

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

* * *

Tuesday, November 6, 2007

6:30 p.m.

J. A. Wendt Elementary School
265 South First Street
Cathlamet, Washington

* * *

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
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm going to forego the microphone and speaker. It's not working. I'm going to have to use my big, loud, federal voice.

I'm Paul Friedman, and I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. We abbreviate that as F-E-R-C, or FERC, or the Commission. I work for the Office of Energy Projects in Washington, D.C., and I want to welcome you here tonight as the project manager for what's called the Bradwood Landing liquefied natural gas, or LNG, project.

We recently produced a draft Environmental Impact Statement for that project, and this meeting is a public meeting to take comments on that draft Environmental Impact Statement, or DEIS, which was issued by the FERC for the Bradwood Landing liquefied natural gas, LNG, project.

Let the record show that this meeting was called to order at about 6:35 p.m. on Tuesday, November 6th, 2007, at J.A. Wendt Elementary School, 265 South First Street, Cathlamet,

1 18:38:02 Washington 98612.

2 We've already held this week two other
3 meetings in Clatskanie, Oregon. And if you
4 attended those meetings, I'm afraid what you're

5 18:38:15 going to hear tonight is going to be pretty
6 much redundant. I give the same speech over
7 and over again, and that's because we have a
8 court reporter here transcribing all of the
9 meetings, and I want all of the meetings to be

10 18:38:26 run in a similar manner.

11 You may have noticed that we have a court
12 reporter transcribing this meeting. This is so
13 we can have an accurate record of tonight's
14 comments. Within a few weeks a copy of the
15 18:38:41 transcript will be placed in the public record
16 of this proceeding and will be available
17 through the Internet via the FERC's Web site.

18 Next slide.

19 The FERC is an independent regulatory
20 18:38:54 agency within the U.S. Department of Energy.
21 We regulate the interstate transportation of
22 electricity, hydropower, and natural gas. The
23 Commission is directed by five commissioners,
24 who are appointed by the President of the

25 18:39:07 United States and approved by the U.S.

1 18:39:09 Congress. The FERC staff, like myself, are
2 civil servants.

3 Next slide.

4 On June 5th, 2006, Bradwood Landing LLC
5 18:39:22 filed an application with the FERC requesting
6 permission to construct and operate an LNG
7 import terminal under Section 3 of the Natural
8 Gas Act, or NGA, in docket number CP06-365, and
9 NorthernStar Energy LLC filed an application
10 18:39:41 for an associated natural gas sendout pipeline
11 under Section 7 of the NGA in docket number
12 CP06-366.

13 Hereafter, I will refer to both Bradwood
14 Landing LLC and NorthernStar Energy LLC
15 18:39:57 collectively as just NorthernStar since, in
16 reality, they are subsidiaries of the same
17 company.

18 Next slide.

19 The FERC is the lead federal agency for
20 18:40:08 this project, and we took the lead in producing
21 the EIS in order to comply with the National
22 Environmental Policy Act of 1969, often
23 abbreviated as NEPA. Our EIS also summarizes
24 activities related to compliance with other
25 18:40:25 federal laws, including the Endangered Species

1 18:40:27 Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation
2 and Management Act, the Marine Mammal
3 Protection Act, the National Historical
4 Preservation Act, Clean Water Act, Clean Air
5 18:40:38 Act, and Coastal Zone Management Act.

6 As part of its decision-making process,
7 the FERC will consider the environmental
8 impacts of the project as disclosed in the EIS.
9 The production of the DEIS was a collaborative
10 18:40:53 effort involving the FERC staff and a
11 third-party environmental contractor, which was
12 Natural Resources Group, which is abbreviated
13 as NRG.

14 Let me introduce some of the people who
15 18:41:07 work for NRG who are here tonight and played
16 major roles in the authorship of the DEIS.
17 That would be Patricia Terhaar, who is NRG's
18 project manager for this project. She's
19 running the slide show tonight. And in the
20 18:41:18 back, taking your signatures, is Janelle
21 Rieland. Janelle is the project biologist.

22 We consider our contractors to be an
23 extension of the FERC staff. The federal
24 agencies that cooperated in the production of
25 18:41:32 the DEIS include the U.S. Army Corps of

1 18:41:34 Engineers and the U.S. Coast Guard and the U.S.
2 Department of Transportation. A cooperating
3 agency has jurisdiction by law or special
4 expertise related to project-specific

5 18:41:45 environmental impacts, and those agencies may
6 adopt the EIS to meet their own obligations for
7 compliance with the NEPA.

8 Next slide.

9 We issued a notice of availability, or
10 18:41:59 NOA, for the DEIS on August 17th, 2007, which
11 gave a closing date for comments as December
12 24th, 2007. The U.S. Environmental Protection
13 Agency noticed the issuance of our DEIS in the
14 Federal Register on August 24th, 2007.

15 18:42:14 Next slide.

16 We mailed almost 1300 copies of the
17 DEIS -- that's this big book here -- to various
18 elected officials, federal, state, and local
19 government agencies, landowners; and interested
20 18:42:29 members of the public. In addition, copies

21 were sent to local newspapers and to local
22 libraries. Copies of the DEIS are available at
23 the FERC in Washington, D.C., at our public
24 reference room and may be viewed electronically

25 18:42:44 on the FERC Internet Web site under our

1 18:42:47 eLibrary link.

2 If you want a hard copy like I just showed
3 a second ago, NRG has some extra copies. And
4 if you provide Janelle with your name and
5 18:42:58 address, she will mail you a copy.

6 Next slide.

7 The DEIS described the proposed action.
8 The purpose of the project is to provide a new
9 source of natural gas to the Pacific Northwest
10 18:43:12 by importing LNG. This is the project as
11 described by NorthernStar. LNG is natural gas
12 that has been cooled to about minus 260 degrees
13 Fahrenheit for shipment and storage as a
14 liquid. It can be transported in specially
15 18:43:28 designed ships across origin -- from its point
16 of origin.

17 Next slide.

18 That is an LNG export facility. It's a
19 place where they take natural gas, and they
20 18:43:37 cool it, and then they put it into ships. This
21 one is in Alaska.

22 Next slide.

23 That's a picture of an LNG ship.

24 In summary, the Bradwood Landing LNG
25 18:43:51 project would consist of the following key

1 18: 43: 53 elements.

2 Next slide.

3 An LNG import storage and vaporization and
4 sendoff facility located at Bradwood Landing in

5 18: 44: 00 Clatsop County, Oregon, about 38 miles up the

6 Columbia River from its mouth. The terminal

7 would include a dredged 58-acre maneuvering

8 area adjacent to the existing Columbia River

9 navigational channel and a single berth capable

10 18: 44: 16 of handling LNG ships up to 200,000 cubic

11 meters in capacity.

12 Next.

13 The waterway for LNG marine traffic would
14 extend from 12 nautical miles off the Oregon

15 18: 44: 30 coast up the Columbia River to Bradwood

16 Landing. The upland portion of the terminal

17 would include two full-containment LNG storage

18 tanks with a capacity of 160,000 cubic meters

19 each.

20 18: 44: 42 Next slide.

21 A nonjurisdictional 1.5-mile-long,

22 115-kilovolt power line to be built, owned, and

23 maintained by PacifiCorp going from the

24 existing Bonneville Power Administration system

25 18: 44: 54 to the Bradwood Landing LNG terminal. The LNG

1 18:44:57 terminal would have a maximum sendoff capacity
2 of 1.3 billion cubic feet per day of natural
3 gas.

4 Next slide.

5 18:45:04 A 36.3-mile-long natural gas sendoff
6 pipeline would extend from the Bradwood Landing
7 LNG terminal to an interconnection with the
8 existing Williams Northwest Pipeline
9 Corporation interstate pipeline system near

10 18:45:18 Kelso, Washington. This would include 18.9
11 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline across
12 portions of Clatsop and Columbia counties,
13 Oregon, and 17.5 -- and 17.4 miles of
14 30-inch-diameter pipeline, mostly in Cowlitz
15 County, Washington.

16 Next slide.

17 Associated with the pipeline would be a
18 sendout meter station located within the LNG
19 terminal track, four delivery meter stations
20 18:45:45 and interconnections with the Georgia-Pacific
21 Wauna mill at pipeline milepost, or MP, 3.7,
22 with Northwest Natural's existing pipeline
23 system at MP 11.4, with the existing PGE Beaver
24 power plant at milepost 18.9, and the existing

25 18:46:03 Williams Northwest Pipeline at milepost 36.3.

1 18:46:07 There would be six main line block valves
2 along the pipeline, pig launchers at terminal
3 meter station and Beaver meter station, and pig
4 receivers at Beaver and at Williams Northwest.

5 18:46:19 Next slide.

6 Short, nonjurisdictional pipeline laterals
7 will be built, operated, and maintained by the
8 gas customers to interconnect with
9 NorthernStar's pipeline at Wauna mill,

10 18:46:29 Northwest Natural, and PGE Beaver.

11 I want to clarify that the FERC is not a
12 sponsor of this project. This is a project
13 proposed by NorthernStar. The FERC is a
14 licensing and regulatory agency, and we take no
15 18:46:47 position on this project until after we have
16 completed the full review of NorthernStar's
17 applications.

18 Next slide.

19 Before the FERC makes a decision about the
20 18:47:00 project, there are several steps that must be
21 completed, including public input. The first
22 thing we're going to do is we're going to
23 consider your comments on the DEIS. Because
24 the Commission has the responsibility to treat

25 18:47:12 all parties to a proceeding equally, we must

1 18:47:15 make sure that our process is open and public.

2 For this reason, we are constrained by our

3 own internal ex parte rules. This means that

4 there can be no off-the-record discussions or

5 18:47:27 correspondence between the FERC staff and

6 parties regarding the merits of this case.

7 Therefore, I urge you to either speak tonight

8 on the record or to send us your comments in

9 writing.

10 18:47:38 Next slide.

11 You can use the Internet through the FERC

12 Web page at www.ferc.gov to have access to

13 public records in this proceeding and to post

14 your comments. You may follow filings in this

15 18:47:54 proceeding through the FERC's eSubscription

16 service. You may view all filed documents in

17 the public record through our eLibrary service,

18 and you may send comments in electronically via

19 our e-filing link, or you can send written

20 18:48:09 comments the old-fashioned way through the U.S.

21 mail. Written comments should be addressed to:

22 Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary

23 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

24 888 First Street, Northeast, Room 1A

25 18:48:23 Washington, D.C. 20426.

1 18:48:27 Please reference docket numbers CP06-365
2 and CP06-366. Send one original and two copies
3 of written comments. Label one copy for the
4 attention of the FERC Office of Energy

5 18:48:41 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 all comments on the
9 DEIS in a final EIS, or FEIS. Copies of the
10 18:48:57 FEIS will be sent to all parties on our mail
11 list.

12 After we have issued the FEIS, the FERC
13 staff will analyze both the environmental
14 impacts of the proposed project and all
15 18:49:10 nonenvironmental issues, including markets and
16 rates. The FERC staff would then make
17 recommendations about the project to the five
18 commissioners who are the decision-makers. It
19 is those five Commissioners who will make the
20 18:49:21 final decision about whether or not to
21 authorize this project.

22 Next slide.

23 If the FERC decides to approve the
24 project, the Commissioners would issue an order
25 18:49:32 to NorthernStar. If the Commission issues a

1 18: 49: 35 certifi cate of public convenience and necessi ty
2 for the pipeline under Section 7h of the NGA,
3 that certifi cate would convey to NorthernStar
4 the power of eminent domain for nonfederal and
5 18: 49: 48 nontribal lands along the pipeline route only.

6 If NorthernStar is unable to negotiate an
7 easement agreement with property owners, it may
8 acquire right-of-way easements through the
9 local courts. We urge NorthernStar to
10 18: 50: 01 negotiate in good faith with all landowners to
11 reach agreements. The LNG terminal is under
12 Section 3 of the NGA, which does not include
13 the power of eminent domain.

14 It is likely that a commission order
15 18: 50: 14 authorizing the project would include our
16 recommended environmental conditions as
17 outlined in the EIS. One of the conditions in
18 the DEIS is that NorthernStar should develop
19 and fund a third-party environmental monitoring
20 18: 50: 29 program to be implemented through construction.

21 In addition, the FERC staff will monitor
22 the project during construction and
23 restoration, performing on-site inspections for
24 compliance with the environmental conditions of
25 18: 50: 41 the order. The U.S. Department of

1 18:50:42 Transportation will also monitor the project's
2 design and construction.

3 Next slide.

4 Other agencies must also issue various
5 18:50:52 federal permits or delegated permits before the
6 project could go forward to construction. The
7 Coast Guard would issue a letter of
8 recommendation indicating whether or not the
9 waterway is suitable for LNG marine traffic.

10 18:51:06 The Corps of Engineers would issue a permit
11 under the Rivers and Harbors Act and under
12 section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

13 The Washington Department of Ecology, the
14 Oregon Department of State Lands, the Oregon
15 18:51:16 Department of Environmental Quality would issue
16 federally delegated permits under Section 401
17 of the Clean Water Act. The Oregon Department
18 of Environmental Quality would also issue a
19 federally delegated permit under the Clean Air

20 18:51:29 Act. And the Oregon Department of Land
21 Conservation and Development would make a
22 determination whether or not the project is
23 consistent with the Coastal Zone Management
24 Act.

25 18:51:40 Let me emphasize that this meeting tonight

1 18:51:43 is not a hearing on the merits of
2 NorthernStar's proposal. As I said earlier,
3 the purpose of tonight's meeting is to give
4 you, the public, an opportunity to comment on
5 18:51:53 the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

6 While you may want to declare that you are
7 for or against this project, those kinds of
8 subjective statements are not particularly
9 useful to the FERC staff in focusing our
10 18:52:08 environmental analysis for the FEIS. The type
11 of comments that we do find useful are those
12 that address data gaps in the DEIS or point out
13 factual errors that need to be corrected.

14 Next slide.

15 18:52:23 Before we take public comments, let us run
16 through some general rules of decorum. I know
17 that some of you find the issues here to be
18 very emotional. I ask that you try to remain
19 calm and present your views in a reasoned
20 18:52:36 manner. Here's our rules. The basic rules
21 are:

22 Please show respect for the other
23 participants and the people in this room.

24 Do not shout out from the floor when
25 18:52:44 there's someone speaking.

1 18:52:48 And when I call people up, you will have
2 three minutes to speak.

3 And I will let people go first who have
4 not spoken at other meetings.

5 18:52:59 If you have comments to take more than
6 three minutes to express, please summarize your
7 main points tonight and mail us or send in
8 through e -- eFiling a detailed letter of your
9 comments.

10 18:53:14 This is a meeting for you, the public, to
11 comment on the DEIS. It is not a question or
12 answer forum, because many of your comments and
13 concerns are complex and the FERC staff would
14 need to do some additional research before
15 18:53:26 addressing those issues in the FEIS.

16 Therefore, I would not be able to give accurate
17 or complete responses tonight to most of your
18 questions. Those questions that I do know the
19 answers to, I'll respond to. And I'll

20 18:53:39 certainly address any answers having to do with
21 administrative or procedural issues.

22 Before we start hearing from public
23 speakers, I suggest we take a short,
24 five-minute break. This will give you an

25 18:53:52 opportunity to go over to Janelle and sign up

1 18:53:55 on the speaker's list, if you've not already
2 done so. After we've given you that
3 opportunity, we'll start taking comments from
4 the floor. Thank you.

5 18:56:01 (Recess.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Now is the time
7 you've been waiting for. It's where you get to
8 give us an earful, what your opinions are about
9 the project. We want to hear what you have to

10 18:59:51 say about the DEIS.

11 I'm going to call people in the order in
12 which they signed up, and I will ask that when
13 you come up to the podium, as you can see --
14 when I used the microphones, it didn't work
15 19:00:07 very well. So you're going to have to speak up

16 in your loud voice in case the microphones
17 don't pick up your soft voice. The court
18 reporter needs to hear you, so you might have
19 to speak slower than I did. I tend to speak
20 19:00:19 too fast. You won't be penalized for your
21 three minutes by speaking slowly and
22 enunciating.

23 Clearly state your name, spell your last
24 name for the court reporter, identify any
25 19:00:31 organization you may represent or yourself, if

1 19:00:35 you're an individual. Please tell us if you're
2 a landowner along the pipeline, and if you
3 happen to know the milepost that your land is
4 located on, please tell us that. If you don't
5 19:00:44 know your milepost, there are some NorthernStar
6 people in the back who might be able to locate
7 your land according to milepost, or you can
8 take a look at the DEIS, which has maps with
9 mileposts on it.

10 19:00:56 That said, the last time I was here there
11 was a certain individual who raised her hand
12 all night long, and I kept forgetting to call
13 on her, and tonight she's first on the list.
14 Paula Carlson. You thought I forgot, Paula.

15 19:01:14 MS. PAULA CARLSON: All right. And I
16 didn't want to be first. I signed up as
17 fourth.

18 My name is Paula Carlson. My last name
19 C-A-R-L-S-O-N. I live on Puget Island.

20 19:01:29 The pages that I selected to talk about
21 are page 4-388 and 4-389. NorthernStar has
22 submitted data regarding ambient noise at the
23 west end of Puget Island, which I do not
24 believe is correct. Thus, the conclusions from
25 19:01:47 their data used to project levels of acceptable

1 19:01:50 noise from construction and operation of the
2 facility and noise from LNG tankers docking and
3 undocking is based on false premises.

4 I charge that NorthernStar's numbers have
5 19:02:01 been massaged, and I question whether they have
6 factored water into their calculations properly
7 as a hard site, a condition which will not
8 reduce noise over distance since water, like
9 cement, offers nothing that can absorb the
10 19:02:17 sound energy from their site to the affected
11 residents of Puget Island.

12 It appears that, in order to meet federal
13 guidelines during construction and during
14 operation of the proposed facility, it has
15 19:02:29 fallen upon the company to be selective with
16 the data they have gathered to avoid an
17 accurate interpretation of ambient and
18 background noise and their formulations, and
19 construct their own numbers to fit the grid.

20 19:02:44 Experience living on the island and tuning
21 into the silence or to the breaking of the
22 silence by intermittent ship traffic and
23 occasional dredging of the channel tells me
24 that the majority of the time we, at the west
25 19:02:57 end of the island, are not as high on the noise

1 19:03:00 level as NorthernStar states. If I'm right --
2 and I assert that I am -- then NorthernStar
3 cannot meet the guidelines set forth federally
4 through EPA and their application should be
5 19:03:14 denied.

6 Since a portion of the island is so close
7 to the site, to the main shipping channel, and
8 to the berthing maneuvers that NorthernStar has
9 outlined, the data and the analysis of noise
10 19:03:24 and sound must be scrutinized. The hard-site
11 conditions which exist cannot be ignored. It
12 is a proven fact that noise adversely affects
13 the physiological well-being of the community.

14 Thank you.

15 19:03:37 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
16 comments.

17 Next is Steve Fluke.

18 MR. STEVE FLUKE: Steve Fluke, F-L-U-K-E.
19 Better spell it okay.

20 19:03:51 First, I'm here as a citizen, and I
21 live -- I don't live on the river here. I live
22 over by Raymond. My kids go to Willapa Valley.
23 I know there's a lot of Mules here. You know
24 the Vikings, I'm sure. This is a pretty tough
25 19:04:06 group of kids my kids play. All my kids have

1 19:04:09 played over here.

2 Anyway, I'm here as a citizen, but I'm
3 also here as a representative of a major union,
4 and that's the machinists' union. I represent

5 19:04:16 here in the state of Washington -- I'm a
6 vice president here on the West Coast, even
7 though I live in the (inaudible) area. I
8 represent the aerospace workers here. I
9 represent the loggers and mill workers on this
10 19:04:27 river here to the tune of about 42,000 members
11 and the families. That's a pretty good group
12 of people that I'm here representing.

13 Obviously -- I know we're not supposed to
14 say whether we support or not. Supposedly you
15 19:04:39 don't give any weight to that. We do. We're
16 supportive because obviously there's a lot of
17 jobs. But one thing that's particularly
18 important to me that we've looked at, and since
19 I've worked primarily in the logging and
20 19:04:51 milling industry here in Washington and Oregon,
21 is the restoration program that they're
22 proposing to do. That's a lot of money.
23 They're proposing \$50 million for restoration
24 work. I've worked all the way from Queets all
25 19:05:08 the way down through Oregon, trying to work on

1 19:05:10 rivers that supposedly were destroyed by -- by
2 logging, but every time we've got a little bit
3 of money, we've ran out of it.

4 I think a company that brings in a
5 19:05:19 proposal to put that kind of money along this
6 river to restore some of these wildlife areas
7 and some of these -- these torn-up riparian
8 zones is pretty unique, because we brought in a
9 lot of industry in this -- up and down this
10 19:05:34 river, and I don't know they brought any money
11 to help with that restorative process.

12 So as far as the environment goes, I've
13 worked -- I've dealt with environmentalists
14 through the spotted owl crisis, from here in
15 19:05:48 Washington and Oregon. I've lost a lot of
16 mills. I know that people are very sensitive
17 about the environment, but if you take a look
18 at the background, we've had our machinists --
19 we have a group back in Washington, D.C. that
20 19:06:03 does a lot of -- a lot of investigation on
21 different companies, and you take a look at
22 this company and they're pretty sound
23 environmentally, both safetywise and
24 environmentally.

25 19:06:13 So we're proposing and we're asking that

1 19:06:15 this Commission move on with this process and
2 let this project get going. Thank you.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
4 comments.

5 19:06:24 Next on the list is Esther Gregg. By the
6 way, if I mispronounce your name, please
7 correct me.

8 MS. ESTHER GREGG: Thank you. I'm Esther
9 Gregg, G-R-E-G-G. I live in the west end of
10 19:06:43 Wahkiakum County, and I do not own property on
11 the pipeline.

12 I am a Wahkiakum County PUD Commissioner,
13 but I'm here before you this evening
14 representing the Washington State Grange. This
15 19:06:57 year in June at its 108th annual conference, we
16 had 283 voting delegates representing
17 approximately 45,000-plus members within the
18 state of Washington grange. A resolution was
19 brought before the floor, and I'd like to read
20 19:07:13 it into the record, if I might, please.

21 "Whereas, NorthernStar Natural Gas is
22 seeking to develop a liquefied natural gas
23 import terminal at Bradwood in a 34-mile
24 sendout pipe through southwest Washington that
25 19:07:30 will adversely impact the land values,

1 19:07:33 customary use, and property right of many local
2 landowners; and

3 "Whereas, NorthernStar's project will use
4 eminent domain against landowners and its
5 19:07:43 pipeline will damage productivity of the
6 100-foot-wide right-of-way for timber,
7 agriculture, and wildlife habitat; and

8 "Whereas, NorthernStar's project is an
9 unnecessary supply for Washington state. The
10 19:07:56 gas from this terminal is for California, who
11 reject LNG terminals being built in their
12 state; and

13 "Whereas, NorthernStar's terminal and
14 pipeline are inconsistent with maintaining
15 19:08:10 adequate public safety and security in the
16 lower Columbia River area. The 34-mile,
17 high-pressure, non-odorized gas pipeline and
18 the LNG terminal presents significant
19 unresolved safety and emergency response

20 19:08:25 infrastructure concerns that NorthernStar
21 refuses to resolve in a timely manner; and

22 "Whereas, NorthernStar's terminal and
23 pipeline undermines state and local economic
24 interests as landowners, river users, and small

25 19:08:39 businesses will bear the economic cost of

1 19:08:42 increased security and delays in river traffic,
2 creating increased shipping costs for any
3 agriculture or other products being shipped on
4 the Columbia River; and

5 19:08:53 "Whereas, the LNG terminal will exacerbate
6 pollution and damage critical salmon habitat in
7 the Columbia River estuary, a vital nursery for
8 salmon; and

9 "Whereas, the Washington State Grange
10 19:09:07 recognizes the need in the Pacific Northwest
11 for clean, safe, affordable energy but finds
12 NorthernStar's project to be destructive,
13 unnecessarily risky, and a cause for extra
14 expense to agriculture and other products using
15 19:09:22 Columbia River ports for shipping.

16 "Therefore, be it resolved that the
17 Washington State Grange urges the Federal
18 Energy Regulatory Commission and all relevant
19 Washington and Oregon agencies to deny site
20 19:09:36 approval and all permits for the Bradwood
21 Landing LNG terminal and pipeline."

22 This resolution was passed unanimously at
23 the Washington State Grange this summer, as I
24 say, and in response to the -- to the nature of
25 19:09:51 the historic nature of Washington State Grange,

1 19:09:54 in passing a resolution, we believe in "say
2 one, say all." So it's safe to say that the
3 Washington State Grange's 45,000-plus members
4 would support, in whole, this resolution to not
5 19:10:09 site the Bradwood Landing plant.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Next on the
8 list is --

9 MS. CAROL KRIESEL: -- is Carol Kriesel.

10 19:10:27 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Thank you,
11 Carol.

12 SPEAKER: Hi, I'm Carol Kriesel,
13 K-R-I-E-S-E-L, resident of Puget Island.

14 I will point out inconsistencies contained
15 19:10:44 in the DEIS regarding distance between Puget
16 Island and the proposed site in Bradwood,
17 Oregon. On page 28, it is stated that the
18 nearest residents are about .6 miles. On page
19 469 it says no residences are present within
20 19:11:03 .05 -- .5 miles. And on page 574, in table
21 4.10.2-5, the distance from the proposed site
22 to Puget Island is listed as 1,000 feet.

23 I want NorthernStar to demonstrate how
24 they arrive at those different figures and what
25 19:11:24 coordinates they used. Just stating the

1 19:11:27 information without a basis for the
2 determination makes it invalid, and to concede
3 there are two main areas that need to be
4 corrected by NorthernStar: The inconsistencies
5 19:11:39 and the information used to gather the data.

6 My second point, the project proposed by
7 NorthernStar to be sited in Bradwood, Oregon,
8 is not small to medium-sized. The following
9 quotes with page numbers from the DEIS
10 19:11:55 demonstrate that this is a large project.

11 Page 162, quote: A type of low-profile
12 LNG storage tank referred to as an LNG smart
13 horizontal tank storage has been developed by
14 Mustang Engineering but has not been used on a
15 19:12:13 scale as large as the proposed project.

16 Page 165: Because a service area of the
17 heat exchangers needs to be large for efficient
18 heat transfer, the structures would be large
19 and require significant space for construction
20 19:12:30 and operation.

21 Page 266: Potential impacts on water
22 quality resulting from boring operations would
23 be due to the relatively large work areas.

24 Page 328: Due to the very dynamic nature
25 19:12:47 of large-scale construction, NorthernStar has

1 19:12:51 not defined specific lighting plans for
2 construction.

3 Page 562: Most large energy facilities in
4 Oregon are under the jurisdiction of the Oregon
5 19:13:03 Energy Facility Siting Council.

6 Page 565: Motor vehicles are a primary
7 source of air pollution, with large industrial
8 facilities accounting for less than 15 percent
9 of those types of criteria pollutants.

10 19:13:20 Finally, there are four pages with the
11 same phrase, page 276, page 283, page 329, and
12 page 350. They say: For any large
13 construction project, there is a potential for
14 spills or leaks.

15 19:13:35 As you can see, FERC refers to this as
16 large. It is not small- to medium-size. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
19 comments.

20 19:13:56 All right. Hopefully we get this right.
21 Mieke Eykel.

22 MS. MIEKE EYKEL: That's Mieke.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mieke. I'm sorry, Mieke.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Please use a mike.

25 19:14:18 MS. MIEKE EYKEL: My name is Mieke Eykel.

1 19:14:20 Last name is E-Y-K-E-L. And I'm here in
2 opposition. I am strongly opposed.

3 The DEIS states no residences within a
4 half a mile of the proposed LNG facility. But
5 19:14:36 my concern, as a residence within half a mile
6 of the closest LNG source, this would be LNG
7 carrier unloading at dockside. This closest
8 LNG source is 2500 feet from my house and may
9 be even closer to some of our neighbor's

10 19:14:57 places.

11 Why is the half-mile criteria so important
12 to NorthernStar? Are these issues -- are there
13 issues within half a mile or less distance to
14 an LNG terminal source? And other issues are
15 19:15:13 side pollution. The submersed vaporizers in
16 NorthernStar's handouts do not show the large
17 exhaust stacks, six or ten of them. Why are
18 these not shown?

19 And then existing -- existing residences.

20 19:15:28 Your FERC statement of construction and
21 operational impact on the dense communities is
22 short-term and not significant. I disagree
23 with the statement as the facility is to
24 operate for the next 30 to 40 years. As a
25 19:15:41 matter of fact, it reflects -- to the effects

1 19:15:44 on how quiet this area is, one can hear
2 people's conversation on the other side of the
3 river, or any other activity.

4 And the potential erosion to Puget Island
5 19:15:58 shoreline would be very significant due to
6 berthing in the LNG areas, especially as
7 berthing is accomplished at high tide. Why is
8 this issue not mitigated with the property
9 owners in Wahkiakum County?

10 19:16:11 Thank you.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
12 comments, Mike.

13 Robert Larson.

14 MR. ROBERT LARSON: Robert Larson. I live
15 19:16:24 20 miles at --

16 (Reporter requests clarification.)

17 MR. ROBERT LARSON: L-A-R-S-O-N. And my
18 question is part of the process. I was
19 wondering how deep will the navigation channel
20 19:16:46 of the Columbia River, the pipeline, will be
21 put in if the process goes ahead?

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

23 Does anyone from NorthernStar know the
24 answer to that? How deep is the horizontal
25 19:17:02 directional drill under the Columbia River?

1 19:17:04 SPEAKER: We couldn't hear the question
2 back here, Paul.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: The question was: How deep
4 is the horizontal directional drill below the
5 19:17:12 Columbia River? Do you know the answer?

6 MR. GARY COPPEDGE: It's at least 50 feet.
7 (Reporter requests clarification.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Gary C-O-P-P-E-D-G-E. His
9 comments was at least 50 -- you said at least
10 19:17:31 50 feet?

11 MR. GARY COPPEDGE: Yeah. It varies.
12 That's a difficult question to answer in one --

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. At the FEIS,
14 we'll do some more research, and we'll provide
15 19:17:42 a more detailed answer.
16 Franz, your turn.

17 MR. FRANS EYKEL: Good evening. Thank you
18 for commenting on the FEIS.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: State your name first.

20 19:18:20 MR. FRANS EYKEL: Excuse me?

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: State your name and spell
22 your last name.

23 MR. FRANS EYKEL: Franz Eykel, E-Y-K-E-L,
24 Puget Island resident.
25 19:18:29 My reference is to 4.7.2.3, existing

1 19:18:33 residences. It's about risk perception. Risk
2 perception amplifies the impact of a
3 disability. Public perception of risk and
4 nuisance effects have a measurable economic
5 19:18:49 consequence. One direct impact associated with
6 risk likely to be experienced by landowners and
7 residents in the area, real estate values may
8 decline. And should propose LNG terminals be
9 approved, is an increase in insurance premiums
10 19:19:11 of available insurance coverage available?
11 Accidents that threatens the value of the
12 land in the community impacts the long-term
13 fiscal -- fiscal health of the community,
14 industrial development, including electrical
15 19:19:28 power plants, oil refineries, and LNG
16 facilities are found to be -- to be associated
17 with a decrease in property values, of
18 properties within approximately a two-mile
19 radius.
20 19:19:42 The fact is it creates is a disamenity,
21 including spacial effects, noise, lights,
22 traffic, air pollution, shoreline erosion, and
23 odors. Tourists -- tourists can be very
24 sensitive to amenities of an area and to the
25 19:20:02 perceived reputation and character of a

1 19:20:05 community. LNG or like facilities are a
2 disamenity to this area.

3 Militarizing the river due to LNG carrier
4 escorts will have a serious scheduling effect
5 19:20:19 on the upriver cruise ship business and other
6 perceived risks and a disamenity. NorthernStar
7 Natural Gas writes off the dollar values of
8 jobs and tax revenues, but they fail to enter
9 the dollar values of the disamenities.

10 19:20:41 Mitigation. The citizens of Puget Island
11 and their properties are negatively affected by
12 the proposed Bradwood Landing facility by the
13 above-mentioned factors, but no attempt has
14 been made to mitigate or compensate for the
15 19:20:58 anticipated decreases in property values.

16 As far as representation, our county
17 commissioners have intervenor status with the
18 FERC, but due to the lack of representation we,
19 the people, have to speak out on these issues
20 19:21:16 and represent our interests and of the others
21 in our the community. Thank you.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
23 comments.

24 Next is Mike Rees.

25 19:21:36 MR. MIKE REES: Good evening. My name is

1 19:21:39 Mike Rees. R-E-E-S, no E on the end.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mike, speak up, if you can.

3 MR. MIKE REES: Shall I pick one of these

4 up?

5 19:21:50 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. I don't think it

6 works. Okay.

7 MR. MIKE REES: I'm a retired engineer

8 from the Boeing Company and currently working

9 as an independent engineering consultant. I

10 19:21:58 did submit scoping comments to you on October

11 the 15th, 2005. My understanding is that it is

12 incumbent on the lead agency to address all the

13 submitted scoping comments as part of the DEIS.

14 This DEIS does not address many of my comments;

15 19:22:18 therefore, I find it inadequate. I would ask

16 that the lead agency review all the scoping

17 comments that were submitted and make certain

18 that those which have not been addressed in the

19 DEIS be included in the FEIS.

20 19:22:35 I have three preliminary technical

21 comments to add now. According to scientific

22 reports, it is typical for an LNG system in the

23 U.S. to have a 1.5 percent leakage rate. This

24 leakage occurs primarily from valves, pumps,

25 19:22:55 and mechanical systems used either to convert

1 19:22:57 the liquid to gas, to transport the gas along
2 pipelines, or from spills and accidents.

3 Further, natural gas is essentially
4 methane, which is 24 times more potent
5 19:23:10 greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. The peak
6 output from Bradwood Landing is 1.3 billion
7 cubic feet per day. That would amount to
8 approximately 20 million cubic feet of methane
9 gas vented to the atmosphere per day somewhere
10 19:23:27 in the system. That's equal to 31,000 tons of
11 carbon dioxide a day.

12 The environmental impact of expected
13 leakage is not addressed in this DEIS. The
14 FEIS should include the maximum expected
15 19:23:44 leakage rate of the total system and the
16 effects of the leakage on global warming.

17 Same comment is on vaporizing
18 technologies. The DEIS indicates that no water
19 would be taken from the Columbia River by
20 19:23:58 vaporizing technologies. However, water
21 condensate would be discharged into the river,
22 which would be treated for PH neutralization
23 and be at 68 degrees Fahrenheit. The amount of
24 water that will be discharged is stated in the
25 19:24:15 DEIS as 160 gallons per minute. That equates

1 19:24:20 to a quarter of a million gallons a day.

2 That amount of water would be
3 discharged -- excuse me. The amount of water
4 that would be discharged has not been addressed
5 19:24:34 in the -- in the DEIS, and I would ask that the

6 appropriate fish and wildlife agency address
7 the effect of this discharge on local aquatic
8 habitat. Also, I would like to ask that the PH
9 neutralization system desired be explained to

10 19:24:54 show how it is to prevent accidental discharge
11 of non-neutralized water.

12 My last comment is about the noise levels.

13 The noise analysis in the DEIS I believe is
14 insufficient. As indicated in my scoping

15 19:25:11 comments, it is not reasonable to identify
16 noise levels only in the day/night level
17 metric, the DNL metric. DNL is misleading. It
18 does not address the impact of short duration
19 noise amplitudes that are significantly higher

20 19:25:29 than the average levels.

21 For example, if a large cannon were
22 located at the Bradwood site and fired every 15
23 minutes, the effect of -- on the residents of
24 Puget Island would be extremely annoying.

25 19:25:45 However, because the DNL metric averages the

1 19:25:48 noise levels over 24 hours, the noise from the
2 cannon would make an insignificant difference
3 to the DNL average, and the DEIS only deals in
4 DNL.

5 19:26:01 Therefore, the FEIS should also address
6 the noise metric called time above. Time above
7 is in which the total time above a certain
8 noise level -- say, 60 dBA -- in a 24-hour
9 period is reported in the number of minutes.

10 19:26:20 With a construction period of 36 months and the
11 pile-driving program of four months, expressing
12 the noise levels in DNL is totally inadequate.
13 Communities would need realistic noise
14 assessments.

15 19:26:32 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mike, can you wrap it up?

16 MR. MIKE REES: I'll just wrap it up. Two
17 sentences.

18 Similarly, for the operational aspect of
19 it. If NorthernStar were truly interested in

20 19:26:41 measuring and minimizing the impact of the
21 adjacent communities, they would include at
22 least two noise monitors -- one at the Bradwood
23 site and one on Puget Island -- to evaluate
24 noise complaints that would surely occur.

25 19:26:55 Thank you for the opportunity for making

1 19:26:56 these comments.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

3 Next is Mike Lewis. Mike, make sure you
4 speak loudly.

5 19:27:10 MR. MIKE LEWIS: Is this loud enough?

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.

7 MR. MIKE LEWIS: Okay. My name is Mike
8 Lewis, L-E-W-I-S. I'm a resident of Puget
9 Island. I represent myself and my family.

10 19:27:19 I have about 30 years of commercial risk
11 and insurance experience, and I'm going to
12 suggest to this audience that no matter what
13 you write down in any of these books and
14 studies, you're inviting yourself into a 9/11

15 19:27:34 incident. We saw a major city in the last ten
16 years attacked by terrorists using our
17 airplanes and attacking a well-built building
18 in a city that had lots of resources and lots
19 of political influence. And we have people

20 19:27:51 dying today from that incident, and they will
21 continue to die from the asbestos exposure that
22 they endured.

23 This is just another example of how our
24 engineers in this country seem to be able to

25 19:28:06 put together just about anything. All you got

1 19:28:08 to do is look up the river and look at Hanford.
2 I worked with contractors at Hanford. They
3 approved everything as safe. What's leaking
4 potentially into the Columbia River?

5 19:28:19 Contaminated groundwater. Do we have a nuclear
6 storage facility yet in the United States? No.
7 So we've got this stuff stored all over the
8 place in defunct power plants.

9 So now we're going to do -- we're going to
10 19:28:35 invite a bomb into our community, a bomb that
11 is not necessary because it's all going to be
12 sold to California anyway. If California wants
13 it so bad, let them put it in. Their
14 lieutenant governor bragged about the fact that
15 19:28:48 we would get the site and they would get the
16 gas. That hardly seems to be a payoff. What
17 are we going to get off of this? Short-term
18 jobs? I doubt it. We won't even get that.

19 But we are inviting terrorists to put a
20 19:29:04 bull's eye on us. We're supplying the bomb in
21 the form of the gas tanks, and we're supplying
22 the foreign crews that cannot be vetted. We
23 can't even vet driver's licenses in this state;
24 and Oregon particularly.

25 19:29:19 And you talk about fires? Someone here

1 19:29:23 got a hundred-thousand-dollar grant to supply
2 firefighting gear for our firefighters on
3 Cathlamet Island -- or Puget Island. It's a
4 waste of time. Whenever there's a refinery
5 19:29:37 fire, they just stand back and contain it. You
6 don't fight fires in those kinds of things, and
7 you don't fight fires in ships like that. So
8 this is an unmitigated disaster being invited
9 into a community that does not deserve it.

10 19:29:50 Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

13 Next is Beverly Beal.

14 MS. BEVERLY BEAL: I'm Beverly Beal,

15 19:30:12 B-E-A-L. I'm a resident of Cathlamet. Thank
16 you for the opportunity to publicly express my
17 concerns with information contained within the
18 DEIS. A more detailed copy of my remarks will
19 be submitted in writing.

20 19:30:32 On page ES-2 under the heading "project
21 impacts and mitigation," your agency wrote the
22 final engineering design for the LNG terminal
23 would incorporate detailed seismic
24 specifications and other measures to mitigate
25 19:30:47 the impact of seismic hazards and may be

1 19:30:51 subject to final review and approval by the OEP
2 prior to construction.

3 Further references to seismic hazards
4 occurred on page ES-8, I-13, table 1.4-2, table
5 19:31:07 2.8.1-1, and so on. The point being, seismic
6 activity is a concern when siting LNG
7 terminals. In western Washington and Oregon,
8 seismic activity is well-known and not taken
9 lightly. Seismic-related hazards, beginning on
10 19:31:29 page 4-9 and going through page 4-13, includes
11 a list of recommendations that indicate a
12 heightened level of concern regarding the
13 location of the terminal. However, under
14 section 4.1.4.3, geological hazards, and on
15 19:31:48 page 4-22, seismic-related hazards, the same
16 regard is not given to the proposed pipeline.

17 I quote: "Given that the proposed
18 pipeline route does not cross any known active
19 faults, earthquakes and associated seismic
20 19:32:05 risks are not anticipated to have significant
21 impact on the proposed pipeline."

22 The Nesqually earthquake occurred February
23 28, 2001, is conspicuously missing from this
24 report. That particular earthquake caused
25 19:32:22 widespread damage from south of Portland to

1 19: 32: 25 Tacoma, Washi ngton. Bridges and buil di ngs were
2 damaged, i ncl udi ng the dome of the Washi ngton
3 state capi tol bui ldi ng i n Olym pi a, the area of
4 the greate st damage as well as near the
5 19: 32: 36 epi center, whi ch regi stered 6.8 on the Ri chter
6 scale.

7 I was li vi ng i n the Mi ll Cree k area near
8 where the pi peli ne i s proposed to come to
9 Cowl itz County. Wh en the Ni squally eart hquake
10 19: 32: 49 occurred, pi ctu res were knocked off of wal ls,
11 books shak ed out of cases, and di shes knocked
12 out of cabi nets. My motor home shook li ke i t
13 was si tti ng on a wave machi ne.

14 Yes, Mi ll Cree k i s a long way from
15 19: 33: 00 Olym pi a, but the Ni squally quake i nformati on
16 shoul d have been taken i nto consi derati on and
17 i ncl uded i n the DEIS becau se i t i s a strong
18 pi ece of evi dence to the vul nerabi lity of thi s
19 area to sei smi c acti vi ty, i ncl udi ng acti vi ty a
20 19: 33: 18 di stance away. I t i s well reported that a
21 strong quake i n the near future i s predi cted
22 for the area -- l ocal vi ci ni ty.

23 The fact that whi le li vi ng i n the Spokane,
24 Washi ngton, area we j oked about the bi g one
25 19: 33: 31 comi ng and eastern Washi ngton becomi ng

1 19: 33: 33 shoreline property along the Pacific Ocean is
2 no longer a joke, according to the
3 seismologists at the University of Washington.
4 It is rather shortsighted of NorthernStar and
5 19: 33: 45 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to not
6 have included this information and the
7 University of Washington studies.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
10 19: 33: 54 comments.

11 Richard Erickson.

12 MR. RICHARD ERICKSON: Good evening.

13 Thank you. I'm Richard Erickson.

14 E-R-I-C-K-S-O-N. I'm the executive director

15 19: 34: 09 for the Lower Columbia Economic Development
16 Council. I'm here to duress -- address the
17 economic development impact.

18 Our county is suffering from the loss of
19 timber revenues, fishing revenues, and we're

20 19: 34: 24 losing a lot of family-wage jobs. Our largest
21 employer, Jerry DeBri ae Logging, has gone from
22 130 jobs to a hundred in the last two years.

23 Our county has gone from 80 employees to a
24 hundred because they've had to assume our

25 19: 34: 39 clinic, which is struggling at best. Our

1 19:34:43 county commissioners are in the throes of
2 having to deal with tight budgets at the time.

3 My board of directors of 13 has taken a
4 wait-and-see attitude about Bradwood Landing

5 19:34:54 over the last two and a half years. In
6 discussing with the Bradwood officials and
7 looking at the safety record, my board of
8 directors has determined that we want to
9 support the Bradwood Landing project for

10 19:35:05 several reasons, jobs being number one. The
11 Bradwood officials have committed to place
12 three tug boats on our waterfront, which would
13 amount to 35 union-paid, high-wage, family-wage
14 jobs. In addition, there could be possibly ten

15 19:35:21 to 15 jobs in our county working at the plant.
16 With that possibility would make Bradwood
17 Landing our fourth-largest employer.

18 If you've never worked in the county where
19 you had to deal with your fourth-largest
20 19:35:36 employer, it is huge when you're dealing with
21 the type of jobs that we are looking for here
22 in our county.

23 The other thing that Bradwood Landing
24 brings to our county is an opportunity for our
25 19:35:46 high school kids to go to work during the

1 19:35:49 construction project and to be able to be
2 trained and come out three years later as a
3 journeyman. We have -- one of our largest
4 exports is our youth. They leave, go off to
5 19:35:59 college, and never return. We have an
6 opportunity for our high school kids, through
7 the work force program, through Lower Columbia
8 College and the work force in Clatsop County,
9 to be able to be employed and then come out
10 19:36:10 with an education.

11 In addition, the Bradwood Landing
12 officials have made several commitments to
13 Wahkiakum County. Because we are not going to
14 receive the tax revenue that Clatsop County has
15 19:36:25 of possibly \$8 million, they have made a
16 commitment to us of \$100,000 a year until the
17 plant is sited and then \$500,000 a year as long
18 as the plant is operating. They have come
19 through on the first two checks. They have
20 19:36:40 made several commitments to our county, and
21 they have fulfilled those commitments.

22 Consequently, we feel that the officials
23 of Bradwood Landing and NorthernStar have
24 fulfilled their commitments to us, and we feel
25 19:36:53 that the jobs are necessary and the education

1 19:36:56 to our children would be important to our
2 operations. So the board of directors of the
3 Lower Columbia Economic Development Council
4 supports the siting of Bradwood Landing for the
5 19:37:06 economic development opportunities. Thank you.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Kathleen
9 Gilbertsen.

10 19:37:23 MS. KAYRENE GILBERTSEN: Good evening.
11 Kayrene Gilbertsen. K-A-Y-R-E-N-E,
12 G-I-L-B-E-R-T-S-E-N.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for correcting
14 me. Speak a little louder.

15 19:37:35 MS. KAYRENE GILBERTSEN: I will. I live
16 on Puget Island. I am a native of Puget
17 Island. I own property within view of Bradwood
18 Landing.

19 I would like to say that I have followed
20 19:37:45 what NorthernStar has done and has said they
21 would do. They have come up -- they have
22 followed through with their promises to our
23 community. I have followed the information
24 that we've received in the newspapers regarding
25 19:38:00 other plants. I have read what firemen have

1 19:38:04 said who have gone to Savannah, come back, and
2 said we can -- we can deal with this.

3 As far as fear, nobody wants something in
4 your own backyard. You'd always like it to be
5 19:38:16 in someone else's. So that tells me that
6 perhaps we're not so opposed to liquid natural
7 gas; we're just opposed to having it in our
8 neighborhood. Let's send it to California.

9 The fact that there is a plant in Boston,
10 19:38:34 in Savannah, and an LNG plant docking every 18
11 hours in Tokyo makes me feel pretty safe about
12 the future of Bradwood Landing, and I think we
13 have more to fear by riding the ocean of fear.

14 Thank you very much.

15 19:38:54 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: You know, let's not applaud
18 or cheer. Let's be neutral. Thanks. Show
19 everyone the same respect. I appreciate that.

20 19:39:02 Gary Gilbertsen.

21 MR. GARY GILBERTSEN: Gary Gilbertsen from
22 Puget Island. I'm a retired commercial
23 fisherman and school teacher. The LNG
24 terminals in this country and worldwide have an
25 19:39:24 excellent safety record. The pipeline comes

1 19:39:29 from Canada going south, goes through Cowlitz
2 County with lines that go under city streets,
3 providing gas for homes and businesses. There
4 is a line that goes from port westward to PG &
5 19:39:46 E's gas-fired plant, and all of these have had
6 good safety records. There's been no accidents
7 within my memory.

8 As far as the environment, this river has
9 been industrialized since the 19th century, and
10 19:40:09 although the fish runs are down from their
11 previous past numbers, they have been stable
12 for a number of years. There is wildlife that
13 doesn't seem to be affected by places like the
14 pulp mill like the old Wauna mill site or other
15 19:40:29 industries. We have ospreys that we didn't
16 have when I was a child, bald eagles, and
17 numerous other birds and wildlife, white-tailed
18 deer, variety.

19 So seems to me that -- that there isn't a
20 19:40:53 problem with building a plant at Bradwood
21 Landing, a former mill site. Thank you.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
23 comments.

24 Richard Beck.

25 19:41:11 MR. RICHARD BECK: I've got some

1 19:41:12 supporting documents and stuff.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: You can give them to me,
3 and I'll put it in the record.

4 MR. RICHARD BECK: Okay.

5 19:41:21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

6 MR. RICHARD BECK: My name is Richard
7 Beck, and I live on Puget Island with my
8 family.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Richard, spell your last
10 19:41:36 name for the court reporter.

11 MR. RICHARD BECK: B-E-C-K.

12 On Saturday, January 30th, 1965, at 1:20
13 in the morning, after weeks of heavy rain, the
14 cliff near Bugby Hole gave way and crashed into
15 19:41:47 the Columbia River. A huge wave was generated,
16 which surged across and washed over a section
17 of the Puget Island dike, killing Haakon
18 Gabrielsen, age 59, as it destroyed his house.

19 Other homes were damaged, including those of
20 19:42:01 Fred Aegerter and Tom Irving. Extensive damage
21 was done to the dikes, sloughs, and crops
22 planted nearby.

23 Representatives from the Army Corps of
24 Engineers, Representative Jody Butler Hansen,

25 19:42:10 and other state and county agencies met to

1 19:42:13 assess the area's needs. All of this, along
2 with pictures showing the slides and damages,
3 were reported on the front page of Wakiakum
4 Eagle on February 4th, 1965.

5 19:42:23 Many concerned local residents, myself
6 included, have previously testified regarding
7 this event, which happened only a few hundred
8 yards from the Bradwood Landing liquified
9 natural gas terminal. It appears, although I

10 19:42:35 cannot find a clear diagram of the proposal,
11 that the plan is to drill horizontally and run
12 their pipeline right through the base of that
13 very cliff.

14 What was FERC's response to our testimony?

15 19:42:43 Quoting from page 4-9 of the DEIS: We received
16 comments about a landslide that reportedly
17 occurred in 1965 upriver of and adjacent to the
18 Bradwood Landing site. We were unable to find
19 information regarding such a landslide

20 19:42:55 occurring in 1965. In addition, a review of
21 aerial photographs from various intervals
22 dating back to 1948 did not reveal any
23 indications of landslides occurring within a
24 one-mile radius of the site.

25 19:43:07 So what was their problem? All someone

1 19: 43: 09 had to do was walk into the local paper of
2 record and ask publisher Eric Nelson, whose
3 father probably wrote the original story and
4 took those pictures, if he had anything on a
5 19: 43: 19 slide in 1965 and they would have got what I
6 got in five minutes. Furthermore, the exposed
7 cliff is still visible, and anyone with an
8 elementary knowledge of geology can see that a
9 slide has occurred there fairly recently.

10 19: 43: 29 If you've lived here for more than two
11 years, you know a basalt rockslide ends up
12 blocking SR4 every couple of years, taking
13 days, months, and sometimes even years to
14 clear, and it is impossible to prevent them
15 19: 43: 42 from happening.

16 Maybe that's it. No one from NorthernStar
17 or FERC is shown much interest in what it's
18 like to live around here -- the fishing, the
19 weather, the wildlife. Does this result in an
20 19: 43: 51 inability to really care what this terminal and
21 pipeline and all these tankers might really do
22 to us? Or is there maybe an agenda which is so
23 focused on seeing a permit awarded to knowingly
24 suppress any inconvenient evidence? Why has
25 19: 44: 04 Puget Island been left out of the background in

1 19:44:06 so many renderings of the facility? Just
2 ignore the potential problems until you get
3 your deal done?

4 My opinion has been all along that if a
5 19:44:13 regulatory agency really cared about the damage
6 from a magnitude-nine earthquake, huge floods
7 washing out the 500-foot-high ridge separating
8 Bradwood from the mighty Columbia, basalt
9 cliffs crashing into the river generating huge
10 19:44:24 waves, maybe even all this happening at once,
11 they wouldn't allow a terminal and a pipeline
12 to be sited there in the first place.

13 The Greeks had a concept called hubris,
14 which is just a cockiness which makes you
15 19:44:36 believe you can handle anything which might
16 come along. It was forever causing guys to end
17 up poking out their own eyes, or the gods
18 punishing them by having their liver eaten by
19 vultures for all eternity. The point was that
20 19:44:45 when you're playing with powerful forces, you
21 should have a little humility. Nobody really
22 knows how to prepare an LNG terminal for a
23 Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake because
24 there hasn't been one in 300 years. But we're
25 19:44:56 due for one now. Don't you do something the

1 19:45:00 rest of us will all regret. Thank you.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
3 comments.

4 Craig Brown.

5 19:45:11 MR. CRAIG BROWN: I'm not going to bother
6 with this because I don't believe it's working
7 anyway. My name is Craig, C-R-A-I-G, Brown,
8 just like the color. I do not own property
9 along the pipeline. I'm speaking as an
10 19:45:22 individual. I'm glad Mr. Lewis made the
11 remarks that he made. It's a good opening for
12 me.

13 I can't imagine what jobs would be
14 worth -- would trump public safety. Public
15 19:45:34 safety seems to be the most critical issue of
16 all concerning this site and those ships coming
17 up the river. This is not like Boston Harbor
18 out here. That's a narrow a channel out there.
19 It is so narrow in many places that you, with a
20 19:45:48 good arm, could throw a rock and hit a ship as
21 it passes by. This is very different from
22 Boston Harbor.

23 There are issues in the draft EIS that
24 concern mitigation of fire hazards because we
25 19:45:59 have to consider the possibility of a rupture

1 19:46:02 or a leak. It can happen. Whether
2 intentionally or accidentally, it can happen.
3 The draft EIS suggests that it can be mitigated
4 with tugboats with firefighting equipment on
5 19:46:15 them.

6 I retired from the San Francisco Fire
7 Department. I've had extensive training with
8 the state fire marshal's office, but I was
9 never allowed to serve on the fire boats
10 19:46:25 because the specialized training that goes into
11 the officers and firefighting crews on those
12 ships is so specialized that if you haven't got
13 the qualifications, you don't get to be
14 assigned there. Fighting marine fires is
15 19:46:38 highly specialized.

16 Crews on tugboats, regardless of the
17 equipment that they may have around them, are
18 not going to be able to deal with this kind of
19 a situation. And besides that, the ships
20 19:46:49 cannot get into -- the tugboats cannot get into
21 position in order to mitigate -- that is, to
22 put up a fire screen -- if they cannot position
23 around the ships. When you have a narrow
24 channel, the tugboat is either going to precede
25 19:47:01 or follow the big ships in those narrow areas.

1 19:47:04 And then there's that problem with the
2 marine layer. We have a marine layer that
3 comes down this river quite a bit. In fact, we
4 had it this morning, if you remember. When
5 19:47:14 that vapor cloud from a leak comes across that
6 cold river, with all the experience and all the
7 equipment in the world, you will not be able to
8 see the vapor cloud; not until it gets over
9 land, not until it begins to warm and return to
10 19:47:28 methane its ambient natural state will you
11 finally find it getting through an ignition
12 source. Then you'll see the vapor cloud
13 because then the flammability will read right
14 back to the source.

15 19:47:40 We have to be realistic about what can be
16 mitigated. The draft EIS does not deal
17 realistically with how we can mitigate fire
18 hazards from that facility or a rupture of a
19 tank along the passage of the river.

20 19:47:53 Thank you.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

22 Karen Berteach.

23 MS. KAREN BERTROCH: My name is Karen --
24 is this one working? Or is this one working?

25 19:48:10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, the first one was.

1 19:48:11 MS. KAREN BERTROCH: Hello. My name is
2 Karen Bertroch, B-E-R-T-R-O-C-H.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for correcting.

4 MS. KAREN BERTROCH: That's fine. I come
5 19:48:19 representing myself, no entity other than being
6 a landowner in Grays River. Grays River is a
7 highly terroir fish with the Lower Columbia
8 Fish Recovery Board because we carry several
9 species of endangered fish. We have a huge
10 19:48:32 flooding issue out there, and we have a very
11 hard time finding funding.

12 I am excited that if the permit goes
13 through, there is additional money available
14 for fish habitat restoration that is not
15 19:48:43 required by mitigation. There is an additional
16 big fund that has been given to the Fish
17 Recovery Board that will be used strictly for
18 fish habitat restoration and monitored, given
19 out, and taken care of by the Fish Recovery
20 19:48:56 Board. The Fish Recovery Board is highly
21 respected, assigned by the State, and we're
22 excited to have that funding available.

23 I am also pleased that the
24 NorthernStar/Bradwood Landing folks have
25 19:49:08 already given significant funding to the area.

1 19:49:12 30,000 went to Puget Island last year, 30,000
2 to the Cathlamet fire department, and this year
3 they have authorized already \$37,000 for a much
4 needed radio study for the Sheriff's Department
5 19:49:24 that the County absolutely does not have the
6 funding to meet. Many of our areas do not have
7 radio coverage for our volunteer firemen. This
8 is an exceptionally important study.

9 In my experience, I have seen here in this
10 19:49:36 county a great deal of fear, a great deal of
11 raising of red flags, but I come from a place
12 where, in Alaska, we fought the pipeline tooth
13 and nail. And I'll tell you, it didn't hurt a
14 thing really. The caribou understood it, and
15 19:49:55 the decision is going to have to be made to
16 rebuild it or not, but we fought that pipeline.
17 And I learned a hard lesson: That if we
18 compromise with nature, we can all win.

19 Thank you.

20 19:50:04 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
21 comments. Paul Viki.

22 MR. PAUL VIK: I'm going to pass.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Before we go on
24 -- Robert Kiser, are you here? Robert, did you
25 19:50:17 speak at any of the earlier meetings?

1 19:50:19 MR. ROBERT KISER: No, I did not.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Please come up.

3 It's your turn.

4 MR. ROBERT KISER: I hope you didn't get

5 19:50:31 me mixed up with my wife.

6 Robert Kiser, K-I-S-E-R; landowner on the

7 pipeline, supposedly. I don't know for sure

8 where the pipeline's going to be, but it

9 potentially can impact me about seven and a

10 19:50:49 half acres of temporary right-of-way and close

11 to three and a half acres of primary

12 right-of-way if it's located where I think it's

13 going to be.

14 I will be providing you with written

15 19:51:05 testimony by December 24th. You'll have to

16 shut me off at probably three minutes because

17 I'm going down through page and paragraph in

18 the DEIS where I have found problems.

19 Page ES-5, you state that the technical

20 19:51:27 review identified several areas of concern with

21 respect to the proposed facility, and we

22 identified specific recommendations be

23 addressed by NorthernStar prior to site

24 preparation. I cannot understand why that is

25 19:51:46 not a requirement in the DEIS. If we are going

1 19:51:50 to provide input related to this DEIS and the
2 decisions that are being made, then we need to
3 have that opportunity up front, not before
4 construction, not before some other EIS or
5 19:52:06 whatever. We will not have that opportunity
6 after this presentation.

7 Page ES-4, first paragraph, you state
8 National Marine Fishery Service and Fish and
9 Wildlife Service has some questions --
10 19:52:21 additional information that means you will be
11 revising your EHA assessment and BA. Your
12 revision needs to be part of the DEIS so that
13 the public can respond intelligently to the
14 impacts of the T and E species.

15 19:52:38 Page ES-7, you state that the U.S. Coast
16 Guard will issue an LOR finding including
17 recommendations that may, may, include
18 conditions. Here again it leaves it up to the
19 NorthernStar discretion to implement all the
20 19:52:53 U.S. Coast Guard identified safety conditions.
21 It should be a requirement of the DEIS. How
22 can you adequately evaluate -- evaluate
23 navigational and community safety without it?

24 Page ES-8, how can you conclude that the
25 19:53:11 construction and operation of Bradwood Landing

1 19:53:13 project has a potential for limited significant
2 environmental impacts when the National Marine
3 Fishery Service and Fish and Wildlife Service
4 are still requesting additional information and
5 19:53:26 haven't identified the impact on federally
6 listed species?

7 Page 1-25, I specifically mentioned at a
8 scoping meeting, along with others, the
9 unstable sales along the proposed pipeline
10 19:53:41 route. Nothing is mentioned here.

11 Page 1-3, purpose and need. How can you
12 deliver natural gas to Williams Northwest
13 interstate pipeline system when it is fully
14 subscribed?

15 19:53:56 Page 1-6, permits approval and regulatory
16 requirements. FERC is also required to follow
17 the NEPA process. NEPA is excluded from
18 statements regarding regulatory requirements
19 for you.

20 19:54:12 Page 2-122.1.215, the discussions
21 concerning 1500 recreational fishing boats used
22 in the Columbia River in a year. It is a very
23 poor way of determining use. Besides the
24 number being low, the use needs to be expressed
25 19:54:32 in user base to determine accurate description

1 19:54:36 of total use. Charter boats, for example, can
2 be on the Columbia for eight hours a day. It
3 is not uncommon for recreational fishing boats
4 to spend five hours a day on the river. In
5 19:54:46 addition, a person who fishes the Columbia
6 usually takes more than one trip per year. For
7 example, I took 17.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Can I ask you to
9 wrap it up?

10 19:54:57 MR. ROBERT KISER: Wrap up?

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yep.

12 MR. ROBERT KISER: Going to hear the rest
13 of it tomorrow night.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's fine. And you're
15 19:55:03 going to send in detailed written comments.

16 MR. ROBERT KISER: Which one do I pick? I
17 might as well keep going.

18 Survey and staking. It is unclear if
19 survey and staking occurs before clearing
20 19:55:16 operation begins or before construction of
21 trench. Property surveys and wood (inaudible)
22 need to be marked and protected throughout all
23 phases of construction. All phases of
24 construction must operate within the
25 19:55:27 right-of-way or with approval of landowner.

1 19:55:30 This should include all equipment, including
2 egress and ingress, over approved access road.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your

5 19:55:38 comments. We'll address those comments in the
6 FEIS.

7 Now we've reached the part where the only
8 people who have signed up are people who have
9 already spoken. So I want to ask, is there
10 19:55:51 anyone in the room who has not spoken yet, who
11 did not speak at a previous meeting, who wants
12 to speak?

13 I didn't see any hands go up, so I'm going
14 to call Gayle Kiser up.

15 19:56:09 Gayle, did you ask me for a hard copy of
16 the DEIS?

17 MS. GAYLE KISER: No. I have a hard copy
18 of the DEIS.

19 I'll try to speak specifically -- oh,
20 19:56:20 excuse me. Gayle Kiser. That's K-I-S-E-R.
21 Pipeline landowner. I'll speak specifically
22 tonight. Last night I spoke generally.

23 Addressing Section 3.1, FERC alternatives,
24 nowhere in the evaluation criteria is the
25 19:56:38 effect on human population taken into

1 19:56:41 consideration. The question: Can we do it?
2 Yes. Should we do it? No.
3 Section 3.1.1, the no-action alternative.
4 Where is the data to support claims of expanded
5 19:56:54 need for natural gas? The sources cited are
6 not independent but industry-related. How can
7 a claim be made that LNG will lower prices?
8 Where is the economic study to support this
9 assertion?
10 19:57:06 Section 3.1.1.2, increased efficiency in
11 conservation. Energy conservation should be
12 encouraged. A study by the Natural Resources
13 Defense Council recently showed that we could
14 reduce our use of natural gas by 12 percent
15 19:57:22 merely by using today's technology. Why state
16 that the United States' production is declining
17 when there are plans under way to build a new
18 pipeline from the Rockies to the Northwest?
19 Section 3.1.8.1, major pipeline route
20 19:57:37 alternatives. Too much weight is being given
21 to the project objective, getting gas from
22 Bradwood Landing to potential markets. Without
23 an independent needs assessment, this is a
24 subjective opinion. The Palomar pipeline must
25 19:57:50 be included in this assessment. Where is the

1 19:57:53 data to support the assertion that an HDD bore
2 of the Columbia River at Bradwood is
3 unconstructable?

4 Table 3.1.8-2 discusses the alternative
5 19:58:05 route from entry pit of the HDD bore hole that
6 would cross the Cowlitz River. I am intimately
7 acquainted with this property, and I can tell
8 you there are no oak trees that would be
9 disturbed. The alternative will take out our
10 19:58:19 pear trees. The power line right-of-way that
11 is mentioned is now abandoned, and access is
12 under control of the landowner.

13 Section 4.1.4.1, stratigraphy. Landslide
14 areas have not been adequately identified. The
15 19:58:33 pipeline is proposed to cross an ancient debris
16 area on our property that was deemed too
17 unstable for housing construction. The Cowlitz
18 River crossing will involve the Ostrander
19 protection zone that the Burlington Northern
20 19:58:46 had to drive pilings more than 100 feet deep to
21 reach solid rock.

22 The nearby KB pipeline crosses the north
23 end of our property. Neighbors had to move
24 their house because of a land movement caused
25 19:58:58 by the installation of that pipeline, and it is

1 19:59:00 under monitor now and was last moved in April
2 and May of this year.

3 Page 4.22 -- excuse me -- 4-22. Seismic
4 related hazards, quote: "The proposed pipeline
5 19:59:14 would cross a seismic hazard area between

6 milepost 34 and 35." Again, I'm intimately
7 acquainted with that area. This area is likely
8 delineated as a seismic hazard area based on
9 the potential for liquefaction of the soils
10 19:59:28 within the flood plain. It changes every year.
11 The high water comes and goes, and that section
12 of the river changes every year.

13 Quote: "In recent history, no accounts of
14 damage to any existing pipelines have been
15 19:59:44 documented in the project area." And we just
16 heard previous testimony about how safe these
17 lines are.

18 Someone is not taking into account the two
19 explosions at the Williams pipeline within the
20 19:59:57 last 12 years, one in Castle Rock, one in
21 Kalama, both due to land movement. I know
22 about them. I watched both of them from my
23 house. Last winter the Williams pipeline fell
24 into the Toutle River. No accounts of damage?
25 20:00:12 I beg to differ.

1 20:00:15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
2 comments.
3 Next is Daniel Serres.
4 MR. DANIEL SERRES: Last name is spelled
5 20:00:40 S-E-R-R-E-S.
6 I want to begin by saying that you pointed
7 out at both meetings, Mr. Friedman, that FERC
8 is not a sponsor of the project. While that
9 may be true, we have to wonder about Natural
10 20:00:51 Resource Group a little bit because they are
11 also doing review for the Palomar pipeline.
12 They're not working for FERC; they're working
13 for Palomar pipeline. Because these two
14 pipelines being so closely related, you have to
15 20:01:05 question if there is not a conflict of interest
16 from Natural Resource Group in participating in
17 both projects, one as the agency-regulated
18 project and the other as agency -- or as a
19 proponent of the project itself. I just wanted
20 20:01:17 to point out that problem.
21 I want to echo everything that's been said
22 about public safety, the limited response
23 capabilities. Sections 4.8.2.6 and 4.8.3.6,
24 the findings regarding public safety.
25 20:01:33 Basically the resources available to safeguard

1 20:01:37 the public along the pipeline and along the
2 terminal are totally inadequate. The problem
3 is you failed to disclose the potential and
4 reasonable and foreseeable incidence that

5 20:01:47 happen along the pipeline, like Gayle talked
6 about having seen two of them from her house.

7 And in doing that, you also failed to
8 assess what can be responded. There's sort of
9 a laundry list in there, fire department here,

10 20:02:00 fire department there, and there's nowhere that
11 provides a reasonable narrative that describes
12 how the public is supposed to be protected, how
13 the public will respond, and again, mitigation
14 of public safety impacts, mitigation required,
15 20:02:12 to be likely to meet the community standard for
16 mitigation, for being included in the DEIS.

17 The Coast Guard has identified -- and I
18 quote from 4.8.2.6 -- significant gaps exist in
19 firefighting capability for both shore and
20 20:02:26 waterside firefighting response. The same is
21 true on the pipeline. So FERC is not
22 disclosing the real impacts both in costs and
23 increased risks in this NEPA document. That's
24 a failure to comply with NEPA.

25 20:02:40 I'd also point out that the salmon

1 20:02:43 enhancement initiative -- I want to switch to
2 fish issues now. The SEI is too vague to be
3 measured with a guaranteed real value to salmon
4 at this point. What we do know is that
5 20:02:56 NorthernStar is essentially proposing to create
6 essentially a blender in the middle of the
7 Columbia River, both in construction and in
8 continued operation, to have tugs operating in
9 the Columbia River with their powerful
10 20:03:06 thrusters, having a vessel turning in that
11 area, ongoing maintenance dredging.

12 The compensatory mitigation measures are
13 not adequately described in Section 4.6.2.2.
14 The table that goes through the impacts to
15 20:03:19 salmon repeatedly states, unavoidable impacts
16 will be mitigated to implementation of
17 NorthernStar's mitigation plan.

18 While that sounds fine, but that fails to
19 lay out again a narrative of how impacts that
20 20:03:34 are very serious and very likely to disturb
21 salmon habitat used for rearing and migration
22 through both -- basically at the head of the
23 channel, how those impacts would be mitigated
24 in place, in kind, and in time. And it's very
25 20:03:50 important that we realize the extreme

1 20:03:53 significance of this area of the river, with 13
2 listed fish species passing through this very
3 point in the river. It's an incredibly
4 important chill point. An estuary that is now
5 20:04:05 widely recognized to be --

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Let's wrap it up.

7 MR. DANIEL SERRES: -- the linchpin to
8 recovery in the estuary.

9 So to conclude, I will say the DEIS fails
10 20:04:14 to comply with NEPA in disclosing impacts to
11 both safety, public service, to threatened
12 salmon species. Impacts to public safety and
13 fisheries are both more significant than their
14 characterization in the DEIS and to the impacts
15 20:04:24 like the 50 acres in the middle of salmon
16 habitat are unmitigable. Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
18 comments. We're going to address most of what
19 you had to say in the FEIS. There is one
20 20:04:34 comment you said at the beginning that I want
21 to address right now. You can sit down,
22 Daniel.

23 Daniel raised the issue that we just found
24 out about that NRG is working for the FERC as
25 20:04:45 our third-party environmental contractor on the

1 20:04:49 Bradwood Landi ng project. They've served thi s
2 role for almost three years. Over two years.

3 Palomar is a brand-new project, just was
4 authorized for the initial prefiling process

5 20:05:09 only recently, and so we've only recently
6 discovered that NRG is working for Palomar as
7 its private consultant. We wrote -- "we,"
8 meaning the FERC -- has written a letter to NRG
9 questioning this apparent conflict of interest
10 20:05:26 and asking NRG to file new conflict-of-interest
11 forms for our attorneys to review.

12 NRG has only recently responded to that
13 letter with new forms, and our attorneys are
14 reviewing those forms to make certain that
15 20:05:40 there is no legal conflict of interest.

16 MR. DANIEL SERRES: Are those documents
17 public?

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: I believe the letter to NRG
19 is public, yes.

20 20:05:52 Everyone who signed the sign-up list has
21 had an opportunity to speak. Is there anyone
22 who has not spoken who wishes to?

23 That being the case, on behalf of the
24 FERC, I would like to thank all of you for
25 20:06:08 being here tonight, providing us with your

1 20:06:10 comments on our draft Environmental Impact
2 Statement for the Bradwood Landing LNG project.
3 Let the record show that this meeting concluded
4 at approximately 8:05 p.m. Thank you.

5 10:02:47 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:05 P.M.)
6 (NOTE: Untranscribed steno notes archived ten
7 years on computer; transcribed English files
8 archived five years on computer.)

9 * * *

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

	TESTIMONY INDEX	
		Page
1		
2		
3	Testimony by Ms. Paula Carlson	18
4	Testimony by Mr. Steve Fluke	20
5	Testimony by Ms. Esther Gregg	23
6	Testimony by Ms. Carol Kriesel	26
7	Testimony by Ms. Mieke Eykel	28
8	Testimony by Mr. Robert Larson	30
9	Testimony by Mr. Frans Eykel	31
10	Testimony by Mr. Mike Rees	33
11	Testimony by Mr. Mike Lewis	38
12	Testimony by Ms. Beverly Beal	40
13	Testimony by Mr. Richard Erickson	43
14	Testimony by Ms. Kayrene Gilbertsen	46
15	Testimony by Mr. Gary Gilbertsen	47
16	Testimony by Mr. Richard Beck	48
17	Testimony by Mr. Craig Brown	53
18	Testimony by Ms. Karen Bertoch	55
19	Testimony by Mr. Robert Kiser	58
20	Testimony by Ms. Gayle Kiser	62
21	Testimony by Mr. Daniel Serres	66

22 * * *

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I, Robin L. Nodl and, a Washington
Certified Shorthand Reporter, an Oregon
Certified Shorthand Reporter, a Registered
Diplomate 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
26th day of November, 2007.

Washington CSR No. 2530

Oregon CSR No. 90-0056