping: Our economy depends
9 a great deal on the commerce conducted on the
10 19:15:42 Columbia River. The WSA does not effectively
11 delineate what the effects of tanker traffic in
12 the shipping lane virtually every day will have
13 on our courts.

14 Eminent domain: The idea our land be can
15 19:15:54 condemned and the pipeline installed over our
16 objections is abhorrent. This is a for-profit
17 company. They should not have the right to
18 take control of private property.

19 Economic impacts on communities: Nowhere
20 19:16:07 is it delineated who will pay for the increased
21 security and safety measures that will be
22 mandated when LNG is sited in the area. State
23 and local governments will be expected to pick
24 up their end of the cost-sharing measure. How
25 19:16:19 much per tanker do we have to pay?

1 19:16:26 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much for
2 your comments.

3 The next speaker is Steve Dragich, and
4 after Steve, Vance Fraser.

5 19:16:55 MS. GLORIA MacKENZIE: Good evening,
6 Mr. Friedman and staff. My name is Gloria
7 MacKenzie. And it's M-A-C-K-E-N-Z-I-E.

8 Wind power is mentioned as an alternative
9 energy source in the DEIS. While wind power
10 19:17:10 represents only a portion of the total Pacific
11 Northwest energy portfolio, and requires load
12 sharing from other sources of energy, the
13 dismissive presentation of wind power in the
14 DEIS is incorrect. Two, it uses outdated
15 19:17:29 information. Three, does not address the
16 Pacific Northwest as a whole.

17 A far more balanced picture is found in
18 the Inner Governmental Northwest Power and
19 Conservation Council. In the Council's
20 19:17:47 document, the rule -- the role of renewable
21 resources in the fifth power plan dated 5
22 October 2006, quote: Over 2600 megawatts of
23 generating capacity of all resource types will
24 have been placed in service in the Northwest
25 19:18:07 between adoption of the fifth plan in summer

1 19:18:11 2004 and by the end of 2008. About 800
2 megawatts is operating, 960 megawatts under
3 construction, and 880 megawatts currently
4 scheduled for completion by the end of 2008,
5 19:18:29 about 1720 megawatts of the total of renewable
6 energy resources. Nearly all of this is wind
7 capacity. Over 99 percent.

8 From the foregoing, the 400 megawatt wind
9 power figure noted in the DEIS is incorrect.

10 19:18:52 Additionally, while the assertion made on page
11 3-4 of the DEIS that most electrical generation
12 is from natural gas-fired sources was true in
13 2003, this assertion is now incorrect by the
14 recent accelerated development of wind power
15 19:19:14 generation.

16 Noted in the introduction to the latest
17 Council's biannual monitoring report on the
18 fifth power plan dated January 5, 2007, the
19 plan -- quote: The plan found that the region
20 19:19:28 had a surplus of generating capability and the
21 need for new generation from coal or natural
22 gas likely would be -- would not occur until
23 after 2012, after the five-year action plan,
24 period, end quote.

25 19:19:46 And in summary, high energy prices,

1 19:19:48 quote -- I'm sorry. High energy prices and
2 concerns about potential climate change policy
3 have also led to excessive development of wind
4 power in the Pacific Northwest. In the two
5 19:20:00 years since the Council adopted the fifth power
6 plan, new generation capacity and slow-demand
7 growth have increased the electrical supply
8 surface in the region, which further delays the
9 need for new generating capability.

10 19:20:17 In view of the above -- of the above, it
11 is requested that FERC and its contract
12 consultants reevaluate: One, the role of
13 alternative energy sources in relation to the
14 proposed -- proposed project using more
15 19:20:33 contemporary and regional data and, two, the
16 necessity for the proposed project in the first
17 place.

18 Thank you very much.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much for
20 19:20:46 your comments.

21 Next I think we have Mr. Dragich.

22 MR. STEVE DRAGICH: Mr. Dragich,
23 D-R-A-G-I-C-H, representing the Dragich Trust.

24 I find it ironic tonight in your rules of
25 19:21:03 decorum that you want the landowners identified

1 19:21:06 under milepost when under the FERC Commission's
2 own rules titled, Critical Energy
3 Infrastructure Information, these
4 identifications and pipeline routes are denied,
5 19:21:20 and it's been further pushed by the proponents,
6 through their attorney, VanNess & Feldman, for
7 the FERC Commission in Washington, D.C., that
8 they have submitted to the FERC Commission a
9 so-called privacy right, which the landowners
10 19:21:38 lists and the privacy for the pipeline routes
11 have been denied.

12 Yet, in the original filing by the
13 proponent in June of 2006, a full 514 names of
14 landowners, their tax records, and their legal
15 19:21:59 descriptions were filed with the original
16 application, has been mentioned under your
17 rules through executive orders through the FERC
18 Commission, rules four -- executive orders four
19 through six. You've designated the emergency
20 19:22:17 response plan as CEII, and you've also
21 designated the water suitability assessment
22 CEII.

23 Since you've restricted all the
24 information to the public, including the
25 19:22:32 required forms under CEII and the Freedom of

1 19:22:35 Information Act, to which this speaker has
2 submitted 94 Freedom of Information Acts to
3 federal agencies, the bulk of which were to
4 FERC, all of which have been denied, yet you
5 19:22:51 expect us to make an informed decision on any
6 environmental impacts on this proposal.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
8 comments.

9 I believe Vance Fraser is next. After
10 19:23:14 Vance, we have Marjorie Castle. And then --
11 Marjie Castle and then Daniel Serres.

12 MR. VANCE FRASER: Hello. My name is
13 Vance Fraser, f-R-A-S-E-R, a landowner.

14 I once heard a wise man say just because
15 19:23:35 you can do something doesn't mean you should.
16 Just because it's possible to build an LNG
17 facility at Bradwood doesn't mean it's the wise
18 thing to do. Actually, quite the opposite.

19 Since FERC is a federal agency, supposedly
20 19:23:46 concerned with national interests, how is it
21 wise to be sucking our economy dry, sending our
22 energy dollars overseas for imported energy and
23 likely to countries that fund terrorists that
24 kill our troops? Why not boost our own economy
25 19:24:02 and make our nation more secure by recycling

1 19:24:06 those energy dollars here at home? Rather than
2 promoting development of LNG, why aren't we
3 promoting development of that 500 miles of
4 shale oil between Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming?

5 19:24:18 It wasn't that long ago that President Bush
6 stated that we import too much foreign energy.

7 How is it wise to drive out cheaper
8 Canadian and Rocky Mountain supplies for more
9 expensive LNG, which arrives by ship and can be

10 19:24:31 cut off at any time? How is it wise to make us
11 pay more for foreign LNG just because Northwest
12 Natural Gas wants it, when other pipeline

13 companies are more than willing to bring us
14 North American gas, like the existing Canadian

15 19:24:45 and Williams pipelines along with the new Rocky
16 Mountain pipeline coming our way? How is it
17 wise to import LNG when North American gas
18 won't be drying out seals, causing equipment
19 damage, and explosions like LNG gas has?

20 19:25:00 You are a regulator and are justifying the
21 damage and detrimental impacts to this region
22 due to the supposed need for LNG and are buying
23 into the NorthernStar's and Northwest Gas work
24 (inaudible). NorthernStar has claimed time and

25 19:25:16 again that the LNG gas is for the Northwest and

1 19:25:19 that we need it.

2 It is time once and for all to make them
3 prove it, and here is how: It's time to
4 actually regulate. Restrict all LNG that comes
5 19:25:30 into the Northwest to stay in the Northwest.

6 Limit the use of LNG gas to Oregon, Washington,
7 and Idaho, as well as any electrical generation
8 made from it. If NorthernStar is unwilling to
9 agree to this, then their whole premise is

10 19:25:46 false.

11 We don't need the LNG, and there's no
12 justification to delay other ships on the
13 river, no justification to lose port jobs in
14 the process, no justification to direct --

15 19:25:56 wreck the river for fishermen or recreation,
16 nor farms nor properties, and no reason to
17 bring in the terrorist tax.

18 If FERC is unwilling to make these
19 restrictions, then FERC is aiding and abetting
20 19:26:12 foreign energy interests, and America is for
21 sale yet again. This whole community is filled
22 with people who think it is a waste of time to
23 come here to speak. If you truly want to know
24 their minds, put it to a vote.

25 19:26:25 Thank you.

1 19:26:27 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
2 comments.

3 Next is Marjorie Castle.

4 MS. MARJORIE CASTLE: Marjorie Castle.

5 19:26:36 M-A-R-J-O-R-I-E, C-A-S-T-L-E. Landowner. I
6 can't tell you exactly where I am along the
7 pipeline route because that's CEII.

8 In the DEIS it states that you did not
9 consider the Palomar pipeline as part of this
10 19:27:00 application because it was directly -- not
11 directly tied to the application or mentioned
12 in the application. However, quoting from

13 NorthernStar natural gas's filing on 12/15/2006
14 to the SEC, it states: We have agreed with the

15 19:27:17 Northwest Natural Gas Company, Northwest
16 Natural, to coordinate the permitting of a
17 connecting pipeline under a consulting services
18 agreement, which also provides Northwest
19 Natural with a nonexclusive option to construct

20 19:27:28 and own the connecting pipeline rather the
21 pipeline.

22 It goes on to say that, simultaneously, we
23 are nearing completion of our negotiations with
24 Bradwood's pipeline partner, Northwest Natural,

25 19:27:44 for Northwest Natural to construct and own the

1 19:27:48 Bradwood pipeline. If these negotiations
2 result in a definitive agreement, we anticipate
3 transferring to Northwest Natural any FERC
4 authorizations that we may have received that
5 19:27:59 are necessary for Northwest Natural to
6 construct and operate the pipeline; meaning
7 that, since December of 2006, in all
8 possibilities, Northwest Natural Gas has
9 purchased the Bradwood line -- the Bradwood
10 19:28:14 pipeline prior to it even be permitting.

11 It further says, through Northwest
12 Natural's transportation arrangements, gas from
13 Bradwood will have access to TransCanada GTN
14 pipeline, which runs from Kingsgate at the
15 19:28:30 Canadian border to Malin in Northern California
16 as well as markets in Nevada and Idaho. LNG
17 supplies only -- LNG suppliers owning LNG
18 terminal capacity in Bradwood will have access
19 to 9 billion cubic feet per day of natural gas
20 19:28:46 demand.

21 In addition to the Bradwood pipeline
22 application, we have recently submitted a
23 request for service to TransCanada and
24 Northwest Natural for their open season under
25 19:28:59 which they would construct, own, and operate a

1 19:29:01 pipeline that would connect the terminal to
2 Williams Northwest at Molalla and TransCanada's
3 GTN pipeline near Madras.

4 This will provide Bradwood and other
5 19:29:13 shippers with gas transportation service from
6 the LNG terminal to the pipeline systems of
7 both the Northwest Pipeline Company and
8 TransCanada's GTN pipeline, which can deliver
9 approximately 2 billion cubic feet per day into

10 19:29:29 Northern California at the Malin-Oregon
11 interconnect point.

12 If it was not Northwest Natural Gas and
13 NorthernStar's intent to take this gas to
14 California, then why would they state it in
15 19:29:43 their SEC? Why is Palomar not considered in
16 the DEIS? And why is the pipeline being
17 constructed through Cowlitz County?

18 Thank you.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
20 19:30:01 comments.

21 We have Daniel Serres, and then Warren.

22 MR. DANIEL SERRES: My name is Dan Serres,
23 S-E-R-R-E-S, spelling of the last name. I was
24 born in Oregon City, and I didn't think I would
25 19:30:33 be that relevant, a Clackamas County residence,

1 19:30:36 until I found out about the Palomar pipeline,
2 but Marjorie already addressed that so I'll
3 take on something else.

4 I want to focus on two things. One is the
5 19:30:45 process by which this DEIS has come to us,
6 which has been disjointed, uninformative, and
7 just unhelpful to the public in terms of
8 understanding the impacts of this project. I
9 would point out the purpose of this project is
10 19:31:02 stated, as you said, to import LNG to provide a
11 new supply of gas to the Pacific Northwest.

12 The Environmental Impact Statement doesn't
13 take a comprehensive view of how to provide
14 either a new supply of gas to the Pacific
15 19:31:15 Northwest or a reliable source of energy,
16 period, to the Pacific Northwest. And again I
17 would refer back to Gloria MacKenzie who gave
18 really excellent testimony on the importance of
19 wind energy in this area.

20 19:31:30 The second key thing I would point out is
21 that there's key omissions in the DEIS. The
22 public is asked to comment on a project it
23 doesn't fully understand. This has been a
24 situation ever since the beginning. You can't
25 19:31:43 hear -- many of the questions you heard, you

1 19:31:45 were there, at the scoping session remain
2 unanswered. Simple questions: Where is the
3 pipeline going? Am I on the pipeline? There
4 are people in the room that they might be, but
5 19:31:56 they're not really sure.

6 It doesn't make any sense to be in this
7 stage of the process and not have a clear
8 understanding of the process. Three tanks or
9 two? There are outstanding permits in the
10 19:32:07 process that say three tanks and two. I will
11 submit detailed written comments on that issue.

12 Other things, the public's being asked to
13 evaluate what the environmental impact is going
14 to be of this project. We can't see the water
15 19:32:22 assessment, presumably a couple hundred pages.
16 We've seen a summary of that report, a water
17 suitability report. We can't see the emergency
18 response plan. Everybody here, regardless of
19 whether they're wearing a blue pin or red one,
20 19:32:37 is probably going to be a participant of any
21 emergency response plan that is formally part
22 of this project.

23 It makes no sense, as Carol Carver said
24 first of all to wait until the permit is issued
25 19:32:46 and, secondly, to keep the public in the dark.

1 19:32:49 Quite literally in the dark.

2 We can't see the ballast water on the
3 (inaudible). I mean, I don't see why this is
4 critical energy obstruction information. I

5 19:33:01 think it's -- it's an example of how the public
6 can't tell from that public state fisheries and
7 local economy are being accurately vetted in
8 this DEIS.

9 Finally, it says that FERC should not
10 19:33:14 infer mitigation in any of those three areas --
11 health, safety, and fisheries. And health and
12 safety are key issues on the pipeline because
13 this pipeline is in extremely geotechnically
14 complicated areas, like the first two miles of

15 19:33:27 the pipeline, which go right through a cliff
16 that has slid off multiple times the past few
17 years. The railroad below was closed last
18 winter because of the slide in the same general
19 area where they were going to drill right

20 19:33:42 through in the first two miles.

21 The description in the EIS as to why that
22 route was chosen rather than going through the
23 railroad --

24 (Reporter requests clarification.)

25 19:33:58 MR. DANIEL SERRES: Sure. This will all

1 19:33:59 be in writing. Don't worry about it.

2 Finally, I'll point out the ballast water.

3 You have to measure the impacts to fisheries as
4 if there was ballast water screening. At this

5 19:34:09 point the public -- first of all, it doesn't
6 want to see the screening. Secondly, as far as

7 deferring implementation of any ballast water

8 screening to a third party, you're saying,

9 well, we're going to ask NorthernStar to ensure

10 19:34:24 and come up with a plan that any ship will have
11 ballast water screening.

12 I see nothing in the DEIS to enforce that,

13 whether it be NOAA or FERC. Unless you exhibit

14 mitigation you areally aren't assured it will

15 19:34:36 succeed. Okay? Yeah, I'll wrap up. Then

16 mitigation -- or your mitigation plan falls

17 apart. You have to give a reasonable assurance

18 of success for mitigation for the fish.

19 And finally, I want to say that along the

20 19:34:51 pipeline, very similar issues, along with

21 response to the various issues where, again,

22 these issues have problems. We're going to

23 mitigate this way or we're going to mitigate

24 that way. If they're kept from the public and

25 19:35:02 deferred to some agency at a later process

1 19:35:05 that's not public, then this DEIS is deficient
2 and (inaudible) environment and into the local
3 economy. Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
5 19:35:18 commence. Almost all are these good going to
6 be addressed in the FEIS because they're
7 complex.

8 There are two things I can address. First
9 of all, pipeline route is disclosed in the
10 19:35:29 DEIS. You can actually go to the back of the
11 DEIS and see the route on USGS quadrant maps.
12 Also, NorthernStar's application is only for
13 two storage tanks. If the FERC authorizes this
14 facility, it would only be for two tanks.

15 19:35:48 Next speaker, please.

16 MR. WARREN MAKKELA: Good evening. My
17 name is Warren Makkela. M-A-K-K-E-L-A,
18 (inaudible.) I represent the Association of
19 Lower Columbia River Flood Control. These are
20 19:36:10 drainage entities within Multnomah and Columbia
21 counties.

22 Specifically addressing the route of the
23 pipeline which will cross levees underneath --
24 directly underneath levees within our member
25 19:36:28 districts, first, they are the Wetland Drainage

1 19:36:32 Improvement Company, the Web District
2 Improvement Company, the Midland Drainage
3 Improvement Company, and the Beaver Drainage
4 Improvement Company, informally Drainage.

5 19:36:44 These districts are organized under ORS
6 Chapter 554, and our authority and mission is
7 to provide flood control and drainage, flood
8 control from floods on the Columbia River and
9 drainage from winter storms. Our member
10 19:37:08 districts are concerned about boring --
11 directly boring beneath levees. We are
12 obligated and -- they're addressed here -- are
13 obligated to comply with the contracts with the
14 United States because of -- in compliance with
15 19:37:32 the 1950 and 1938 Federal Flood Control Act.

16 The districts have received benefits from
17 the United States. In return, we are
18 obligated, the member districts are obligated,
19 to abide by the published United States Corps
20 19:37:52 of Engineers Levee Improvement Standards. This
21 does not allow direct boring beneath levees.
22 Therefore, we're in a position to have to deny
23 access to our -- boring beneath our levee
24 easements.

25 19:38:14 In addition, there are the other questions

1 19:38:18 outside of federal -- United States Army Corps
2 of Engineers jurisdictions are drainage ditches
3 (inaudible). They exist and are maintained on
4 a recyclable basis of five to seven years, and
5 19:38:35 we are concerned that the pipeline be well
6 protected, armored or deep enough, that there
7 is no way that we can damage the pipeline in
8 the event of an accident -- or in the event of
9 contacting the pipeline through our digging
10 19:38:52 operations. Therefore, we ask that the
11 pipeline be protected in some manner or other,
12 have them develop these -- or beneath the
13 drainage ditches.

14 Thank you. I will give you a copy here
15 19:39:05 and make it a part of the record with the
16 Corps' standards and procedures.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Whenever I get
18 something from the audience like this, that's
19 in written form, I will put it in the record.

20 19:39:34 MS. PATRICIA TERHAAR: Walt Multanen. And
21 then Casey Kegg.

22 MR. WALT MULTANEN: Walt Multanen.
23 M-U-L-T-A-N-E-N. I'm a property owner,
24 possibly enjoined within a few feet of the
25 19:40:07 proposed pipeline.

1 19: 40: 08 Any and all comments that I was going to
2 make have already been made. A lot of thoughts
3 that I never entertained have been brought to
4 the surface, and so all I can do is second the
5 19: 40: 22 motion that the Bradwood Landing permit be
6 denied. Thank you.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
8 comments.

9 Casey Kegg is next. And after that, Randy
10 19: 40: 43 Martin.

11 MR. CASEY KEGG: Good evening. My name is
12 Casey Kegg, K-E-G-G. I'm a single father of
13 two kids. I currently live in Astoria, and I
14 rent a room in Westport. Right now I'm wiring
15 19: 41: 05 number seven paper mill. I'm here tonight on
16 behalf of the IBEW Local 48, a union
17 organization currently with 3500 members. Some
18 of them are here tonight out in the audience.

19 We strongly support the Bradwood project.
20 19: 41: 20 We think it's a clean and a safe project;
21 believe in the local jobs, union work; good for
22 the schools and the economy, both local and
23 state. On behalf of myself and the IBEW Local
24 48, we'd like to thank you for listening to our
25 19: 41: 37 viewpoints.

1 19:41:40 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

2 MR. RANDY MARTIN: Randy Martin. That's

3 R-A-N-D-Y, M-A-R-T-I-N. I'm an electrician

4 chairman of the IBEW Local 48 coast unit and

5 19:42:10 one of the delegates to the Clatsop/Tillamook

6 AFL/CIO Central Labor Council. Subjective

7 statements are less useful to the FERC staff,

8 so I'll just try to stick to the facts.

9 I was there when our Astoria mayoral

10 19:42:30 council and the IBEW coast unit gave its

11 endorsement of the Bradwood Landing project.

12 NorthernStar's slogan of good jobs and clean

13 energy just about says it all, so I don't have

14 a lot to add. I just want to second their

15 19:42:48 slogan a bit.

16 Good jobs. My family came to Westport,

17 Oregon, almost 20 years ago after chasing a

18 good job through five states in two years, on

19 the road in a travel trailer. That job was

20 19:43:04 provided in part by natural gas used to power

21 the paper machines and the boilers at the now

22 Georgia-Pacific-owned Wauna mill.

23 During my 20 years here, I've helped

24 install Northwest Natural Gas's turbine

25 19:43:21 compressors up at Mist, the pipelines there.

1 19: 43: 24 They used those compressors and pipelines to
2 inject and extract natural gas from their Mist
3 storage field. I might add, with a spotless
4 safety record.

5 19: 43: 40 I want to continue the partnership with
6 good supplies of natural gas, with good
7 suppliers of natural gas. These jobs were in
8 part provided by natural gas. I want to avoid
9 the economic hardship that my family had to go

10 19: 44: 04 through searching for a good job throughout the
11 American West.

12 The other slogan, clean energy. We need a
13 good, clean supply of energy, and a lot of
14 people using that term here, but there's just

15 19: 44: 23 two products right there that I know perhaps
16 put to use. Would you rather see a new nuke
17 down there or oil refinery? Maybe a coal-fired
18 generator? Perhaps now that another promising
19 industrial site has been identified along the

20 19: 44: 42 Columbia River, who knows what could come next.

21 A bird in the hand, especially an
22 environmentally benign bird, may be the best
23 way to go. NorthernStar has promised to do
24 their best to mitigate environmental damages

25 19: 45: 01 and replace that habitat disturbed for whole.

1 19:45:07 Let's not be those not-in-my-backyard-type
2 people who would deny future generations clean
3 energy and new jobs.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. I believe that
5 19:45:21 Mr. Martin was the last speaker on the list.
6 Is there anyone who has not yet spoken who
7 wishes to speak? If so, please raise your
8 hand.

9 All right. At this time if anyone spoke
10 19:45:34 earlier who did not -- who feels they have more
11 to say, wants another three minutes, I'll allow
12 it.

13 MS. GLORIA MacKENZIE: I don't need three
14 minutes.

15 19:45:47 MR. FRIEDMAN: I do need you to go to the
16 microphone. Again, any time anyone speaks,
17 they need to state their name and spell it for
18 the court reporter.

19 MS. GLORIA MacKENZIE: My name is Gloria
20 19:45:59 MacKenzie. M-A-C-K-E-N-Z-I-E.

21 I don't have the specifics with me, but I
22 believe it is the Corps of Engineers' permit
23 application, dated I believe October 18th,
24 where it states that the pipeline route is
25 19:46:20 Germany Creek, and that is a definite

1 19:46:24 difference between the DEIS. And I did call,
2 and they did say at the Corps of Engineers that
3 they believe it might be Germany Creek and not
4 Abernathy Creek. So -- and I'm sorry, I don't
5 19:46:41 have the paperwork. I just wanted to clear up
6 that one point that you seem to be not sure of,
7 Mr. Friedman. Thank you.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Like I said earlier, the
9 pipeline is in the DEIS. You can look at it.

10 19:46:58 MS. GLORIA MacKENZIE: Okay. But you look
11 at the Corps of Engineers' paperwork, their
12 application, because it is definitely
13 different.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's something we'll look
15 19:47:06 at before we recommend the DEIS.

16 MS. GLORIA MacKENZIE: Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

18 Are there any more speakers from the
19 floor? Please come on up and get your three
20 19:47:16 minutes. Just make sure you restate your name
21 for the record and spell it.

22 MR. BILL CASTLE: Thank you. My name is
23 Bill Castle, C-A-S-T-L-E. I'm on the pipeline
24 route, and I would challenge FERC as to where
25 19:47:29 the pipeline is. You cannot tell me within a

1 19:47:32 hundred feet where it's going to be going under
2 the Columbia River, from the Washington side.
3 We have seen three different satellite images
4 showing different spots in which this is going
5 19:47:44 to be.

6 We've been told in the very beginning that
7 our five acres was going to be the drill site.
8 As of last -- two weeks ago, down in Astoria,
9 Mr. Garrett did come up to me and tell me that
10 19:47:58 it is not on our property, but he would also
11 not tell me exactly where it is. If I'm not
12 mistaken, the draft environmental statement
13 says they can move that pipeline 30 days prior
14 to construction.

15 19:48:09 We've seen a report that also states that
16 up to three possibilities that a geological
17 outfit in Portland did that right back up on
18 our property, is the most economical, yet we're
19 not privy to that information.

20 19:48:25 This also is a concern whether it's on the
21 ridge between Mill Creek and Abernathy, it is
22 not at Germany Creek, that there's
23 approximately 20 wells that are going to be
24 affected by this. According to this draft
25 19:48:44 environmental statement, what's defined as a

1 19:48:46 shallow well? We drilled 140 feet, got six
2 gallon a minute. We drill to 522 feet to get
3 14 gallons a minute. Is that defined as a
4 shallow well?

5 19:48:59 If they disturb the water, if they drill
6 within 120 feet of our well, I would bet that's
7 going to disturb that shale aquifer, that the
8 water runs through in that aquifer, especially
9 if they use their bentonite process.

10 19:49:17 The other thing that we have written, my
11 wife and I have written to the FERC is about
12 the hillside they're going to drill on. Even
13 if it is not on our property, I cannot get a
14 straight answer from even Mr. Garrett; get only

15 19:49:26 told that I'm using the best engineers that
16 money can buy; that I challenge you cannot fool
17 Mother Nature on this issue when we live in an
18 area in which the hillsides fall off the top by
19 themselves.

20 19:49:41 It's estimated that it will take between
21 five and 11 million pounds of pressure to pull
22 this pipeline under the river. This hillside
23 where this is going to be at is steeper than
24 one to one. Now, not even you guys back here

25 19:49:53 that live here, do you suppose that hillside

1 19:49:57 might fall off?

2 I don't get any straight answers, and
3 FERC's had this information since the first
4 filing or permitting that was mailed back in --

5 19:50:04 almost two and a half years ago -- excuse me --
6 15 months, thereabouts. Nobody's answered
7 these questions yet, and I think they need to
8 be addressed.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
10 19:50:16 comments.

11 Mr. MacKenzie? Does anyone else want to
12 speak? Again, please restate your name and
13 spell it for the court reporter.

14 MR. DUNCAN MacKENZIE: My name is Duncan
15 19:50:26 MacKenzie. D-U-N-C-A-N, M-A-C-K-E-N-Z-I-E.

16 Reference was made to the operational
17 noise aspects of the LNG terminals found in the
18 DEIS on page 4-392 and table 4.10.2-4. There
19 appear to be a number of missing equipment
20 19:50:44 elements in this table, most notably the noise
21 contributions arising from where nitrogen and
22 unknown quantity of vapor return blowers and
23 most blaringly the five 2,335-horsepower
24 sendout pumps. The overall decibel levels
25 19:51:00 figures cited are uncharacterized as to whether

1 19:51:02 the value is from a single unit or multiple
2 units, and whether or not the figure includes
3 the motor associated device or is the device
4 alone.

5 19:51:11 Furthermore, the number of units of
6 specific type is undocumented. It is the -- it
7 is noted that the noise level of the submerged
8 combustion vaporizer is 118 decibels on an
9 unweighted scale. Is this a generalized

10 19:51:24 composite value comprised a generous source of
11 suppressed fund of vaporizers, such as
12 combustion air blowers, blower motors, blower
13 intake and exhaust fans? Is this one unit or
14 the worst case of seven units operating

15 19:51:34 simultaneously?

16 If the plant is expanded to the three
17 proposed additional SDPs, how much will this
18 increase the noise level? 118 dB noise level
19 of the vaporizer appears to be an overall

20 19:51:48 measurement only without characterization shown
21 for which frequencies the various levels might
22 occur. If there is a significant low-frequency
23 component to this sound, will it affect the
24 overall reception of the noise?

25 19:52:00 Finally, as found in the applicant's

1 19: 52: 02 Resource Report 9, submission section 4.9,
2 sound propagation factors on page 9(b)-11,
3 hills surrounding the facility were modeled
4 from GIS contours at 20-meter height intervals
5 19: 52: 15 to simulate shielding from the terrain at
6 noise-sensitive areas to the west of the
7 facility. This modeling assumption needs more
8 as the noise-sensitive area designated as M2
9 inhabited areas to the east of the site on
10 19: 52: 28 Puget Island. The hills, rather than shielding
11 of the shoreline area in Puget Island, serve as
12 a reflective surface instead, especially the
13 rock face at the southern end of the site.

14 The overall presentation of the operation
15 19: 52: 40 of noise aspects associated with proposed LNG
16 terminals is, at best, cursory and does not
17 include significant equipment elements. It's
18 requested that FERC recommend the applicant
19 provide a far more complete and realistic
20 19: 52: 55 assessment of the noise arising from the
21 operations of the site.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

23 Anyone else want to have an opportunity?
24 Please state and spell your name for the court
25 19: 53: 07 reporter.

1 19:53:08 MR. STEVE DRAGICH: D-R-A-G-I-C-H. I'll
2 speak specifically to the Corps of Engineers
3 401 and 404 permit application, issued on
4 October 18th, 2007, specifically the river mile
5 19:53:24 that they designated for the crossing at the
6 Columbia River.

7 Under the National Oceanographic and
8 Atmospheric Administration that prints most of
9 the navigational charts in the United States,
10 19:53:37 they designate river miles. At the crossing
11 location, they designated in the Corps permit
12 river mile 54. This does not exist on any know
13 charts. They're in five-mile intervals, and
14 the nearest river mile is 55, which is
15 19:53:56 approximately between the Abernathy point and
16 the Bunker Hill point on the Washington state
17 side of the river. This is just another
18 example of the vagueness in the permit
19 application when one federal agency is unsure
20 19:54:15 of where the exact crossing location is.

21 Now, you mention the USGS quadrant maps.
22 These are basically contour maps. In this area
23 of river crossing there are four quadrants:
24 The Clatskanie, the Stella, and the Riderwood
25 19:54:34 (phonetic). At a photo scale reciprocal which

1 19: 54: 38 the maps were derived from, which are aerial
2 photos, the first flight mentioned in this area
3 was taken in 1923. During the second -- before
4 the Second World War they were -- a reflight
5 19: 54: 52 was taken, which your maps in the back of your
6 DEIS are based on, were taken in 1940.

7 And I have copies from FERC on the
8 supposed -- one of the proposed pipeline routes
9 that are so illegible that you can't even see
10 19: 55: 12 the contours from the USGS maps. This Corps
11 permit for the clean water and wetlands permit
12 is just another example of how vague the permit
13 process has gone in this proposal.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
15 19: 55: 32 comments.

16 Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

17 MR. DANIEL SERRES: Dan Serres again.
18 S-E-R-R-E-S. I just have a couple of points.
19 First I want to make clear the question is both
20 19: 55: 48 where the pipeline's going, because the maps,
21 as Mr. Dragich pointed out, are not incredibly
22 high resolution. Actually, the best maps I
23 have seen are in the bio assessment for this
24 facility.

25 19: 56: 01 The question is not so much that actually

1 19:56:04 as it is who's on the pipeline? And that's --
2 that's pretty important for evaluating
3 socioeconomic impact of this project. I think,
4 in general, socioeconomic impacts on this
5 19:56:15 project is entirely weighted on one side. We
6 have the benefits, you know, with huge
7 assumptions made about natural gas or LNG
8 coming into the area.

9 Secondly, I wanted to point out -- let me
10 19:56:31 see. I lost my spot. Sorry. That's it.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
13 comments.

14 Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

15 19:56:48 All right.

16 MS. MARJORIE CASTLE: Marjorie Castle,
17 C-A-S-T-L-E, landowner.

18 In the draft EIS it states, as
19 NorthernStar has stated, that there would be
20 19:57:01 125 deliveries per year, meaning 125 vessels in
21 the river. NorthernStar anticipated 125
22 deliveries for a total of 25 million cubic
23 meters of LNG per year. However, according to
24 the Sandia study and the waterways suitability
25 19:57:22 assessment, the Coast Guard is restricting

1 19:57:26 NorthernStar to the smaller vessels no greater
2 than 148,000 cubic meters, until additional
3 analysis addressing vessels with higher cargo
4 capabilities is completed.

5 19:57:38 NorthernStar, though, has continued to use
6 the figures of 125 deliveries per year, or a
7 total of 18,500 -- or 18,500,000 cubic meters
8 of gas using the smaller 140 -- up to
9 140,000-cubic-meter vessels. That means that
10 19:57:58 they would be accepting a loss of 6.5 million
11 cubic meters of gas per year.

12 One of two things is happening here.
13 NorthernStar either does not have customers to
14 warrant the need for the additional deliveries
15 19:58:12 to pick up the loss in revenue, or NorthernStar
16 is being less than truthful to us about how
17 many deliveries will actually occur using the
18 smaller ships and that they actually anticipate
19 as many as 169 vessels per year in the river.

20 19:58:30 This would mean an LNG ship would be coming up
21 the river, one per day, according to their
22 figures; at the pier, 24-hour unloading period;
23 or going down the river another day, for over
24 500 days in a 365-day year.

25 19:58:48 Questions that I think that should be

1 19:58:50 addressed in the final EIS:

2 How many ships will indeed be in the river
3 during the course of a year?

4 And what impact will that have on the

5 19:58:59 shipping of all ports along the Columbia and
6 the Snake river system, socioeconomics?

7 What will the cumulative environmental and
8 endangered species impact be if NorthernStar
9 does increase the amount of shipments per year?

10 19:59:14 If the research is completed to the
11 satisfaction of the Coast Guard and the larger
12 mega vessels are allowed into the river, what
13 will be the impact on all identified
14 environmental issues as well as the socioeconomic

15 19:59:25 impact on all other stakeholders along the
16 Columbia and Snake river systems?

17 What is the plan of action to be taken if
18 the 1200-foot mega tankers are allowed and
19 erosion of beachfront occurs, leading to

20 19:59:39 lawsuits?

21 Who will monitor the truthfulness of the
22 information in the NorthernStar's land use
23 application and be accountable to the people
24 and environment for actions they perform in

25 19:59:50 opposition to what was understood, since

1 19:59:51 several justifications for adoption of
2 applications and the permitting process are
3 based on, "it is our understanding"?

4 Thank you.

5 20:00:04 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

6 Is there anyone else? Okay.

7 MR. VANCE FRASER: Vance Fraser again.

8 F-R-A-S-E-R.

9 The DEIS should include a sensitivity
10 20:00:18 analysis on the impacts that would occur when
11 multiple LNG facilities are allowed on the
12 Columbia River by equal protection law, and far
13 more jobs will be lost than gained at the ports
14 when that occurs.

15 20:00:38 Secondly, Oregon is simply being used, and
16 I do mean "used," as a backboard to California,
17 regardless of what any made-up studies the
18 promoters say. The California Lands
19 Commissioner has stated so, and Oregon Public
20 20:00:56 Utilities Commissioner has also stated that the
21 majority of the imported and regasified LNG
22 would go to California.

23 Why aren't these statements in the DEIS,
24 rather than just quoting the Northwest Natural
25 20:01:14 Gas Association? Why aren't the results of

1 20:01:21 existing pipeline capacity meetings, which
2 state "no increase needed," also included in
3 the EIS?

4 Thank you.

5 20:01:33 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

6 Has everyone had an opportunity to speak
7 who wanted to? If that's the case, at this
8 time I'd like to wrap up this meeting, close
9 up. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
10 20:01:47 Commission, I want to thank you all for coming
11 here tonight, providing your comments on the
12 DEIS for the Bradwood Landing LNG project. Let
13 the record show that this meeting concluded at
14 approximately 8:00 p.m. Thank you.

15 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:00 P.M.)

16 * * *

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

	TESTIMONY INDEX	
		Page
1		
2		
3	Testimony by Ms. Diane Pohl	17
4	Testimony by Ms. Carol Carver	18
5	Testimony by Mr. Duncan MacKenzie	22
6	Testimony by Ms. Gayle Kiser	25
7	Testimony by Ms. Gloria MacKenzie	28
8	Testimony by Mr. Steve Dragich	30
9	Testimony by Mr. Vance Fraser	32
10	Testimony by Ms. Marjorie Castle	35
11	Testimony by Mr. Daniel Serres	37
12	Testimony by Mr. Warren Makkel a	42
13	Testimony by Mr. Walt Multanen	44
14	Testimony by Mr. Casey Kegg	45
15	Testimony by Mr. Randy Martin	46
16	Testimony by Ms. Gloria MacKenzie	48
17	Testimony by Mr. Bill Castle	49
18	Testimony by Mr. Steve Dragich	55
19	Testimony by Mr. Daniel Serres	56
20	Testimony by Ms. Marjorie Castle	57
21	Testimony by Mr. Vance Fraser	60

22

* * *

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I, Robin L. Nodl and, a Washington Certified Shorthand Reporter, an Oregon Certified Shorthand Reporter, a Registered Diplomat Reporter, and a Certified Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in stenotype the proceedings had upon the hearing of this matter, previously captioned herein; that I transcribed my stenotype notes through computer-aided transcription; and that the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate record of all proceedings had during the hearing of said matter, and of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this 30th day of November, 2007.

Washington CSR No. 2530

Oregon CSR No. 90-0056