

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

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x

IN THE MATTER OF: : Docket No.

JORDAN COVE ENERGY PROJECT, L.P. : CP07-444-000

PACIFIC CONNECTOR GAS PIPELINE : CP07-441-000

PROJECT, L.P. :

- - - - - x

Red Lion Inn

Rogue River Ballroom

200 N. Riverside Avenue

Medford, Oregon 97501

Wednesday, October 29, 2008

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:30 p.m., Lonnie Lister (FERC), presiding.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (6:30 p.m.)

3 MR. LISTER: Good evening everybody. On behalf
4 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I want to
5 welcome you tonight. This is the third of four planned
6 public meetings that will be held this week to give you an
7 opportunity to provide your comments on the draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the FERC staff
9 for the Jordan Cove LNG import terminal and Pacific
10 Connector Gas Pipeline Project.

11 My name is Lonnie Lister. I'm a branch chief
12 with the Office of Energy Projects in the FERC. By the way,
13 I'll say FERC or Commission or Federal Energy Regulatory
14 Commission -- all the same entity. For those of you who
15 might have met Paul Freeman, our environmental project
16 manager, I'm sorry to say that Paul could not be here this
17 evening because he had a sudden illness and couldn't make
18 it. Here with me tonight is John Scott the project manager
19 for Terra Tech Environmental Consultants who assisted us in
20 preparing the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

21 The FERC is an independent agency with
22 headquarters in Washington, D.C. that regulates the
23 interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil.
24 Among other responsibilities the FERC reviews proposals by
25 private energy development companies and authorizes

1 construction of interstate natural gas pipelines, gas
2 storage facilities and liquefied natural gas import
3 terminals. The FERC is composed of five commissioners who
4 are appointed by the President with the advice and consent
5 of the Senate. The commissioners serve five-year terms and
6 have an equal vote on regulatory matters. One commissioner
7 is designated by the President to serve as the chair and the
8 FERC's administrative head.

9 The FERC is the lead federal agency responsible
10 for the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA review of
11 the Jordan Cove Energy and Pacific Connector Projects and by
12 act of Congress is the lead agency for preparation of the
13 EIS, the Environmental Impact Statement. NEPA requires FERC
14 to analyze the environmental impacts, consider alternatives
15 and provide appropriate mitigation measures on proposed
16 project.

17 The U.S. Forest Service, the Army Corps of
18 Engineers, the EPA, the Coast Guard, U.S. Department of
19 Transportation, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of
20 Reclamation, and Douglas County, Oregon are participating as
21 cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS, and we
22 thank them for their involvement and assistance in preparing
23 the EIS. Those agencies intend to utilize the EIS as the
24 basis for their environmental review of the various required
25 permits, authorizations, right-of-way plans and required

1 amendments to management.

2 On September 4, 2007, Jordan Cove Energy and
3 Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline filed an application under
4 Sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act to construct and
5 operate new natural gas facilities, including the liquefied
6 natural gas import terminal, 229.5 miles of 36-inch diameter
7 gas pipeline, a 10,300 horsepower natural gas compressor
8 station and auxiliary-related facilities in Oregon. All of
9 the proposed facilities are more fully described in the
10 draft Environmental Impact Statement.

11 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide
12 each of you an opportunity to give us your comments on the
13 draft EIS. We're here tonight to learn from you. It will
14 help us the most if your comments are as specific as
15 possible regarding the proposed project and draft EIS.
16 During our review of the project, we assembled information
17 from a variety of sources, including the applicant, you the
18 public, other federal, state, and local agencies and our own
19 independent analysis and field inspections. We analyzed
20 this information and prepared the draft Environmental Impact
21 Statement that was distributed to the public for comment. A
22 notice of availability of the draft EIS was issued for this
23 project on August 29, 2008. We're in the midst of a 90-day
24 comment period on the draft EIS. The formal comment period
25 will end on December 4. It is during this period that we

1 seek to receive comments on the draft EIS. All written
2 comments received during this period or verbally tonight
3 will be addressed in the final EIS.

4 We ask that you provide comments as soon as
5 possible to give us time to analysis and research the issues
6 and provide an adequate response. I'd like to add that the
7 FERC strongly encourages electronic filing of any comments.
8 The instructions for this can be located on the FERC website
9 at www.FERC.gov and under the link entitled e-Filing. The
10 FERC website also provides a free service called e-
11 Subscriptions that provides an e-mail notification to all
12 subscribers whenever a formal filing is made in a particular
13 case. You will need the project docket number if you're
14 interested in e-subscribing; the docket numbers for the LNG
15 project is CP07444. The docket number for the gas pipeline
16 project is CP07-441.

17 If you received a copy of the draft Environmental
18 Impact Statement, you'll automatically receive a copy of the
19 final impact statement. If you did not get a copy of the
20 draft and would like to get a copy of the final, then please
21 sign the attendance list outside the room here and provide
22 your name and address. We'll be happy to put your name on
23 the mailing list.

24 The EIS is not a sole decision document. It's
25 being prepared to advise the Commission and to disclose to

1 the public the environmental impacts of constructing and
2 operating the proposed project. When it is completed the
3 Commission will consider the environmental information from
4 the draft EIS along with non-environmental issues such as
5 engineering, markets and rates in making its decision to
6 approve or deny the project, and the specific requirements
7 will have to comply with it. There is no review of the FERC
8 decision by the President or Congress maintaining FERC's
9 independence as a regulatory agency in providing fair and
10 unbiased decisions.

11 If the Commission votes to approve the project,
12 both Jordan Cove Energy and Pacific Connector will required
13 to meet conditions as outlined in the order. If met and
14 construction is granted, the FERC staff will monitor the
15 project through construction and restoration, performing on-
16 site inspections to ensure environmental compliance with the
17 condition of the order.

18 In a moment we will begin the important part of
19 this meeting, which is to hear your comments. When your
20 name is called, please step up to the microphone at one of
21 the podiums and state your name and affiliation, if any, for
22 the record. Your comments will be transcribed by a court
23 reporter tonight to ensure that we get an accurate record of
24 tonight's meeting. A transcript of this meeting will be
25 placed in the public record at FERC so that everyone has

1 access to information collected here tonight. I ask you to
2 please limit your comments to five minutes so that everyone
3 who wants to speak tonight will have that opportunity before
4 it gets to late for those who might need to leave early.
5 We'll provide additional opportunity for others to speak
6 again, if you like, after we've gone through the initial
7 list.

8 If you have a lengthy statement, I ask that you
9 summarize your comments and provide a copy of your full
10 comments for the record. You can hand a hard copy to the
11 court reporter or file them with the FERC. All comments are
12 given the same level of consideration whether verbal or
13 written. Lastly, before we start calling names, I ask that
14 as a courtesy to all in the room here tonight that you
15 please silence your cell phones and other communication
16 devices. Thank you. Now, we'll start the meeting. Call
17 the first speaker, please.

18 MR. SCOTT: I'll call the names in order down the
19 list and the next name on the list so that you can be
20 prepared to be on deck. First is J.D. Jones and then the
21 next after J.D. Jones is John Ward.

22 MR. JONES: Well, I'm just an old fisherman. I
23 don't represent anybody but myself. I love the river and I
24 don't want to see you guys screw it up. Now, liquid
25 natural gas -- to make natural gas into a liquid you've got

1 to keep it down to a temperature of minus 264 degrees
2 Fahrenheit. That's cold. That's colder than a witch's tit.
3 That's way colder than to freeze the balls off a brass
4 monkey. That is cold. And you're telling me that you're
5 going to waste through a swath of land, what, 50 feet, 50
6 years by 200 and some miles long all the way from Coos Bay
7 down into California so they can have this stuff down in
8 California.

9 Now, pardon me, but I think if you draw a line
10 from China where this stuff is coming from to California,
11 it's shorter than from China to Coos Bay. So what sense
12 does it make to bring this stuff up here and ship it up to
13 California? Now, you're going to tell me it's jobs. Right.
14 Yeah. How many of you people in here from Jackson County,
15 Josephine County, Douglas County, Coos County know anything
16 about laying a pipeline or running an LNG plant. I want to
17 see a show of hands.

18 (Show of hands.)

19 MR. JONES: One. Okay. I'll discount that one
20 from Jackson County. I'll give you one from each of the
21 other counties. That's four jobs for resident Oregonians.
22 The rest of them are going to come from where, California,
23 Seattle, Portland. That ain't going to help the economy of
24 these four counties. I think if you want to bring this
25 stuff into California you bring it into California, don't

1 run this thing under my river, poison the river. You're
2 going to lay waste all this land, why? Two sixty-four
3 degrees below zero, man, that's permanent frost. That's
4 permanent frost you're going to create for what -- what'd we
5 say, 200 and some odd miles down through Oregon, underneath
6 the river? What's that going to do to the river? You're
7 going to create an ice dam under the river 6 inches deep, 6
8 feet deep? Do you even know? Do you even care? What's
9 that going to do to the fish? They ain't gonna like it.
10 Any of them gonna make it up to the hatchery? You want to
11 run this thing across about Trail Creek, I understand.

12 You might bullshit me. You might get pass me.
13 I'm just some dumb fisherman, but sooner or later you put
14 this thing in you're going to have to answer to another
15 fisherman. His name is Peter, St. Peter and I doubt his
16 boss is gonna like that very much. So you do this thing.
17 You run this thing into the river, you kill my river, I'll
18 fight you all the way to the gates of hell and back. And if
19 I lose, that's okay. I got somebody else backing me up.
20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. LISTER: I'd just like to make one point of
23 clarification here. The liquefied gas, cryogenically stored
24 gas is at the terminal and the gas is vaporized before it
25 leaves the terminal. So there is no cryogenic material

1 flowing through the pipeline.

2 MR. SCOTT: John Ward and the next up Stephanie
3 Tidwell.

4 MR. WARD: My name is John Ward and thanks for
5 the opportunity to give some input related to the proposed
6 Pacific Connector LNG pipeline. I'm a 40-year resident here
7 in Jackson County. And though I'm a past president of the
8 Rogue Basin Coordinating Council, chairman of the Bear Creek
9 Watershed Council and a member of the Rogue Fly Fishers
10 Conservation Committee, I'm speaking tonight for myself.

11 I'm very concerned, even with the proposed
12 construction and conservation measures that the proposed
13 pipeline would very likely adversely affect the Coho salmon
14 in the southern Oregon, northern California ESU and other
15 anagermous (phonetic) native salmonics (phonetic). We have
16 those -- you've noted in the document critical habitat Tier
17 1 key watersheds under the Northwest Forest Plan on federal
18 lands, put the value of that resources shared on private
19 lands as well.

20 Just to briefly summarize, I think that the
21 legendary salmon runs in the Rogue are definitely impacted
22 by the long-term destruction and removal of stream-site
23 habitat, both by the stream crossing and the down-slope
24 impact of project roads. Secondly, the draft Environmental
25 Impact Statement does not provide assurance that the ODF&W

1 in stream work windows will be met because it leaves some
2 discretion to the construction managers where there are
3 nest-inspired owls and other wildlife considerations.

4 The third and last point I want to make tonight
5 the proposed pipeline crossing of the Rogue River has a
6 contingency plan in the event that the horizontal
7 directional drilling fails. The contingency is to use the
8 wet, open cut trench dredging method to cross the river,
9 which certainly would disturb the gravel, the cobble, the
10 rocks and other things in the flowing river. The document
11 in this instance and a number of others doesn't really give
12 adequate details. It discusses the wet, open trench method
13 when it discusses the Coos Bay estuary, but it doesn't
14 discuss what provisions would be in crossing the river. It
15 does note that the wet, open cut method would have seven
16 times the tributary that the dry method crossing would, but
17 probably not likely that the Rogue River could be put in a
18 large tube and safely sail pass Trail Creek.

19 Those are the comments I have and I'll be sending
20 some others in, in writing, later. Thanks.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Stephanie Tidwell and
23 then Glen Archambault.

24 MS. TIDWELL: My name is Stephanie Tidwell. I'm
25 the executive director of the Klamath-Siskiyou Wild Land

1 Center and I speak on behalf of our 1,800 household members
2 that primary live in southern Oregon and northern California
3 and there are so many reasons to oppose this project that I
4 hardly know where to begin. I think it's pretty fair to
5 lump it into three general categories. So we'll just focus
6 on those for this short time period, and they are direct
7 environmental impacts; two, impacts to rural residents and
8 communities; and three, bad energy policy.

9 First, direct environmental impacts, the pipeline
10 would cross dozens of streams as well as going under both
11 the main stem Klamath and Rogue Rivers. The proposed method
12 for drilling under the riverbeds has a high failure rate and
13 potential for significant sediment loading into these vital
14 salmon-bearing rivers. Also, the industry folks like to
15 tell us that there's virtually no risk of leaks from this
16 mega-pipe. But anyone that's ever paid much attention to
17 gas pipelines knows better. As they start up and as they
18 age, these pipelines will have failures. Again, the
19 industry folks swear that they have emergency response teams
20 that will be there in no time to deal with the problem.
21 Yeah, right.

22 Number two, impacts to rural residents and
23 communities, people are justifiably worried about the
24 negative impacts that this going to have on their lives.
25 Declaring eminent domain, seizing property to force through

1 the fossil fuel pipeline that no one here wants is
2 reprehensible. Not being one of the unlucky individuals
3 facing this takings, I'll leave to those that are to more
4 fully elaborate on this industry and government strong-
5 arming of Oregon's rural communities.

6 And finally, bad energy policy, liquefied natural
7 gas is not a sustainable or clean energy resource. It is a
8 finite fossil fuel mined primarily in countries not even
9 particularly friendly to the U.S. that requires a great
10 amount of dangerous processing to get it to its usable
11 state. And in all reality, it is really not even that much
12 of it. If industry manages to ram this project through to
13 implementation, our forests, streams, wildlife and
14 communities will suffer simply so that energy-hungry
15 California can have a couple of decades of gas on the backs
16 of the taxpayer and our communities.

17 And don't forget, the State of California refused
18 to allow them to site this terminal on their coastline at
19 all, which is why they're trying to shove it down Oregon's
20 throat. Once it's gone, Oregon will be left with an ugly
21 pipeline and a big mess to clean up. It's time to look pass
22 such short-sighted plans and begin to create and implement
23 the real sustainable energy plan for our country and its
24 people, which brings me to the topic of process. Since the
25 inception of the LNG proposal, Oregonians have unequivocally

1 been opposed. The dangers it poses to our quality of life
2 are real. Folks across the political spectrum have come
3 together to say no. I truly hope that FERC listens and
4 chooses to support democracy over short-term corporate
5 profit margins. Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Glen Archambault and then
8 Barbara Foley.

9 MR. ARCHAMBAULT: My name is Glen Archambault.

10 COURT REPORTER: Please spell your name.

11 MR. ARCHAMBAULT: Excuse me? Glen Archambault.
12 You want it spelled? Okay. It's A-R-C-H-A-M-B-A-U-L-T.

13 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

14 MR. ARCHAMBAULT: I'm a board member of the
15 Pipeline Safety Trust, which is a non-profit organization
16 nationally. I'm also an interstate gas pipeline landowner
17 and I remember well the Year 1993 and I stood in the same
18 room at a FERC meeting, so I'm a seasoned individual here in
19 the State of Oregon on this subject. I'm also a citizen
20 volunteer on a U.S. Department of Transportation project
21 called PIPA or Pipelines Informed Planning Alliance and I'm
22 going to make some recommendations in this process and some
23 recommendations directly to my friends at FERC.

24 I'm hoping that they will look closely at that
25 end product, and for the audience here I'm going to briefly

1 explain what the PIPA or Pipelines Informed Planning
2 Alliance is about. We're working on coming up with
3 recommendations and best practices for oil and gas pipelines
4 for the communities, the landowners, everyone who is
5 affected -- that includes the pipeline operator -- to make
6 some better decisions.

7 Now, as a long-term resident along an interstate
8 gas pipeline, I have a great deal of experience within the
9 State of Oregon regarding land use. Currently, if I go to
10 my planning department or to my elected officials in the
11 State of Oregon and ask them a question about my land, not
12 the actual pipeline or the easement, but what should be done
13 with this land. Can I build a house there? Should we put a
14 daycare center in? Should we put any kind of land use in
15 place along there? They have no answer, none, so I feel for
16 the people that are having this project proposed to them
17 that own land and the communities along there because it's
18 not necessarily about the pipeline. It's the failure of the
19 State of Oregon to be prepared to accept and deal with the
20 pipeline that's being proposed.

21 We are completely unprepared in the State of
22 Oregon as are many other areas of the nation and so I must
23 ask, considering the money and time and effort, all of this
24 on the Department of Transportation teams have spent that
25 FERC put a special effort and consideration in asking the

1 pipeline operator and the communities engaged in the process
2 to deal with the land use along this proposed pipeline,
3 should it be granted or certified of necessity and
4 convenience.

5 This is one of those issues that I've listened to
6 the FERC process across this nation repeatedly asked. Of
7 course, it's not the FERC's business. It's not the pipeline
8 operator's business. It's local government's business and
9 they don't answer the question. And I know there are people
10 in this room that own land and they're going to ask those
11 questions. They're going to go down to the planning
12 department after this pipeline, should it be built, and
13 start asking questions and they're going to have no answers.

14
15 I own land that has no survey. The pipeline
16 where I live has no survey. That's one of those basic land
17 use questions I'm going to ask. Is that going to be
18 required? I think it should be. I think we should know
19 exactly where that pipeline is and I think we should know
20 where every pipeline in the state is and where the easement
21 boundaries are so that the local government can plan
22 accordingly with accurate information. I'd be glad to
23 expand on any of this later, but I'm going to let others
24 speak. Thank you very much.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Barbara Foley and then
2 Jody McCaffree.

3 MS. FALCY: My name is Barbara Falcy, F-A-L-C-Y,
4 and I'm representing myself today. I am not what's being
5 considered an affected landowner, but I believe that
6 everyone in Oregon is affected by this pipeline, so I'd like
7 to speak on, briefly I hope, a couple of issues. I oppose
8 it in many, many different aspects, so I'll try and talk to
9 just a couple. I brought my DEIS statement. I've never
10 seen one before. It's quite a daunting document and I
11 thought maybe you would want me to refer directly to what
12 you have put in there. So I brought a few pages if I needed
13 them, but basically I'll just talk one thing about fish.

14 In the statement it says that the construction
15 company would be doing their construction on crossing --
16 where they're crossing or going under waterways according to
17 low flow periods. And so my statement to that is that by
18 using that statement, which was repeated several times in
19 the document, by the way, which looked to me like a lot of
20 it was cut and pasted, that by repeating this sentence and
21 using it inappropriately leaves the pipeline to determine
22 whether or not that work should be done -- the pipeline
23 people -- rather than the ODFW, so I am concerned about that
24 and the fish because of pipeline that were built in the past
25 and the detrimental affect that they did have on fish.

1 When you talk about blasting in the DEIS, there
2 are pages of that and again, the wording is repeated often,
3 so I'll just talk to a couple of those. When you talk about
4 wells in Section 4.136, 37, 38, 35, water is a concern for
5 me and the people in Trail. It's a small community of 1,800
6 to 2,000. We're not incorporated, but I do deal with the
7 public every day, so I hear a lot of comments about that.

8 A lot of people haul water now, so when they talk
9 about turbidity and water flows and the affect in the
10 blasting it's pretty much apparent that there will be
11 affects and it's admitted to and talked about in this
12 statement, and especially because of the unstable rock in
13 the area. But the bland statement that's repeated in the
14 DEIS makes it sound like it's a simple thing that we'll just
15 get you some water if you need it or if you're affected by
16 it. On a temporary basis that's rather huge already. I
17 know where I live there is a hill. I'm kind of at the top
18 of the hill and I have great water, but people on the one
19 side of the road have terrible water or no water and one
20 side have water. So they're hauling it already. So if
21 you're hauling water and then they say, oh, you have no
22 water a temporary thing for one day that means you can't use
23 your toilets or bathrooms or kitchens, and as you all know,
24 water is a huge issue.

25 And then they'll say if it's a permanent damage

1 to your water system, we'll fix that. And they make that
2 sound like that's an easy thing to do. But if there are no
3 water wells to get that water from, it is not an easy fix.
4 So if you're the landowner or homeowner hoping to have a
5 shower tonight that could be a problem. I've been in that
6 situation myself.

7 Another thing I would like to briefly talk about
8 is the landowner impacts. There are many phases of that as
9 well that is repeated, the wording. I think that the
10 Environmental Impact Statement is done prematurely because
11 there are so many statements that say, "information will be
12 added later." And if it's added later, the public is not
13 going to be able to comment on it because the deadline is
14 December 4. So one thing I would respectfully ask that the
15 deadline be extended so that comment periods, once we get
16 this information, we'll know exactly how to address it.
17 There is one statement where it's landowner impacts where
18 Pacific Connector says that there will be 12 rectifiers in
19 the 230-mile pipeline that's 10 miles apart. Well, if you
20 can do math that would be 23 rectifiers, not 12. So I don't
21 even know if the figures that are given in this are correct.
22 So that's another issue.

23 Landowner impacts also talk about threat to the
24 land by condemnation and eminent domain. I think that those
25 issues will be strongly opposed to by all of the landowners.

1 As I said, I'm not personally affected. My land is, thank
2 goodness, two miles away, so I'm not affected. But I will
3 be crossing this pipe four times a day. So I believe that
4 everyone in the area is affected, whether it's on their land
5 or not. So I'll quit with my pages and pages of information
6 and just say that I'm opposed for many, many reasons and I
7 respectfully request that we at least get an extension so
8 when we get another document it's got the information we can
9 address in a manner that we know how to do with our figures
10 and numbers and calculations. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. SCOTT: Jody McCaffree and Wendy Wong Haigh.

13 MS. McCAFFREE: I'm Jody McCaffree. That's
14 J-O-D-Y, McCaffree is M-C-C-A-F-F-R-E-E. I spoke with North
15 Bend. I'm going to repeat a lot of that testimony because
16 you were not there in North Bend. Also, I feel there were a
17 lot of problems with the mike in North Bend and I don't know
18 that those testimonies got recorded properly. So almost
19 feel that meeting might should be redone so that everybody's
20 testimony is in the record.

21 I'm a lifetime resident of the Bay area, North
22 Bend. I live in North Bend. I'm a volunteer executive
23 director of Citizens Against LNG. Thousands and thousands
24 of people have signed our petition against this project and
25 I'm speaking for them. I'd like to first ask that FERC

1 reconsider Senator Wyden's requests for a deadline extension
2 and I would like to get into why I feel that way.

3 You mentioned at the beginning of the meeting
4 that this is not a decision document, but yet you have a
5 conclusions and recommendations in a draft Environmental
6 Impact Statement. That's sounds like you're making a
7 decision. And in the very first page, page 1, you state
8 that "Jordan Cove has limited adverse environmental
9 impacts." I do not know how you can say that because if you
10 review this document there is incomplete -- you can't
11 actually review because the documents are there. They're
12 incomplete or they're not available or they don't even
13 exist. If you look at page 5-32 through 5-57, there's 141
14 major reports, analyses and/or requests by FERC that have
15 yet to be completed by Jordan Cove. Many of these are
16 critical reports and analysis that we citizens will not be
17 able to view or comment on. They will not be made available
18 until like the end of the comment period or after it's long
19 over with like prior to construction, prior to site prep, on
20 and on and on. That's not fair to us. We're looking at
21 something that's very incomplete and we cannot comment on it
22 because the records don't exist.

23 The second issue landowners on alternative routes
24 such as the one FERC now prefers as the preferred route
25 around Coos Bay, which is Route WC1(A). That's on page 3-

1 63. They've not been given ample time or due process. The
2 original proposed route through the Bay had over a year of
3 scrutiny by officials. The latest preferred route has not.
4 At the end of September there were public meetings that were
5 put on by Williams and at that time there were no updated
6 maps and Williams had not notified landowners at that
7 meeting, and we were already a month into this draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement review regarding that
9 preferred route.

10 I even went to BLM. They didn't even have any
11 information and that was just a couple of weeks ago. I
12 realize now at these meetings finally they do have detailed
13 maps, but that doesn't give landowners very much time. It's
14 not really fair to them. These are landowners -- these
15 alternative routes were not in the filing. When they filed
16 their filing in September of last year a lot of these --
17 none of these alternative routes were in that filing. So
18 these landowners have been hit broadside and they're finding
19 out the end of the process when we're already in the draft
20 stage. That's not fair to them. They never got a chance to
21 be interveners because they didn't even know they were on a
22 pipeline route.

23 Several Bay area businesses are impacted by this
24 such as Clausman's (phonetic) Oysters, Contuck (phonetic)
25 golf course and Coos County Sheep Farm. These all have been

1 hit, you know, the last and there's also another Blue Ridge
2 alternative on page 3-64. I realize that FERC did not --
3 landowners requested this route, but FERC did not approve
4 it. But if there is some pressure to get them to approve
5 it, those landowners need to be given due process, too.

6 Some of the missing reports I'd like to talk
7 about just a little bit. One of them is the tsunami study
8 and you only require that prior to construction. It hasn't
9 been completed yet. We just got an announcement in the
10 paper the other day that it's going to be due in ten days.
11 That study needs to include ship impacts to the brume along
12 with other floating objects, channel modifications and the
13 facility itself. And after that is completed we should have
14 at least 45 days to review that study. With it just prior
15 to construction, that's long after the comment period and
16 that's not fair to us because if there was a tsunami that in
17 itself is very harmful -- could be very harmful to our
18 citizens. But if you add that with a gas facility that
19 could have gas explosions and pretty significant since we
20 have two 42 million gallon tanks of this liquefied natural
21 gas will be sitting in a red tsunami zone. I think that we
22 should have that study available to review.

23 A second one is the airport air space review.
24 That's on page 4.9-8. That's not due to prior to the end of
25 the comment period or with the implementation plan. That's

1 a serious issue and the tank heights that that study, which
2 is under way now I take it, they need to be taken from the
3 August 2007 GRI report, which is a data report for phase 2
4 geo-technical investigation. This was something that Jordan
5 Cove hired this company to do. In their report they state
6 the tanks to be about 265-foot in diameter with a roof peak
7 at approximate elevation of plus 200 feet; so if you're
8 going to have the FAA study, it needs to have the tanks at
9 plus 200 feet because your draft states that they're at 180.

10 The way the draft reads I can see where people
11 could take the wrong height for those tanks and that study
12 needs to include the right height for the tanks. And then
13 after that study is done, we need 45 days to be able to
14 review it and comment on it. And with it due at the end of
15 the comment period, that's not going to likely happen and
16 that's not fair.

17 The emergency response, which is at page 4.12-42,
18 that's not due really until initial site prep. That's long
19 after the comment period. There is no emergency response
20 for us to even look at or know. There's no report currently
21 available. Nearly 17,000 people in our area, the North Bend
22 area, live in the LNG housing zones of concern. That's page
23 4.7-3 and 4.7-15, the maps. I'm asking that all those
24 humans be considered. And not just that, you have a
25 pipeline for 230 miles, has a hazard zone of 900-foot hazard

1 radius, those human beings need to be considered because a
2 lot of people live -- I know you think you're going through
3 rural Oregon, but people live in these areas very close, 90
4 feet from their front door in some cases is where this pipe
5 is going.

6 Those people deserve a right to have -- if there
7 was an accident in Coos Bay or along the pipeline route, you
8 have 30 seconds before you would receive second-degree burns
9 and that's up to a mile away. So there's no way a fire
10 department is going to get there and out in rural Oregon
11 you're really looking at major forest fires. So you're
12 going to have secondary fires impacting homes. The people
13 that live in these zones deserve to have the fire protection
14 equipment. They deserve to have fire suits, if need be, at
15 their homes and their businesses. There are several
16 business where the severe, Sandia zone. It impacts several
17 businesses and people that live there. The draft is wrong
18 about that.

19 And I'm asking too that our fire departments be
20 given hazard information that isn't just coming from Jordan
21 Cove consultants who have no experience or expertise in LNG
22 hazards. Professional scientists and/or true LNG hazard
23 experts need to be consulted. The LNG accident that
24 occurred in 1987, and it's referred in the Sandia report,
25 page 112 and 113, it needs to be released -- the full

1 report, to our fire departments and emergency responders and
2 our Coast Guard personnel. And there was a video of that
3 accident and they need to have that for the review because I
4 don't think they're being given correct information on the
5 hazards. We deserve an emergency response plan that is
6 adequate and is based on all the facts and not just the
7 industry's slanted and misleading version.

8 There's also this issue of alternative renewable
9 energy. That's page 3-4. The information in the draft EIS
10 is completely inadequate and incomplete. If this is
11 supposed to be a review of all the alternatives, and it
12 isn't, you have just skimmed over and disregarded some very
13 viable alternatives.

14 And one of them, for instance, solar alone --
15 that's on page 3-8. You're saying that we can't do solar
16 because it's too cloudy in Oregon, yet Germany is betting so
17 much on solar that they're building solar world. October 17
18 the cut the ribbon on their facility in Hillsborough, Oregon
19 that will employ a thousand people. It will be the largest
20 solar manufacturing company in North America.

21 There is more photon energy in Oregon than in
22 Germany where they heavily rely on solar for electricity
23 generation. So that is not correct, your assumptions in the
24 draft. And also there was a study that shows LNG competes
25 with renewables. Okay. That's the production cost modeling

1 for high levels of photovoltaics penetration. In other
2 words, thousands of jobs in the renewable industry are at
3 stake in Oregon if these West Coast terminals are allowed to
4 proceed, and that was actually referenced in a letter that
5 was sent to FERC by Peak Sun Silicon. They were concerned.
6 They're building a plant in Millersburg, Oregon that will
7 employ 500 people and they were concerned that those jobs
8 could be at risk if these LNG terminals are allowed to come
9 in.

10 I'm asking that you don't only just consider
11 those 500 jobs, but the thousand jobs at Sun Solar and all
12 the secondary jobs. There are even some here in the Medford
13 area that could be at risk because we're actually at a point
14 where, where are we going to have our electricity? Is it
15 going to be from gas-fired power plants or is it going to be
16 from alternative renewables? There are more jobs in the
17 renewables and you discredit that. Two paragraphs are given
18 to solar in the whole, huge 1,500 pages of that draft. It's
19 not right. You need to go back and look at that.

20 The Citizens Against LNG request that FERC
21 provide us with a properly done draft EIS that includes
22 complete and accurate reports and complete and accurate
23 analysis of all the alternatives. Then and only then we
24 request 45 days to review it. Citizens need to be given
25 ample time for that process. FERC has not followed NEPA in

1 regards to this issue and we are requesting that NEPA
2 guidelines be followed and this process be done correctly.

3 Senator Wyden's request for a 45-day comment
4 period extension pails in comparison to what is really
5 needed. FERC should at least consider and honor his
6 request. In a recent letter from Commissioner Joseph
7 Kelliher, his response to Senator Wyden assumed that
8 landowners have all been notified and given a copy of the
9 draft EIS or pipeline routes through their land and that is
10 a false assumption, as many have not. In fact, in our
11 Monday meeting finally -- there were two landowners there I
12 know that had never been given a draft. They got it that
13 first time that night.

14 One landowner, finally, after two years of asking
15 got a copy of the pipeline route through their land. I know
16 two interveners that did not get a draft Environmental
17 Impact Statement. So I don't know what the problem is
18 there, but people -- you know, not everybody's been notified
19 about it.

20 So we're asking that this process be done right
21 and that you follow the intent of NEPA and that our concerns
22 that we raise in scoping, which many concerns raised in
23 scoping have not been addressed in this draft. In fact, I
24 don't even know that our scoping comments that were done in
25 the North Bend area ever made it into the record. I never

1 saw it go through. I saw the Roseburg one go through, but I
2 never saw ours go through, no typewritten comments. I'm
3 just asking you please extend the comment period and do this
4 process properly. Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Wendy Wong Haigh and then
7 Ed, I apologize, Plume.

8 MS. HAIGH: Okay. This is my third meeting with
9 you guys. I'm a lot calmer than the first one and the
10 second one. So I actually have something I should have said
11 yesterday at the Douglas County meeting. And it's just
12 three words were left out of something that you quoted from
13 the Douglas County commissioner resolution that was filed on
14 July 25, 2007 your DEIS. It's on 1 or is that I -- no, it's
15 1-3.

16 And it says, "Douglas County would be crossed by
17 the Pacific Connector pipeline between mileposts 45.5 and
18 109.6 and its land department has chosen to be a cooperating
19 agency in the preparation of the EIS. However, the Douglas
20 County Board of Commissioners have passed a resolution
21 recommending that the pipeline should not be constructed
22 unless and until Pacific Connector negotiates with all
23 affected landowners and all landowner concerns are
24 addressed" and then you stopped.

25 In the actual resolution that was passed the

1 actual wording says the same thing except that you left out
2 three key words, which I would like you to include in the
3 final EIS because I think they're crucial three words and I
4 have a document that I will submit to you that you actually
5 left them out. Those three words are "to their
6 satisfaction." You guys took those three words out. So I
7 want you to put them back in because those are crucial words
8 that the landowners needs -- their needs need to be
9 addressed to their satisfaction and you have taken those
10 three words out and I request that you -- actually, you need
11 to put them back in. I don't request it. They need to be
12 put back in because those are three important legal words.
13 Those landowners were protected by Douglas County
14 commissioners with that resolution and you have taken those
15 words out of your document, so put them back in.

16 Okay. Next item is fuel and chemical spills on
17 page 4.5-96. Basically, you say there is a potential for
18 spills of hazard liquids from storage containers. You admit
19 that. And it says, "Basically, to minimize the potential
20 for spills, Pacific Connector has developed an SPCC plan.
21 Okay. And then you refer back to another page where you
22 have to find the SPCC plan and then that refers you to
23 another page. But I never found the SPCC plan written out
24 anywhere, so I would like to see that in the final EIS
25 because I didn't get to see any plan to mitigate the

1 there where the pipeline is supposed to be going underneath
2 the river and I have a problem with -- I have a problem with
3 the whole pipeline anyway, but one of my main concerns is
4 with the horizontal drilling and sometimes they create
5 fractures and the fractures leaks the bentonite and then it
6 goes up into the riverbed and the Trail Creek area is where
7 their spotting the salmon steel head spawn and all that
8 bethanite can go on top of the rigs, which will kill the
9 eggs and especially our salmon steelhead season we're down
10 like -- I don't know exactly, but 50, 60 percent from like
11 three or four years ago and they're closing salmon up in in
12 the ocean, Oregon, Washington and California and we can't
13 afford to be losing any more steelhead and salmon. So I'd
14 just like -- I'm against the whole thing and I'm going to
15 give the rest of my time to Jody McCaffree. Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Marcie Laudani and the
18 next us Richard Harrington.

19 MS. LAUDANI: Yes, my name is Marcie Laudani and
20 I live in Trail, Oregon --

21 COURT REPORTER: Spell that please.

22 MS. LAUDANI: L-A-U-D-A-N-I. And I want to say I
23 don't really have anything prepared tonight because I've
24 been rather busy running around our road and I'll bring that
25 up in a bit. But I have also very, very many concerns with

1 this pipeline issue. One being the crossing, the Rogue
2 River crossing and Pacific Connector's HDD track record in
3 terms of 36-inch pipe where they have a three-in-one failure
4 on that HDD crossing, exactly what does that mean when you
5 have a failure. That's a concern for this resident in the
6 local area. Also, it's in a very close proximity to the
7 Trail Market, which has underground storage tanks for three
8 pumps and a gasoline service site. It's within 500 feet of
9 this proposed directional drill. And if you remember back a
10 month ago in Appomattox, Virginia there was a major
11 explosion that incinerated two homes and took the siding off
12 of seven other homes and injured five people and the only
13 reason nobody was killed in that incident is because they
14 heard an earthquake-like rupture and everybody was able to
15 run. That was a Williams pipeline that had been inspected
16 and passed a month prior to this incident occurring. And
17 this is just one of a long string now of events that are
18 happening with this company. And I'm concerned living in an
19 area that is rather remote. There are a lot of residents in
20 that area.

21 There is the Shady Trails Motor Home Park.
22 That's also within a few hundred feet of this proposed
23 crossing and that's a couple of hundred motor homes there.
24 And then you have the Peninsula across the river where there
25 are several homes right down in the Peninsula and a lot of

1 these are new. These are retired people that have moved to
2 the area, such as myself. My husband and I built a passive
3 solar home there. It's a beautiful three-story home with
4 decks and it's a solar home. I'm proud to say we only paid
5 7 or \$8 a month last winter for a 24,000 square foot
6 structure for our electric and that's because we do get a
7 lot of solar energy in southern Oregon, even in the winter
8 months.

9 I'm also concerned -- I've worn many hats when I
10 worked for the County of San Diego before I moved up to
11 Oregon and I had worked for the Air Pollution Control
12 District and I'm not going to even address the Falls
13 compressor station. I think someone else may take that.
14 But I had worked a couple of fires, the Cedar and the Pines
15 fire when I worked for Campground Parks and Recreation. And
16 a lot of my concern is this BLM lands and it's a rough,
17 roughed, mountainous terrain that they're going to be
18 putting this pipeline up through and a lot of my concern is
19 how will we have the resources -- how will you have the
20 emergency response available?

21 These are core areas. You don't have a lot of
22 the facility, the necessity. There's nothing there. You
23 don't have the helicopters. You don't have response. There
24 are small town type operations and eventually there's going
25 to be a breach. It's a huge pipeline. This pipeline is

1 1,440 psi. That's almost twice the pressure of the pipeline
2 in Virginia that ruptures and that created almost a --
3 picture a huge zippo lighter going a mile high in the sky
4 and almost a quarter mile wide. It is not a natural event.
5 You can't just come and put it out. It has to be addressed.
6 People have to be on the ball and be in the area. And
7 oftentimes, on a lot of these things they are not responded
8 to properly and they talk it up and say, oh, we have this
9 wonderful program in place or it all looks fine and dandy on
10 paper; but when you get down to it and you've got people's
11 lives at stake and issues that have to be addressed I'm
12 sorry, sir, it just isn't happening and I've got a big
13 concern about that.

14 Lastly is I'm also a part of the Old Ferry Road
15 Committee, which is in a trail and you did dedicate a page
16 to our resolution and I do thank you for that. It says here
17 "Old Ferry Road Committee suggest Pacific Connector use the
18 Indian Creek Firebreak Road as an alternative access point
19 to the east side of the Rogue River. Pacific Connector has
20 identified this road as an existing access road that it
21 would use, which would intersect the proposed pipeline at
22 milepost 12409 and there may be reasonable alternatives to
23 minimize impacts to landowners." Okay. "Therefore, we
24 recommend plan identifies measures that would either avoid
25 entirely the need to use Old Ferry Road as a temporary

1 access road or would allow use of the road, but without
2 improvements. Measures include, but not limited to use BLM
3 34123 to access the right-of-way on the east side of the
4 Rogue River between mileposts." And then what we would like
5 is to come down the road to the Peninsula should this
6 project go through, and we don't want that, but you know,
7 we're trying to be reasonable here. And we think that's a
8 reasonable alternative as so you wrote.

9 Just this week we've noticed Pacific Connector
10 surveyors out criss-crossing, going all over our road and
11 area and primarily, which really blows me away, is down a
12 seasonal stream is where they're accessing -- there's all
13 these flags going down that area. So is this a road idea?
14 And they're looking at an area above the Old Ferry Road.
15 This is not the Indian Creek Road, which we suggested, maybe
16 150 feet and it's just -- the line goes like this and it's a
17 new road that would be in the BLM taking out more forest
18 station, more erosion control methods that we need along our
19 road because this is a maintained road by the residents.
20 I'm having a hard time understanding what that's all about,
21 if that some cruel joke or something.

22 Anyway, here was a letter who John Roberts, who's
23 the president of our group, had received that said, "You're
24 receiving this letter because Pacific Connector and the Old
25 Ferry Road have identified alternative temporary access

1 road." I'm sorry. I was in that meeting which wasn't
2 really a meeting because we didn't have maps available. We
3 didn't have the Old Ferry Road group present. It was the
4 president, the secretary and myself for maybe 15 minutes
5 because I wasn't informed of the meeting present. We need
6 to have a real meeting to discuss an alternative. If that's
7 what they truly desire, we should have it where all are
8 present, where they have maps, where they have routes that
9 they're going to consider and on and on. And then they say
10 within the next couple of weeks Pacific Connector will have
11 people requesting permission. Well, nobody asked me
12 anything. I just saw them all over the route. Thank you
13 very much.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Richard Harrington, then
16 Leslie Adams.

17 MR. HARRINGTON: My name is Richard Harrington,
18 H-A-R-R-I-N-G-T-O-N. I'm representing myself. As Marcie,
19 the previous speaker, mentioned near Appomattox, Virginia on
20 September 14, 2008 a Williams 30-inch pipeline operating at
21 approximately 800 pounds per square inch ruptured and
22 exploded in flames with two homes destroyed, five people
23 injured. And the photographs on the Internet of the site
24 are very shocking. It looks like a bomb went off. This was
25 not the first Williams' pipeline failure and it probably

1 will not be the last.

2 About such hazards the DEIS in Section 4.12.10
3 under the heading of "Pipeline Facilities" state, "The
4 transportation of natural gas by pipeline involves some risk
5 to the public. In the event of an accident and subsequent
6 release of gas, the greatest hazard is a fire or explosion
7 following a major pipeline rupture." That's it. That's the
8 discussion. The DEIS does not elaborate on that. However,
9 from a fire or an explosion following a major pipeline
10 rupture and why not?

11 However, table 4.12.4.4-1 on page 4.12-20 lists
12 what it calls thermal exclusion zones for an LNG storage
13 tank impoundment in the context of, according to the table,
14 an outdoor-assembly area occupied by 50 or more people. It
15 informs us that if the radiant heat from a natural gas
16 explosion is of an intensity of 1,600 British Thermal Units
17 per square foot per hour an exposed portion within 967 feet
18 will experience burns within about 30 seconds if they do not
19 leave the area or get shelter. Also, for a LNG storage tank
20 impoundment in the context of offsite structures used for
21 occupancies or residences if the radiant heat is of an
22 intensity of 3,000 BTU per square foot per hour the exposed
23 person within 76 feet would experience burns within 10
24 seconds. However, a wooden structure would not be expected
25 to burn and affords protection to sheltered persons.

1 And also in this table for LNG storage tank
2 impoundment, "If radiant heat is of an intensity of 10,000
3 BTU per square foot per hour, within 482 feet of that --
4 wood can ignite spontaneously. Obviously, the residents
5 near Appomattox, Virginia were within 482 feet of the
6 pipeline. Since heat intensities also apply to a natural
7 gas explosion from a pipeline rupture, the DEIS should
8 discuss this hazard to residences along the pipeline.
9 Please do not hide this danger in the discussion of LNG
10 storage tank impoundments since there are many residences
11 within 482 feet of the proposed pipeline where this wood can
12 ignite spontaneously and many more within 976 feet where
13 burns to the skin can be experienced within about 30
14 seconds.

15 Even more disturbing is the fact that there are
16 reportedly -- and this is what a Williams guy told me in a
17 public meeting in Shady Cove last spring -- there are some
18 residents within 50 feet of the pipeline. It is criminal to
19 permit pipeline siting this close to residences even though
20 it is legally permissible under the cover of eminent domain,
21 but at least discuss this with the public in the EIS so that
22 it can understand the seriousness of the danger. For
23 example, the numbers of 967 feet or 482 feet are imprecise
24 we are discussing a hypothetical residence near a 30-inch,
25 800-psi pipeline compared to a 36-inch at 1,440 psi or if

1 there is a wind blowing the flames horizontally.

2 Finally, on page 4.12-56, is an example of the
3 questionable approach to public safety put forth by the
4 DEIS. "The available data showed that natural gas pipelines
5 continue to be a safe, reliable means of energy
6 transportation based on approximately 320,000 miles on in
7 service. The rate of public fatalities for a nationwide mix
8 of transmission and gallon lines and service is 0.1 per year
9 per 1,000 miles of pipeline. Using this rate, the Pacific
10 Connector Pipeline and associated facilities might result in
11 a public fatality every 435 years. This would represent a
12 slight increase in risk to the nearby public."

13 It is comforting to know that there is only a
14 slight increase to the nearby public. But since there was
15 no risk before, how can it be an increase. Uhm, if I had
16 one marble and I got a second one that would be a 100
17 percent increase, but if I had none and got one that would
18 be not an increase. That would be my first marble. It is
19 misleading to say that this would represent a slight
20 increase in risk to the nearby public which had none before.
21 This risk that residents are being forced to assume is at
22 the heart of much of the public opposition to the pipeline.
23 Please do a better job in subsequent versions of this
24 document of analyzing the explosion hazard. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Leslie Adams and then Ray
2 Jamison (sic).

3 MS. ADAMS: My name is Leslie Adams and I'm
4 representing the Rogue River Keeper Program of the Klamath-
5 Siskiyou Wild Land Center. We're a non-profit organization
6 and we are advocates for the Forest Wildlife and Waters of
7 the Rogue and Klamath River Watersheds of southwest Oregon
8 and northwest California. We work to protect and restore
9 ecosystems and help build sustainable communities.

10 I believe that this project will both harm our
11 ecosystems and it is a slap in the face to people who are
12 working to develop sustainable solutions to our future
13 needs. I want to thank everyone for coming here tonight who
14 is in the room. I think it takes a lot for people to take a
15 step out of their daily lives and read documents like this
16 and attend meetings like this, and I appreciate you all
17 coming out tonight being a watchdog of our federal
18 government.

19 I have a lot of questions for FERC tonight, but
20 as has been stated, you're not taking questions. I think
21 because you don't have very many answers. Your advancing a
22 dangerous proposal that has more questions than it has
23 answers. Rather than exercise the precautionary principle
24 or sound ecological or economic judgment, you're gambling
25 with our communities and our future. This proposal has

1 enormous impacts and is being pushed through a distorted
2 public process. And to top it off, there's really no need
3 for it. This draft Environmental Impact Statement is
4 riddled with holes and inadequacies and you ask us to trust
5 you.

6 You ask us to trust out-of-state multi-national
7 energy companies. You repeatedly reference mitigation
8 measures with no clear plan. You threaten water quality and
9 the safety of adjacent communities. You ignore other
10 federal agencies and you're violating federal laws. You
11 threaten to seize private property and all of this to
12 benefit energy companies. And I want to point out tonight
13 that there are more energy company representatives at this
14 meeting than there are employees of FERC, and it makes me
15 wonder who's actually overseeing this process, which
16 actually I know who's overseeing this process. It's very
17 clear the energy companies have been designing our federal
18 energy policy, including the 2005 Energy Act which took
19 siting authority away from the states and gave it to the
20 federal government, which is why we're here tonight.

21 Our government has privatized corporate profits
22 and socialized their losses. We will not stand for the
23 losses anticipated by this ill-conceived proposal. You ask
24 us to trust you, yet when I look for sound reasoning in data
25 I see little. I don't trust you because this document is a

1 disgrace to the National Environmental Policy Act. The
2 purpose and need is flawed. According to a May 2008 report
3 from the Oregon Department of Energy, Oregon's natural gas
4 needs could be adequately met by natural gas from North
5 America. LNG requires much more money and has a much large
6 carbon footprint to transport natural gas across the ocean
7 as opposed to transporting a natural gas to Oregon from the
8 Rockies.

9 To exercise eminent domain and seize private
10 property for fuel that we don't need is irresponsible at
11 best and more likely criminal. This project is for southern
12 California's energy needs and that is not disclosed in the
13 purpose and need. In addition, there's an overcapacity of
14 existing LNG facilities in the United States. Existing
15 facilities cannot acquire natural gas anywhere near their
16 capacity because of international competition from other
17 countries such as Japan.

18 This proposal is a national security threat.
19 Bull string reliance on fossil fuel from foreign governments
20 that don't like us is a really bad idea and I thought that's
21 something that we had already learned by now.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. ADAMS: Iran, Russia and Qatar hold 60
24 percent of global natural gas reserves. Renewable energy is
25 homeland security and this project diverts resources away

1 from renewable development. This proposal has inadequate
2 mitigation measures. Mitigation measures throughout the
3 draft Environmental Impact Statement are too weak or absent
4 across the board for a project of this size and implication.
5 I'm talking about wildlife, safety, water quality, old
6 growth habitat, wildfire just to name a few.

7 The proposal puts endangered species at risk as
8 famed naturalist Elder Leopold said, "The first rule of
9 intelligent tinkering is to keep all the parts." And I'm
10 not just talking about our own well-being. It is in our
11 best interest to protect endangered species and the
12 biological diversity of this planet for our own survival.
13 But there's also, I believe, a moral obligation that we have
14 to not lessen the biological diversity that this planet has
15 been blessed to have.

16 You disclose in this document that eight species
17 listed on the Endangered Species Act will be adversely
18 impacted by this proposal and that includes Coho salmon.
19 You only recommend consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife
20 Service before construction begins. Maybe you only
21 recommend it because you recently ignored U.S. Fish and
22 Wildlife with the Bradwood Project up on the Columbia River.
23 You only recommend mitigation measures, but they are absent
24 from the document. Mitigation measures do not exist when
25 actions contribute to the extinction of a species.

1 This proposal threatens water quality. The
2 pipeline would cross 110 water bodies with known fish
3 populations and would cross or be adjacent to 11 public
4 drinking water sources. Again, mitigation measures are
5 inadequate. Water quality is impaired throughout these
6 watersheds and cannot risk the impacts associated with this
7 pipeline. The Rogue crossing is absurd. The salmon
8 fisheries of the Umpqua River and Klamath watersheds are
9 already struggling to survive and adding to the cumulative
10 effects of dams, diversions, pollution, development and
11 climate change this proposal unnecessarily threatens our
12 fish and our water. You have no business threatening or
13 Coho salmon for a quick profit for out-of-state
14 corporations.

15 I will be submitting detailed comments before the
16 December 4 deadline to fully address concerns about
17 environmental, economic and social impacts of this proposal.
18 I do agree with Jody. I would like you to reconsider
19 Senator Wyden's request for an extension on this document.
20 I can't believe that you're going to proceed with a document
21 that is this inadequate. Ideally, you would listen to the
22 public comments that I'll be submitting and those of many
23 others and kill this proposal. But in reality, I know that
24 you are going to ignore these comments and that FERC is
25 going to proceed with this project because it has a pre-

1 determined conclusion. So tonight, I am going to appeal to
2 your conscience.

3 I understand that you work for a gargantuan
4 bureaucracy, but you are not immune from individual thought,
5 analysis and action. I could stand here and easily argue
6 that your job is to work for Americans because we pay your
7 paycheck. As servants to the American people, you should
8 answer to us not multi-national energy corporations.

9 (Applause.)

10 MS. ADAMS: But really, I ask you to look into
11 the eyes of your grandchildren and explain to them how they
12 will tell their children why they've inherited the
13 financial, security and environmental catastrophes we are
14 leaving them. The reality is that we have reached the end
15 of an era. The writing is on the wall. The age of fossil
16 fuels should be over. I employ you to look within
17 yourselves and do everything you can to pull the fossil fuel
18 syringe out of America's arm, to stop this LNG proposal
19 immediately and redirect public funds to a complete
20 investment in renewable, alternative energy sources.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. ADAMS: We do not have the luxury of waiting.
23 We do not have the time to fumble and further enrich energy
24 companies at the risk of our communities, the planet and the
25 hope for a sustainable future.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Ray Jameson and Dave
3 Picanso.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Ray Johnson.

5 MR. SCOTT: Yes, I think it is Johnson. I
6 apologize.

7 COURT REPORTER: May I have your name, sir?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Ray Johnson. My wife and I
9 have an engineering business in Shady Cove. So I'm going to
10 move a little to the side so I can talk to the people that I
11 know. So I'd like to start with two facts. China signed an
12 agreement for liquid natural gas that they're purchasing at
13 \$17 per million BTUs. Today's price at Henry Hub, which is
14 a spot price -- these are both spot prices for not liquid
15 natural gas, but natural gas of the same energy units that's
16 just a little bit above \$6. So since Doler and I have a
17 small company, I'd like to understand how a company can buy
18 a commodity for \$17 or higher at least a factor of two than
19 what they're going to sell it or -- little difficult to
20 understand.

21 But I'd like to have you look a little bit deeper
22 on this. I think this might be a shuck. It's a pea and
23 shell game. If you can buy gas cheap, you can make liquid
24 nitrogen for export. If you come to the community and you
25 say I'd like to get licensed by these August boards, I think

1 I'd better come and say I'm importing gas to help out
2 people. I don't want to tell them that I might bet the
3 system built, put the gas pipeline in, have the big storage
4 containers in Coos Bay, have the ships slot, have everything
5 ready and then say I can't get this gas in liquid natural
6 form and it's too expensive. So they'll go back to friendly
7 FERC and say, you know, you've given us this gas line. We
8 have this facility that's lying -- we can't use it. In
9 fact, if we use it we're losing money every day because it
10 cost us more to buy it than what we can sell it for.

11 Now, isn't that a nice business model? I guess I
12 don't understand that. So how can something that's built to
13 import be then changed to export? Well, you can pump gas to
14 Midland (phonetic) and Klamath Falls or you can pump gas
15 from Klamath Falls. The compressor station with just an
16 adding maybe a couple new values can reverse the
17 compressing. It can suck from the Midland. It can compress
18 to Coos Bay. And what do you have to do when you get that
19 gas to Coos Bay. You see you can then say to FERC, well, we
20 have all this land so let's put a refrigeration unit in,
21 pre-staged like maybe the one in Kenai, Alaska that's
22 presently doing that, the only one in the country at this
23 point that's exporting gas. Where does that gas go to, that
24 LNG goes to Japan?

25 So it's a good shot. Coos Bay is like 43 depress

1 latitude. Hodoku (phonetic) Japan is about 43 degrees
2 latitude, so you might have to go a little south to get to
3 Tokyo or maybe a little bit further south to get to the
4 Beijing area. So this is what I think needs to be looked
5 at. Is this what is being projected? Is this what's being
6 planned? Why should three entities, two on the Columbia and
7 one here be falling over themselves to get licensed? It
8 doesn't make sense. Now, California might be a little
9 disturbed, but maybe not because they wouldn't probably buy
10 the gas anyway.

11 So I think this FERC organization should look at
12 this. It's not unusual. All the facility would be in --
13 the footprint at Coos Bay where the liquid natural gas
14 terminal is would already be laid out. Nobody would be
15 impacted. They don't have to come to a bunch of
16 troublemakers like this group and have to go through
17 something. So I'd like to have you address this because
18 financially it doesn't make sense to me. It's a way for a
19 Canadian outfit to help their countrymen raise the price of
20 gas and if they're shipping gas out of one of these
21 terminals or three of them, the cost of gas is going to go
22 up here. Kenai is already having that problem. My brother
23 put in a plant up north -- helped put in a plant for Union
24 Chemical. He's a chemical engineer. And they used natural
25 gas out of Cook Inlet to make fertilizer, ammonia nitrate

1 and hydra ammonia, that sort of thing. Some was shipped to
2 Japan. Some was shipped up the Columbia River to -- you
3 know, to fertilize the wheat fields. And now they're having
4 a problem up there, even Tesoro (phonetic) that owns that
5 plant now has had problems that natural gas is the feed
6 stock to make this fertilizer. They had to go to diesel
7 because they didn't have adequate power.

8 The power companies are starting to complain
9 because all this gas is being shipped out. They're shipping
10 ships with 550 barrels of liquid natural gas every ten days
11 to Japan. So the other point is what if they want to ship
12 from say the Gulf Coast or the far coast to Japan? Well,
13 can you imagine the distance they'd have to travel to get
14 there? They have to go around the Cape of Good Horn. Would
15 you like to go on that with a liquid natural gas tanker? I
16 wouldn't.

17 So I think that when you're addressing an EIS
18 like this you've got to look at downstream and say how can
19 they do this? How can you talk to somebody in this
20 environment, how can you get money to build all this
21 equipment and you tell me you're going to go to a bank and
22 say I can buy it for this and I can sell it for that? Boy,
23 I mean if you guys can do that I need some help with my
24 business. Thank you.

25 (Laughter.)

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Dave Picanso and Roger
3 King next.

4 MR. PICANSO: Hi. My name is Dave Picanso and I
5 represent C-2 Cattle Company.

6 COURT REPORTER: Spell your last name for me.

7 MR. PICANSO: P-I-C-A-N-S-O.

8 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

9 MR. PICANSO: First of all, we oppose the
10 pipeline. Seven miles of the pipeline traverses our ranch.
11 We have critical winter habitat for deer and elk. How this
12 statement says there will be no impact on these is beyond me
13 because if you drive a four-wheeler through there for four
14 days they're gone. But at any rate, we oppose it on several
15 fronts.

16 Number one, it's ludicrous that in the 233-mile
17 pipeline only 60 some miles fall in the national forest, BLM
18 or state lands. The routing should be seriously reviewed by
19 FERC to minimize impact on private property. Economics of
20 construction should not be a factor, which is the primary
21 decision or the reasoning in the selection of this route. I
22 was told that by Rex Owing, the route surveyor that they
23 flew over and choose the simplest route and it just so
24 happens that it's all on private property.

25 Also, though many landowners have chosen to

1 cooperate with Pacific Connector, FERC should not construe
2 this as support for the project, merely the fear of eminent
3 domain. And private property rights are being trampled in
4 Oregon for a project that furnishes a minimal amount of LNG
5 to the citizens of Oregon. The primary beneficiary of this
6 project is California. We support the construction of a
7 terminal and pipeline in California.

8 (Applause.)

9 We request that members of FERC do a personal
10 viewing of the private property affected by the pipeline.
11 This written Environmental Impact Statement does not do
12 justice to the remarkable landscape that will be impacted
13 for years to come. We, the landowners, are the stewards of
14 our land and that duty should not be taken from us by a
15 commission sitting 2,000 miles away. FERC has an
16 opportunity to show that they're a thinking commission
17 rather than just a rubber stamp for the energy industry. Thank
18 you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Roger King.

21 MR. KING: I'd like to give my time to Rick Mori.

22 MR. SCOTT: Okay. And next up is Rick Mori.

23 MR. MORI: M-O-R-I. Got it? Gentlemen, your
24 body language has given you entirely away. We came here
25 tonight expecting a fair hearing and as my father said

1 life's not fair. I don't expect to get a fair hearing from
2 you gentlemen because your body language has told us that
3 this is a done deal. It's disgraceful. You are going to
4 create a scar across this beautiful state like the Great
5 Wall of China that will be visible from the space station.

6 Furthermore, common sense tells me after 34 years
7 in the construction industry that you could put a terminal
8 in the Santa Barbara Channel off of one of those drilling
9 rigs and pipe that gas through one of those abandon rigs
10 into California and this is not going to have to affect us
11 at all. Now, it's going to take a little more R&D on the
12 part of the Williams Pipeline people. And furthermore,
13 you're going to have to convince the almost 39 million
14 Californians that it makes good sense to them. But you know
15 damn well what happened when you tried to ram this down
16 California's throat.

17 Now, I make my living as a construction project
18 manager and as a homebuilder. However, my hobby is as a
19 fiction writer and what you're doing tonight resembles
20 science fiction of the horror genre. I can tell you that
21 I'm no Clyde Kustler, but I can tell you right now of ten
22 ways of how I can sabotage what you're planning to ram down
23 our throats. There's already been a fiction story written
24 where the Strait of Harnos was mined with lippet
25 (phonetic) mines and an LNG tanker was blown up. It was a

1 fiction story. You're going to create the possibility to
2 make that a reality.

3 Furthermore, in this document that you call an
4 EIS, nowhere in it do I see the insurance limits required by
5 Williams Pipeline. Nowhere in it do I see the reinsurance
6 limits required by Williams Pipeline. And nowhere in it do
7 I see when does FEMA have to step in and bail Williams
8 Pipeline out when the inevitable disaster occurs and the
9 insurance limits and the reinsurance limits are reached and
10 then we, the taxpayers, are going to pay the bill.

11 Previous speakers have asked to appeal to your
12 conscience. So I look into your faces and I ask you this.
13 When the first child or grandchild is killed by just the
14 mere truck traffic through the beautiful town of Shady Cove
15 that I live in, I'm going to publish your page, your names
16 and your pictures in the paper and hold you personally, in
17 addition to that truck driver, responsible for the death of
18 one of our cherished children or grandchildren.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. MORI: You've heard previous speakers say
21 that we are going to be purchasing gas from people who are
22 not fond of us, not fond of us. I'm trying to be polite,
23 sir. I read further in this dam near 1,500 page document
24 that you had the courtesy to send me earlier enough to
25 digest it that merely in the Winema Forest there's a fault

1 zone. And when Williams Pipeline gets to this fault zone
2 and determines that it's a seismic fault that going to
3 require remediation then, and only then, are they going to
4 figure out how to fix it. For goodness sakes, if you know
5 you've got a known fault zone you send the folks in there
6 with the backhoes and make the determination before you let
7 the horse out of the barn. But unfortunately, in our
8 country we have a tendency after the horse gets out of the
9 barn to burn the barn down and declare there was no horse.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. MORI: So my father said, son, there's two
12 things in life you've got to know, life's not fair and
13 follow the money. I don't expect to get a fair hearing from
14 you gentlemen. I don't expect the citizens of Oregon, the
15 citizens of Trail, the citizens of Shady Cove to get a fair
16 hearing, so I'm going to appeal to your conscience as you've
17 heard a previous speaker do. You're going to send so much
18 truck traffic through that small town of 2,800 people
19 inevitably statistics and the actuaries bear me out some
20 small child will be killed. We're a rural community. ODOT
21 already told us it takes ten years to get a crosswalk put in
22 across Highway 62 and you're going to have all this truck
23 traffic down Old Ferry Road, down Highway 62, and the
24 actuaries are going to back me up on this, there's going to
25 be enough truck traffic that a child will be killed. It'll

1 be on your conscience. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Nola Johnson.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Off mike.)

5 MR. SCOTT: All right. If you'd like, afterwards
6 Jody McCaffree can speak again. David Machovec and then
7 after David, Kathy Everett.

8 MR. MACHOVEC: I'm Dave Machovec. My spelling is
9 M-A-C-H-O-V-E-C. I own that property adjacent -- in fact,
10 it's actually less distance from me to the gentleman at the
11 counter from the fence line to the Butte Falls compressor
12 station. I'm not sure while you call it the Butte Falls.
13 It's actually Derby, but that's all right.

14 We have several things that are proposed on that
15 thing. Let me read my comments here and then I'll have some
16 comments at the end that I'll go ahead and e-mail in because
17 they're actually text corrections because for example, like
18 you've got several places where you talk about the tower, a
19 160-foot tower has guide wires. Some places it does; and
20 some places it doesn't in the document. But anyway, I'll go
21 through the main ones that I'm concerned.

22 The proposed location of the compressor station
23 does not consider the topography of the surrounding area due
24 to three draws located west of the proposed site, the McNeil
25 Creek west of the proposed site and access road and the

1 Butte Falls Highway sound is amplified to the point of three
2 times the source and you actually cover part of this -- dogs
3 barking, cattle and even human voices. I can hear people
4 down on the Cascade Butte Ranch at my house and I'm on the
5 west end of that property.

6 It looks like you made a study by MAKI
7 Corporation modeling program. That does not account for the
8 topography of the surrounding area. In fact, actually, it
9 covers the flat area and actually they did looks like some
10 testing in the area. But I would like to see, for example,
11 on this one here that they maybe take some other reading at
12 actual noise sensitive areas rather than a fence, which is
13 not very noise sensitive the last time I checked.

14 Item number two, the proposed location of the
15 station will adversely affect my property to the west site
16 of the proposed site, and I reference the page, at least at
17 the east end of the property fence I have a direct view of
18 the barn described in the page. So I'll be able to set up
19 chairs and we can all watch them construct it. I've been
20 considering building a new home on the hill just due west of
21 the proposed site that has a nice view of Mt. McGlaughlin.
22 It looks like I'll get a nice view of a compressor station
23 and I heard a 60-foot tower.

24 Item number three, currently the proposed site
25 will permanent affect local elk herd that roam the area on

1 the proposed site. The herd is greater than 50 head of cows
2 and their calves and generally a couple of spikes. And I
3 get to watch these once in a while, so that's kind of fun.
4 They use this area for calving and feeding. About every two
5 weeks they occupy the northern area of my ranch and the
6 small canyon due west of the proposed site. Up to this
7 point, mine and the Cascade Butte Ranch are providing cover
8 with no harassment from the human population. As an
9 additional note, the proposed pipeline route follows their
10 migration route where they make a big circle in that area
11 south of Indian Lake. They did discuss and the EIS was very
12 good. It gives me a name for that herd. I never knew the
13 name of it before this.

14 Another area of concern is that the proposed site
15 that old timers say the Native American used to camp during
16 the salmon runs that come up both McNeil and Neil Creek.
17 This provides a possibility for you gentlemen to encounter
18 some Indian artifacts when you start doing construction of
19 that compressor station. That might be something to
20 consider.

21 Alternatives are one of the things that I'd like
22 to talk about for a second. The compressor station could be
23 located in either direction for its location. Of course,
24 nobody likes it in their backyard
25 , but I don't think anybody I know of in Oregon likes the

1 pipeline yet that I've heard. Milepost 127 is mentioned in
2 the draft EIS in the conclusions and recommendations.
3 However, it has one slight problem that milepost 127 is
4 definitely not 1,500 north of Butte Falls Highway. It
5 appears to be -- let's see. It does appear that it is in
6 kind of a level area with no residents located within the
7 canyons around the Shady Cove and Trail or at least one
8 range south. Can you discuss that a little bit because it's
9 sitting so close to a church and thing -- but of course, if
10 the compressor station is that's quiet it shouldn't be a
11 problem for them.

12 But if you take your 1,500 feet that you were
13 going to use to building the road to where your existing
14 area is that would also add to that road and you'd be in
15 another area around the ridge from that town or from that
16 area and areas nearby -- items in the area for power and
17 stuff like that. Another option is located between 136 and
18 138. Now, the reason I didn't go any further than that is
19 because your design criteria actually give you milepost
20 number 98 to 138. That's up in the hills up there and you
21 have Over Chain (phonetic), not Over Chain. There's another
22 set of mountains up in there. Like I said, I only put these
23 in as a comment. The third option is near Highway 140, but
24 that's outside your range and that already has noise traffic
25 to it.

1 And the rest of my comments are actually -- for
2 example, you call DOE, Department of Defense, and it's not.
3 It's Department of Energy in your acronyms. That's one
4 spot. We also talk about a hot water boiler. There's no
5 mention in your document anywhere where that well is that
6 you're going to put in that, use for make-up water on that.
7 And then several places in the text it talks about a
8 communication tower, which is 160 foot. Sometimes it says
9 with a guide wire and sometimes it says without. What is
10 it?

11 You also talk about putting a strobe on it, which
12 I'll be able to see and everybody in that whole Derby area
13 is going to be able to see. That strobe is going to be
14 running 24 -- you know, at night where we can see that. So
15 that will be kind of a new star that we can look at since
16 it's so quiet in that area. You don't really have to have
17 that thing. In one side of the document you talk about the
18 FAA does not require one on anything less than 200 feet and
19 then later on you talk about putting one on it anyway. And
20 I have some trees fairly close to you that's going to be
21 taller than that anyway. Anyway, that's pretty much my
22 comments for right now and I'll send them in. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Kathy Everett and then
25 Susie Hoffterhide. You'll have to correct me on that one.

1 MS. EVERETT: Actually, my concerns were
2 addressed very eloquently earlier this evening. So I'd just
3 like to give you an antidotal event. I live at the base of
4 Bear Mountain along the Rogue River up Old Ferry Road and in
5 the middle of August we had a lightning fire up there. I
6 found out about it because a neighbor across the river
7 called me and said did you know there's a fire up above your
8 place? And I went outside and sure enough there was a fire
9 up on Bear Mountain. We have a lot of strikes in our area,
10 a lot of them because it's very dry.

11 There are times when no equipment is allowed in
12 the forest. There are whole weeks of no activity at all in
13 the forest because of the fire danger. So I stayed up that
14 night wondering if I was going to have a house the next
15 morning. And the next morning a helicopter came over and
16 dumped big buckets of water, took them out of the Rogue and
17 took them up and put the fire out. That happens a lot. Our
18 Forest Service is good at putting out all the lightning
19 strikes that we have, but we have a lot of them. And one of
20 the things that crossed my mind is if we had a pipeline up
21 there and there was a leak and we had some of our lightning
22 strikes or there was an equipment problem when they're
23 putting this pipe in and there was a leak of whatever fuels
24 and stuff they use, I wonder if I would have had time to
25 stay up all night and worry about a fire. Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. I'm going to have to try
3 this again Susie Hoffterhide. Is she here?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. SCOTT: Well, we'll come back. Linda
6 Henderson and then next up Howard Woods.

7 MS. HENDERSON: Hi. I'm Linda Henderson from
8 Trail, H-E-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. And my concerns have pretty well
9 been addressed. One of my main concerns is our well water
10 where our private wells are our only source of water in my
11 area in Trail and should something happen with the blasting
12 and the digging it will affect the well and it's only water
13 source. If they say they're going to fix it, are they going
14 to fix it for just our residence? What about our garden?
15 What about our livestock? So for me it's a big concern.
16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Howard Woods and then
19 David Lohman.

20 MR. WOODS: I'm Howard Woods and that substation
21 is going to be put -- proposed anyways on my 80 acres in
22 Trail. Now, I just found out some information and it was
23 misrepresented to me whenever they came out and talked about
24 the pipeline. And I received the information the day it was
25 due to turn it into the county if I objected it. I had to

1 get a lawyer to do that, but I had two hours to submit it to
2 the county. And the county was really good about stopping
3 it on that part.

4 But now, whenever they told me about the pipeline
5 going through I was a newcomer coming into the valley. I've
6 been here about a year, year and a half -- close to that
7 anyways -- and I built a new home right above where they
8 want this substation and they told me it would never affect
9 me, just going through the corner of my property. Well,
10 it's not. It's going through a lot of it and plus they take
11 five acres for that substation that's getting fenced off
12 where I got my cattle and stuff. In fact, I moved out my
13 cattle the other day because all the people were they're
14 checking for artifacts and stuff because they just kept
15 going through there and there was a lot of people.

16 But anyways, it was misrepresented to me and I'm
17 against it because if it's that little amount not telling
18 you the truth I'm afraid for the people that live here in
19 our little community and especially me, and it's going to be
20 dug right from my place -- proposed anyway to dig right
21 across underneath the river and that would go right through
22 where my wells are. I've got two wells right there where
23 they want to do it and they said they'd relocate and stuff,
24 but I've already put two new wells in up on top. I have 30
25 gallons a minute on the bottom. I got four and I got almost

1 ten 106 up on top and it's perfect water in the bottom.

2 And I just don't understand how come money takes
3 preference over the people that's lived in an area forever.
4 That they can come in and take your land and use it for
5 things that doesn't even help them in their area. I wasn't
6 really against it too much when they first came out because
7 they said it would only be an area -- a 10 by 10 with a
8 chain-link fence around it. That as all they were going to
9 use, but if you look at the new map that I got from the
10 county it takes all my bottom, takes all the trees out,
11 takes all the trees all the way over the hill and my house
12 is right above within about I'd say 200 feet, 300 feet of
13 that area and I just don't think it's save. And I think the
14 people have a right to stop it and I appreciate your time.
15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. David Lohman and then Tom
18 Collett.

19 MR. LOHMAN: Thank you. It's David Lohman,
20 L-O-H-M-A-N. I work with the Southern Oregon Pipeline
21 Information Project. Under NEPA's statutes and case law, an
22 EIS is required to provide objective analysis of whether
23 there is a need for the proposed project. This draft EIS
24 covers the need for the project in only the most scanty way.
25 It does not include information, any of the latest

1 information that has been referred to here tonight
2 concerning the skyrocketing prices for LNG in the Pacific
3 realm and it doesn't refer to the latest discoveries of
4 natural gas reserves throughout North America.

5 The NEPA statutes and case law also require an
6 objective analysis of potential alternatives and not just
7 here's an alternative and we don't think it's good. They're
8 supposed to provide a full-blown analysis of those
9 alternatives. This DEIS does not do so. It says on page 3-
10 1 that the primary objective of the project is to provide a
11 new access point for LNG imports and a new source of natural
12 gas to the Pacific Northwest, northern California and
13 northern Nevada markets to meet growing demands. This
14 narrowly stated objective "to provide new sources of natural
15 gas through LNG" artificially precludes consideration of
16 other means of addressing natural gas demand, including new
17 domestic sources currently in the planning stages and demand
18 management.

19 I'm going to quote from the DEIS and then offer a
20 few comments on each quote. A quote from page 3-17, this is
21 on the alternatives. "The Sunstone and Blue Bridge Projects
22 could achieve many of the main objectives -- excuse me,
23 "main objects of the JCE and PCGP Projects. They would
24 provide additional volumes of Canadian and Rockies produced
25 natural gas to markets in the Pacific Northwest, northern

1 Nevada and northern California. However, these projects
2 would not meet the objective that Jordan Cove has of
3 diversifying regional sources of natural gas through the
4 importation of LNG."

5 This statement that other proposed domestic
6 pipeline projects could achieve many of the objectives of
7 the Jordan Cove projects means they are alternatives to the
8 Jordan Cove project whose alternative impacts need to be
9 analyzed and compared with Jordan Cove's, not merely
10 dismissed in a sentence or two as is done later on page 3-
11 24. If we can get plenty of gas where we can get it from is
12 irrelevant except that surely we would not want to increase
13 our dependence on interruptible, foreign carbon-based fuels
14 just to achieve diversification for the sake of
15 diversification.

16 Page 3-17, "Because the Sunstone Pipeline would
17 be longer than the Pacific Connector Pipeline it does not
18 appear to be environmentally superior." Comment -- length
19 does not necessarily correlate with the extent of impacts.
20 If Sunstone affects fewer landowners, crosses fewer rivers
21 and mountain ranges and more barren unproductive land, then
22 its environmental impact could well be much smaller than
23 Pacific Connectors; but this DEIS doesn't even address the
24 environmental impacts of the Sunstone Project.

25 Page 3-24, after first saying at page 3-28 that

1 southern Oregon is not among the target markets that this
2 Jordan Cove Project is intended to serve, they go on to say
3 at 3-24 "It is unclear if the Bradwood Landing LNG Project
4 could meet all of the objectives of the JCE and PCGP
5 Projects because it would not directly connect to the Avista
6 LDC system serving southern Oregon. Also, if natural gas
7 were to be provided by the Bradwood LNG import terminal to
8 markets in northern Nevada or northern California it would
9 have to be transported longer distances through the existing
10 GTN system than the Pacific Connector Pipeline."

11 Well, first of all, the natural gas industry is
12 always arguing that new supply in one part of the West Coast
13 will free up existing supplies in other areas. So where is
14 all this emphasis all of sudden in this DEIS on having a
15 particular direct source in southern Oregon where, in fact,
16 we have plenty of gas already and two pipelines to provide
17 it to us? Furthermore, having to transport gas a long
18 distance is not, in itself, a comparative disadvantage. We,
19 after all, get a lot of gas from Canada through a much
20 longer pipeline than the Pacific Connector Pipeline. So
21 this point is irrelevant.

22 Page 3-16, "It stands to reason that a longer
23 pipeline would not have any clear environmental advantages.
24 For example, construction of the Pacific Connector Pipeline
25 would affect about 6,260 acres while construction of the

1 Ruby Pipeline would affect about 12,000 acres." Well, if
2 Ruby affects fewer landowners, crosses fewer rivers and more
3 barren unproductive land, then its environmental impact
4 could be considerably less than that of the Pacific
5 Connector.

6 Page 3-16, "At this time even its -- I'm talking
7 about Bronco's -- "exact route is uncertain. We consider
8 the Bronco Project to be speculative given its lack of
9 customer support." Well, if route certainty is a
10 prerequisite for being a valid alternative, then the Pacific
11 Connector is not a valid alternative. Further, that Bronco
12 lacks customer support is mere unsubstantiated speculation.
13 They don't talk about that. They don't provide any proof of
14 that in this DEIS. Not announcing the result of its open
15 season doesn't necessarily mean it lacks customer support.

16 Page 3-28, "After reviewing these data, the FERC
17 was unable to identify any other alternative locations for
18 an LNG terminal in the region that could serve the same
19 target markets and would be environmentally superior."
20 Comment -- this statement is one example of many in this
21 DEIS in which they shouldn't be reaching a conclusion at all
22 in a DEIS, but they nevertheless do reach a conclusion but
23 without any thorough analysis of the alternatives. It
24 eliminates alternatives by inappropriately narrowing the
25 objectives that is to serve only these specified markets.

1 By narrowing the objectives to such an extent that anything
2 other than Jordan Cove is precluded from consideration.

3 Further discussion of alternatives at 3-3, "An
4 expansion of existing systems or construction of new
5 facilities would result in specific environmental impacts
6 that could be less than, similar to, or greater than those
7 associated with the proposed project." Well, this is truism
8 that you could say about every proposed project. It's not
9 an analysis of the impacts of alternatives.

10 At page 3-12 on alternatives again, "It is
11 unknown exactly what additional facilities would have to be
12 built to accommodate the proposed volumes of the JCE and
13 PCGP Project on existing systems. The expansion or
14 modification of these existing systems would result in
15 environmental impacts equal to or greater than the new
16 facilities proposed by Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector."
17 In other words, they say we don't know what would be
18 involved, but we're concluding that the impacts would be
19 greater by expanding the existing systems than by building
20 this new pipeline.

21 I won't go on reading more about alternatives,
22 but you get a sense of what is lacking in this document.
23 There's no real analysis of alternatives, either pipeline
24 alternatives or other kinds of alternatives. There is a
25 discussion here about the -- on page 3-35 about the

1 possibility of not digging out a slip to put that container
2 terminal in, but putting along the shore, the north shore
3 there of the bay. They've rejected that in a sentence or
4 two without doing any kind of analysis of the environmental
5 impacts of taking that plan instead of digging out 5.6
6 million cubic yards of material out of Coos Bay, no analysis
7 of that alternative.

8 Similarly, they say at the -- the DEIS says at
9 page 3-56, "It would not be feasible to install the proposed
10 pipeline within the existing I-5 right-of-way because
11 construction could impede traffic and there are restrictions
12 imposed by the Federal Highway Administration that exclude
13 utilities from federal highway easements and access." Well,
14 could impede traffic and there are restrictions are simply
15 generalizations and speculations without reference to any
16 facts. This statement is merely a conclusion without any
17 fact-based substantiation.

18 Similarly, there is no discussion in this
19 document about the possibility of using the Westside energy
20 corridor about which there has been hearings in the last
21 year as an alternative to bring the pipeline down from the
22 Douglas County area to Klamath County.

23 There's lots of other defects in this document.
24 The lack of any real substantive discussion of alternatives
25 is a serious flaw. FERC needs to go back and start over,

1 otherwise, it's going to be challenged and this is going to
2 be dragged out even longer. Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Tom Collett and then Jean
5 McNamar.

6 MR. COLLETT: Tom Collett, C-O-L-L-E-T-T. The
7 DEIS is a long report, but it's got a lot of gapping holes
8 in it and I can see there are a few people that agree with
9 me tonight.

10 I have many concerns and I'm just going to tell
11 you a few. I have lots more, but I'll keep it short. In
12 the DEIS Section 5.1 states that the PCGP Project would
13 result in limited adverse environmental impact. I disagree
14 on the basis that the report does not take into account that
15 there is already significant impacts of human activity.
16 Some of those impacts include water removal, runoff
17 pollution, riparian removal and there are more. But anyway,
18 you get the idea. Water quality as well as the fish and
19 wildlife have already been heavily impacted. This report is
20 inadequate in that regard. You can look at table 4.3.2.2-2.
21 Anyway, that's the one that lists the 3L3D-listed streams.

22 There are also many more 3L3D-listed streams
23 which are not shown in the table, but which are in the same
24 watershed and will also be affected. The Coho salmon are
25 listed as threatened and endangered species in the

1 Endangered Species Act. In Section 5.1.1 and 4.1 through 38
2 and also 4.3, I believe that the statements about the
3 potential impacts on wells and surface water, groundwater
4 and wetlands are severely understated. Some of these areas
5 are being proposed or already very problematic. A lot more
6 work needs to be done on that. It's very inadequate.

7 In Section 5.1.3, I'm concerned about boring
8 underneath the Rogue River and the potential of
9 contamination of this important fishery and the water
10 source. The section is very short on details in light of it
11 being such an important resource. It mentions contingency
12 plans, but I don't know what that is or what they plan to do
13 in case of leakage. That benonite (phonetic) getting out of
14 there will contaminate the river and it could very well
15 impact the threatened Coho salmon. A lot of folks live
16 downstream. I live downstream. Downstream a lot of the
17 people are pulling water out of there for their city water
18 supply.

19 In Section 5.1.3, I'm also concerned about the
20 water use for hydrostatic testing. They're pulling a lot of
21 water and running it through the pipeline to see if they
22 have leaks, and that's going to be a whole lot of water.
23 And where they take it from could very well impact the water
24 source that they get it from and then because water seems to
25 run downhill, you're going to turn it lose somewhere else

1 and it could very well impact another area by turning lose
2 some organism that isn't already there. And we already have
3 bunches of non-native species of lots of things in Oregon
4 and it's getting worse all the time.

5 They say they're going to try to turn it lose
6 within the same watershed areas, but I can see where that's
7 going to be very problematic and probably isn't going to be
8 done as much as they're trying to lead us to believe. I
9 think that some more work needs to be done on that part of
10 the plan. That also makes reference to the Rogue River TMDL
11 and their draft report is now available and should be
12 referred to. Thank you very much.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Susie Hoffterhide?

15 MS. McNAMAR: I'm Jean McNamar and that's spelled
16 M-C-N-A-M-A-R, from North Bend.

17 COURT REPORTER: The first name is Jean?

18 MS. McNAMAR: Jean, J-E-A-N. First, I have to
19 say that I have been more than impressed with the wealth of
20 detailed and observation and passion shown by this group
21 here tonight. I'm really highly impressed. What I want to
22 share with you tonight is a letter that I wrote to the Coos
23 Bay World. I will add a few little comments because I'm
24 from out of town and will not make a whole lot of sense to
25 you. A dozen years ago there was natural gas piped into

1 Coos Bay. But there were those who that that would be a
2 good idea and so there was a group that promoted and there
3 was a group organized to promote it and so here's my letter
4 on it.

5 "Friends of New and Sustainable Industry was
6 first developed as a grassroots group to promote bringing in
7 natural gas to Coos County using tax dollars. Northwest
8 Natural had studied the possibilities several years earlier
9 and had concluded that it was not cost effective. However,
10 with public money to build a pipeline, Northwest Natural
11 contributed more than all the other contributors put
12 together. Now, FONZI is rallying support for the LNG
13 pipeline projects. The Port Commission has facilitated land
14 for LNG tanks, which means that property owners far outside
15 its jurisdiction will also be irreversibly affected.

16 Now, the Port is commendably involved in
17 restoring railroad transportation and possibly siting
18 container facilities among their usual port responsibilities
19 and I do commend them for having the courage to be seen and
20 heard on public television, governmental television, channel
21 14. Crews will be paid good wages during the construction
22 of the pipeline and the tanks and the destruction of the
23 land base."

24 After that, a couple of Texas multi-millions --
25 does the name Paul Garrett, Paul Sowns (phonetic) mean

1 anything? At least one with a history in Enron, the
2 Canadian corporation shareholders, Northern Star, and
3 California will benefit. There will be very few local jobs.
4 Now, FERC has the ultimate power to site storage in a
5 seismic tsunami zone, to pollute the air with tons of health
6 damaging toxins" -- and this is out of their own statistics
7 of what will be turned loose in the air -- to destroy a
8 variety of fishing grounds, to confiscate private property,
9 to push through public lands which belong to all of us, to
10 cut a 235-mile swath through landslide-prone mountains for
11 the 36-inch pipeline" -- and geology is something I do know
12 something about. And to make mistakes that will dwarf a
13 mere 12-inch project, which was the first project into Coos
14 County. FONZI you fooled me once. That's enough. Coos Bay
15 should not pimp gas for the beneficiaries above.

16 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Jane Mara and Jen
17 Alexander.

18 MS. MARA: I didn't come prepared with all the
19 information that so many of you have, but does the opening
20 statement that says it will minor -- you know, affect it
21 adversely. I don't remember exactly what that says. The
22 one piece of land that I know about has a beautiful meadow
23 and then it has a very high ridge. And they were going to
24 go through the meadow first and then they decided that
25 didn't work because I think some other landowners objected.

1 So they're going to go through the top of a ridge. I mean
2 this doesn't make any sense and you're talking about it's
3 not going to adversely affect people or affect all the
4 wildlife. They're going to go through this ridge and a
5 whole bunch of room needs to be on either side and they have
6 to come in and check it every year. So these huge machines
7 are going to come in to this wild land. It doesn't make any
8 sense. I don't understand how you can see it doesn't
9 adversely affect. That's it.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

12 MS. ALEXANDER: I'm Jane Alexander. I've heard
13 some things tonight about body language and about whether
14 this is really a real hearing, whether we really have a
15 voice and a chance. I would just ask you to really be
16 stewards for us. That's what we've hired you to do and we
17 really hope that this isn't just a Faust that we're going
18 through here. We've had all kinds of people bring forward
19 really important considerations and I worry about the
20 environment. I worry about the eminent domain. There's all
21 kinds of reason -- the safety of it that other people have
22 been very eloquent about. I just ask you to really consider
23 this and treat us fairly about that. Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Tony Woolsey.

1 MS. WOOLSEY: Toni Woolsey. You know your kids
2 ask you if they can go out on Saturday and you say we'll
3 see. We'll see.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MS. WOOLSEY: Got to lighten it up a little bit.
6 I have lived in Trail for 48 years.

7 COURT REPORTER: Could you spell the last name?

8 MS. WOOLSEY: W-O-O-L-S-E-Y. As I said, I've
9 lived in Trail since 1948 and when I was a kid we could walk
10 across the heads of the salmon if wanted to when they were
11 spawning in the creeks and the river because they were so
12 thick you could not believe it. It was just absolutely
13 unbelievable. And then, of course, the Elk Creek Dam came
14 in and we had flood control, but then the salmon started
15 decreasing and decreasing and each year due to, I guess,
16 man's intervention, I'm assuming, the salmon keep on
17 decreasing.

18 What I find really odd is that I can't pee in the
19 river without a permit. But the government notched the Elk
20 Creek Dam \$7 million to do it and why was this, to improve
21 the salmon, the hope that they will spawn better and that
22 they won't have to truck the eggs up there so that they can
23 get them to spawn on Elk Creek. So they spent \$7 million
24 notching the dam. This has just been completed in the last
25 few weeks. And then if you guys let Williams come three

1 miles downstream and trench the Rogue River in one of the
2 spawning beds that I knew was there and is there since 1948
3 that's ludicrous. Going to allow them to come down and
4 trench the river because we know they're not going to bore
5 it. They wouldn't have it written down that they're going
6 to -- well, in case we can't bore it, then we'll trench it,
7 stirring up and destroying all the natural spawning beds
8 that are already there. So we're going to screw up
9 something that's there naturally to do what they're going to
10 do. So that's one thing.

11 Also, I can't burn my garbage without calling
12 Medford because we have air inversion. Air inversion means
13 it keeps things down and they're always telling me that this
14 LNG when it turns into the air it's lighter than air and it
15 goes up and blah, blah, blah. So let's just say that it's a
16 day when we're having a massive air inversion and there is a
17 leak in the pipe. You can't smell it.
18 They've already told me that it's colorless and odorless.
19 You can't smell it. So now a logging truck is going
20 backfire on Highway 62 and kaboom, Trail is no more because
21 the gas has been kept down, but we don't know it because
22 they're not going to odorize it until it gets to California
23 because nobody cares if we lose a half a dozen hicks. But
24 God forbid we should lose a Brittany Spears. Okay.

25 So I want you to know that I'm an affected

1 landowner. My mother's an affected landowner. They're
2 coming across our property in three different places.
3 Neither she -- and you might wonder. I don't have any EIS
4 numbers to talk to you about like all these other people
5 tonight because we never got anything like that. We never
6 got any EIS -- not that I would have read anything that was
7 bigger than my telephone book, but I didn't get one if I
8 would have chose to have read it.

9 Also, the last meeting that Williams had in Shady
10 Cove at the Grange Hall there were notices sent out to any
11 property owners. The only people that knew about it were
12 people that were not affected. Nothing in the mail, and I
13 know this from our Post Master. So I think that's odd
14 because I've been to every meeting and I didn't know there
15 was a meeting. I didn't get anything in the mail. Mom
16 didn't get anything in the mail. They have our name. So I
17 just think that that's strange that I didn't get the EIS or
18 I didn't get the whatever and it's going to come within 125
19 feet of my house, a brand new home that I just had built
20 four years ago.

21 And I was told by one of the Williams
22 spokespeople that the noise, once they start it, will be
23 deafening 24/7. I'd like to know where I'm supposed to go
24 while they're doing this for six months, eight months or
25 however long it's going to take? Because I lived in Trail

1 when they put Highway 62 through the mountain in front of my
2 house where it is now and I saw how long it took them to go
3 through 65 feet of solid rock and my house is at the edge of
4 that cliff. So there's no way they're going to be able to
5 bore it. So I'm just kind of wondering where do I go while
6 they're doing that if the sound is deafening 24 hours a day
7 seven days a week. When I was at one of the pipeline
8 meetings I asked Williams about the 27 dead horse in Idaho
9 about a year and eight months ago or so that were grazing
10 along one of their pipelines that had a hole in it the size
11 of a nickel and 27 horses just dropped dead. They said that
12 we can't discuss that. And I said why is that? And they
13 said because it's under litigation. I said, in other words,
14 what you mean is because the gas that as leaking killed
15 them. Oh well, we can't talk about that. It could have
16 been a lot of things. Well, there were no cougar marks on
17 them. They hadn't been shot in the head and I'm sure they
18 didn't all die of a heart attack with all the same span of
19 time.

20 I have a friend who invited some of these people
21 to her home to discuss where the pipeline was going to go.
22 She fixed them lunch. I don't know whether she cares
23 whether I tell this, but I'm not going to tell her name.
24 While she was doing up the dishes, one of the head people
25 from Williams -- I guess he was so stupid he forgot that she

1 was in the kitchen doing up the dishes and she heard him say
2 to the other man I'll just be glad when we get our FERC
3 permit then we can do as we damn well please. So no, I
4 don't trust them and that's all I have to say. Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Paul Sebestra and then
7 Susie Hoffterhide.

8 MR. SEBESTRA: My name is Paul Sebestra, S-E-B-E-
9 -S-T-A. Thank you gentlemen for coming. I know you're away
10 from your families, your friends and a warm atmosphere. I
11 spent 35 years working in the government. The first four
12 years were for the National Park Service doing environmental
13 studies. I have a Master's degree in Botany and in Zoology.
14 I spent the rest of my career putting biological payloads in
15 space and using those instruments for looking at global
16 change. So I know a little bit about what's going on.

17 I also know that back in the late '50s the
18 Eisenhower administration said we'll cut off this area in
19 Yellowstone Park as an environmental, motor-free zone. And
20 the first thing Kennedy did was put it back to motors in
21 spite of 99 percent of those people that testified saying we
22 don't want motors in there. Well, what do you see here
23 today? How many people here not in the employ of the
24 pipeline, not working for FERC, are here to say, yeah, we
25 want this pipeline? How many are here today? I know a lot

1 left, but I don't they would have stood up and said, yes, we
2 want the pipeline. And I don't know how many meetings
3 you've had were a bunch of people come and say, yeah, let's
4 have a pipeline.

5 So we're here and I don't want to see the same
6 thing that happened to all the work we did back in
7 Yellowstone Park happen when the government runs over the
8 top of everybody who said, no, we don't want motors in this
9 environment and then they put them back in.

10 You will get my details. I did send you an
11 alternative route and some ideas to think about. And I will
12 send that again with the details on it. But let's talk
13 about 14,400 psi running through a 36-inch pipe. You know,
14 it's presented as it's going to be 6 feet deep in the
15 ground. It's not. It's only going to be 3 feet deep and it
16 does leak. At one of the meetings that I believe you were
17 here we had in this hotel and then at the end of the meeting
18 there was a welder lending up against the sidewall said wait
19 a minute. I spent my whole life welding pipelines. If that
20 gentleman is here tonight, would he come and see me before I
21 leave?

22 He said I've welded these. They don't x-ray
23 every one of them even though they say they're going to, and
24 they all leak. And we're not going to have any odor to tell
25 if they leak. And the lady was talking about the gas being

1 trapped and I put that in my statement for you folks to look
2 at that we do have inversion. So we're not allowed to burn
3 our trash. We're very careful about trying to take care of
4 our air quality. This stuff can leak. It can get trapped
5 up there and we're going to have the equivalent of what the
6 military calls an air bomb and there aren't going to be any
7 people in Shady Cove.

8 And the gentleman was talking about the trucks
9 running over one kid. Forget it. There's not going to be a
10 school or churches. All the facilities will be gone. But
11 we hear what's going here. There is a lack of communication
12 and there is a lack of talk about safety. And so we don't
13 trust what's going on because we're smart. I think the
14 pipeline companies are thinking, well, we can't get through
15 California. Let's go to Oregon. They can't read or write
16 there. And as you've heard, these people read this thing
17 and they think about it.

18 And let's just think a little bit. Somebody tell
19 me how many horsepower are going to be in that pumping
20 station, 10,310. Okay, two of those. Go out in the parking
21 lot, reeve up your 150 horsepower engine and see what it
22 sounds like. Man, and right away it's not in Butte Falls,
23 is it? No, it isn't. So right away, what's going on here?
24 It's not truthful. And this gentleman is talking about
25 pumping it the other way, all kinds of stuff going on here.

1 We don't know who to trust and we need you and the
2 government. You had the clear writing course, right, public
3 speaking, how to write a proposal. They didn't tell you how
4 to sit up here and look at all of these faces, not a lot of
5 friendly ones.

6 Okay. The sound -- you're going to put how many
7 billion feet a day through this pipe, 1 billion cubic feet
8 through the pipe. I go in the bathroom. I turn on the
9 fans. It's about 3 miles an hour that little bitty fan is
10 going. I can hear it. Now, we're going to put a stream of
11 air through this thing and they say, oh, it doesn't make any
12 noise. It's got to be turbulence in there. There's got to
13 be turbulence. It's going to make some kind of noise, maybe
14 a terrific noise. Ever been in an airplane at 200 miles an
15 hour and somebody open the door? It is noisy. There's
16 going to be terrific impact there and from the engines
17 driving this thing.

18 Okay. I was on NASA's disaster assessment and
19 rescue team. I know about conflagration from liquid
20 petroleum. And I remember watching this fireman who climbed
21 up the ladder and took a picture of a burning propane tank,
22 a quarter mile away. It was a railroad propane tank. They
23 did recover the camera, but he was vaporized. So we can
24 talk about, you know, 30 percent body burns at 700 feet, 900
25 feet. I think the numbers cannot be defined. This is a

1 hugely, hugely dangerous thing that we are putting through
2 this state. I did say if you got to put it through this
3 state why don't you use the places that are already cleared
4 for pipelines for water, for the power lines up above
5 ground. You don't have to rip everything up. I know you're
6 not going to rip it up. The pipeline companies don't have
7 to rip this all up. There are places that have already been
8 cleared and I proposed you run the things across the top of
9 the dam so you don't have to disturb the Rogue River and the
10 comment -- the only comment -- I didn't get an analysis like
11 the Ladies' Club did for their guesthouse. I didn't get
12 anything except it's too close to the dam. Do you think
13 it'll blow up? It might hurt the dam? It's not going to
14 hurt the dam if it did blow up because it's going to blow up
15 and we studied this in World War II. We went to great
16 effort to try to figure out how to blow away the German and
17 the French dams and it's very difficult. That's how Kennedy
18 lost his first son trying to figure that out.

19 So we've been working on this for a long time.
20 It takes a shaped charge and this is not a shaped charge.
21 If that line blew up on top of the dam, it would go up. It
22 wouldn't be nice, but it would go up. It's not going to
23 hurt the dam. It might make a few rocks black, but you
24 don't have to go under the Rogue. You don't have to go
25 through Trail. You can use the existing power lines that

1 have been cleared, go under them, take it up over the dam
2 and eliminate a lot of risks to a lot of people. So that
3 was not addressed and you're going to hear about it from me.

4 Drilling through basaltic lava -- that's what we
5 have here. We live on a volcano, which brings me to the
6 last point. You did not give a good accounting for
7 geothermal power. They've used it in California. They've
8 used in Klamath Falls, geothermal power. There it is. It's
9 free for the drilling. If you put this much time and energy
10 that's just gone in to talking about this thing and to
11 setting up the geothermal plant, you already have energy
12 that could be turned into electricity, that could be turned
13 into heat. Half of the City of Boise used to be heated with
14 geothermal energy. The city now has grown, but that's still
15 there. They use it to heat the city and it's free. And
16 people might say, well -- they used to say the caustic
17 nature of geothermal can't be handled by the pipelines that
18 would take the energy into generators. Well, folks in NASA
19 we harnessed that and through the use of ceramics we are
20 able to handle caustic high heat flow of gas that can turn
21 generators, that can make electricity, that can heat homes
22 and hospitals and fire stations and schools. That has not
23 been addressed. We don't need foreign fuel coming in. We
24 don't need to ship our out. We don't need to play games
25 with the economic. We don't need to deal with the greed

1 that we have been battling and we see how it's taken down
2 our economy. This is part of it. We're being run over.
3 And I ask you -- people have asked you here again and again
4 think of our children. Think of your children. A
5 conscientiousness, a conscientiousness of what this planet
6 is. I'm too old to mess with this. I've been a planet
7 resident for 73 years. This fisherman here he's got it
8 right. At least he has time to go fishing. Do you have any
9 idea of the psychological impact to the people in the
10 community of Oregon up and through these towns and villages
11 and in the canyons? They lay awake and they stare at the
12 ceilings and say, "What the hell am I going to do? Where
13 can I go?" I can't live next to 10,000 horsepower
14 screaming.

15 My wells could be contaminated because these
16 things do leak. We know they leak. They blow up.
17 Everybody ought to Google up MTSB and look at the accident
18 reports. They go on all the time and you can go back 10, 20
19 years. This has been going on a long time and this pipeline
20 is made out of steel and it will corrode. It's not
21 stainless. It's going to pit. It's going to leak and it's
22 going to corrode. We may not see it, but the people that
23 will be living here will if they live through it.

24 Okay. You're going to get my written stuff and
25 I'll detail it a little bit better for you. Thank you for

1 coming and please listen to us. We're out here. We'd
2 rather be home and with our families. We'd rather take our
3 properties and develop them to support our families. But it
4 is not a family environment. Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Is Susie Hoffterhide
7 here? They left? Okay. Well, that is everybody who had
8 signed up on the list. And as we said, if anybody else
9 would like to speak or speak again if you've already had a
10 chance, please come to the microphone and state your name.

11 MS. McCAFFREE: Jody McCaffree and Dola Johnson
12 has given me her time and I wanted to follow up on something
13 that Ray said. I'm going to read you a sentence out of the
14 draft. It's on page 1-14 and it goes to 1-15. "The cost to
15 land LNG on the West Coast is estimated to be \$4.50 per
16 MMBTU, whereas the current price of domestic gas is \$11 per
17 MMBTU." Do you want to know what's wrong with that
18 statement? I'm just a housewife and I'm happy to tell the
19 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission what's wrong with that
20 statement. They are comparing a wholesale cost to a retail
21 price. That's what's wrong, and that is throughout this
22 draft.

23 You have taken what Jordan Cove has said as fact
24 and you have just assumed it was fact. In other words, your
25 justification for being in this terminal is to bring in low,

1 cheap gas because our domestic is so high when the truth is
2 not that. It may cost Exxon \$4.50 to get gas to the West
3 Coast. I'm not doubting that. But do you think they're
4 going do that when Japan will pay \$20? No, they will not.
5 They will sell it to Japan. And two terminals already that
6 have been approved have asked to become export terminals.
7 Why? Because they can make more money to sell it on the
8 open market than they can domestically. We have 110-year
9 supply. The Navagant study showed that and yes, it may cost
10 a little more to get gas out of shell, but when we're
11 dealing with a world market, Japan and Korea they're already
12 paying like \$20 a MMBTU.

13 So the gas companies don't operate like computer
14 chip companies where you got more it's cheaper. They
15 operate on complex energy markets and cartels, and they
16 control a lot of people and even elections because they make
17 so much money. It may only cost them \$4.50. They're going
18 to sell it for \$20 if they can. So my concern is that these
19 terminals will apply for export status after they've taken
20 everybody's land because they couldn't do that -- if they
21 asked for it now, they would not have the right to take
22 people's land because that would not be justified for
23 eminent domain. Eminent domain is only for the benefit of
24 the people and exporting gas would be for the benefit of a
25 foreign energy corporation, not for the benefit of the

1 people.

2 So I don't know if there's any way we can have
3 some kind of safeguard so that can't happen. And I'll tell
4 you right now -- right now in Coos Bay, in Coos County we
5 have a methane energy corp. They're drilling coal bed
6 methane. They say there's 1.2 trillion cubic feet of gas
7 right where we live, so why in the world would we want to
8 import gas from some foreign country when it's going to be
9 right there. What do you think is going to be cheaper right
10 where we live or halfway across the world? I can guarantee
11 you, even though it's coming from coal beds, the price is
12 going to be cheaper right there, not shipping. Shipping is
13 very expensive and all those kinds of things.

14 I want to get into another little section of this
15 because this is throughout this draft. You've just taken --
16 if we're supposed to be looking at an analysis done by an
17 energy regulatory commission of all the alternatives, you
18 know, what this is? This is all about Jordan Cove. It
19 isn't about any alternatives, just Jordan Cove. This whole
20 second book is just justifying Jordan Cove. And in this one
21 section, "Socioeconomic" our South Coast Development
22 Council, which is a front basically, the guy that runs that
23 is an ex-Northwest Natural employee, so what do you think
24 he's for? He's for gas.

25 They did a study and they paid Eco Northwest to

1 do this study on the benefits of this terminal and that
2 study is a bogus study. It only shows benefits according to
3 them and you've taken it and used it as absolutely the
4 gospel fact. It does not show any negative impacts. In
5 fact, in my scoping comments I have several pages of
6 concerns about the negative impacts and I ask that there be
7 an analysis. There's no analysis. They don't show the
8 impacts and the negative impacts to fishing and all the
9 things I list, and I'll be happy to go over them with you.
10 They didn't do it in that study. They only showed what they
11 considered the benefits.

12 So of course, it looks good if you look at it
13 that way. I'll tell you, if you want to go look at one that
14 did compare it, you can go to Passamaquody's Whole Base
15 Study. They did an analysis of both the benefits and the
16 negative impacts. And what they found when they looked at
17 everything they found that the overall benefit there was
18 none because for every job you created, you lost a job
19 somewhere else. So overall, it was not a good thing.

20 And I just want to give you an example of what
21 they -- in that Eco Northwest Study what they do. They
22 compare a peak shaving tank, which you're talking a storage
23 facility and we have two in Oregon, which is what they used.
24 One is in Portland. It's an 8 million gallon tank in
25 Portland. One is in Newport, 12 million gallon tank. They

1 compared those tanks to 84 million gallons sitting in a red
2 tsunami zone on dredging spoils right across from the end of
3 an airport runway with ships coming in. The ships are a big
4 issue because if there was to be a breach there's no
5 containment brems on a ship, so you're impacting all these
6 people with a ship. They compared those as being equal.
7 And because they said, well, there was no negative impacts
8 on those peak shaving tanks that ours would not be
9 negatively impacting.

10 That would be like comparing a gas station -- for
11 instance, just on the property value issue; they said
12 property values wouldn't go down. Well, if there's a gas
13 station that's built in your community, you know, property
14 values probably wouldn't be affected that much, but if
15 you're comparing -- it's like comparing a gas station to a
16 whole refinery. Now, if you put a refinery in, yes,
17 property values are going to go down within a 2-mile radius.
18 They didn't look at it that way and this facility is a
19 refinery. It actually has to take the gas because this gas
20 from foreign sources has other hydrocarbons in it. It has
21 to refine them, take them out. It's a whole different
22 process. It's not a storage facility.
23 It is a big refinery, so property values are likely to go
24 down.

25 We have this big, beautiful pristine area.

1 People move there for the view and the beauty of it and
2 you're impacting thousands actually, 17,000 live just in the
3 hazard zones. That's not everybody there, but just in the
4 hazard zones right there with the terminals. Those property
5 values are going to go down. That is not included in the
6 Eco Northwest Study as many other things. So I'm asking
7 that FERC be the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that
8 they are supposed to be and look at both sides of that story
9 and do a complete analysis. This is not a complete
10 analysis. You're expecting housewives and everyday people
11 to look through this -- you've had a year to go through this
12 thing. You're expecting everyday people to go through it
13 and you're going to go through page after page because I
14 would have had to do some research to know that because if I
15 had read that as a common citizen I would have thought, oh
16 well, it's cheaper then. It's cheaper to bring gas from
17 Iran than it is to buy our own domestic and that is not true
18 and can be proven.

19 Why should I, a common citizen -- you're an
20 energy regulatory commission. You should know these things.
21 You should have caught that and said, hey, wait a minute.
22 We can't compare those two prices because they're not equal.
23 So I'm just asking you to be what you are or what we're
24 paying you to be and do this right, compare the
25 alternatives, all of them, including our renewables which

1 was actually Oregon one of the states is a leading state in
2 the nation on renewables. You didn't even give it the time
3 of day. You just discredited it. Actually, big parts of
4 this should be donated to renewables, not Jordan Cove. We
5 should be able to look at them side-by-side and we don't.
6 It's not fair.

7 It would be nice if you would give us the
8 extension because your commission president didn't, but that
9 isn't really a justification. This needs to be redone and
10 done right so that when we have our review time we can look
11 at something that's done right and then we are able to
12 compare it in everyday language that we can understand.
13 This is written so -- it's supposed to be written, according
14 to NEPA, so that everyday people can understand it. It's
15 not. So it is not a fair analysis and I'm just asking that
16 it be done right and then you give us a review time so that
17 we can review it properly. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Anybody else? Okay. Is
20 it Mr. Jones?

21 MR. JONES: Do you need spelling on that?

22 MR. SCOTT: I'm okay.

23 MR. JONES: This lady over here mentioned coal
24 bed methane. Well, you guys heard me say I'm a fisherman.
25 I know a little bit about fish. Before I was a fisherman,

1 before I retired and became a full-time fisherman I was
2 involved in the engineering business, I know a little bit
3 about machines and automation and all of that, but let's get
4 back to coal bed methane. They want to put some of that
5 stuff up there in Smithers, British Columbia, Skeine
6 (phonetic) River drainage, Now, if you're a steel head
7 fisherman, you know about the Skeine River, Smithers.
8 Nobody up there wants that damn thing in there. Coal bed
9 methane is a dirty business.

10 She also mentioned this refinery. It's not just
11 a storage facility. It's a refinery. I know a little bit
12 about refineries too, that we find this kind of stuff. I've
13 been on some tours of some of those places. You know how
14 many people it takes to run a whiskey distiller? One, one-
15 person 12 hour shift, two people 24-hour shift. So don't
16 tell me you're going to create a lot of jobs building this
17 refinery.

18 Now, let's get back to steelhead and the rivers.
19 You people work for the Federal Energy Regulatory
20 Commission. I don't like you guys very much. Everything
21 you touch turns to shit. Besides, the only thing I know of
22 that you guys have done right is you've let them take out
23 those five dams along the Klamath River. Other than that,
24 you don't have a very good track record.

25 You want to talk about energy, World War II we

1 used to run ships on diesel. We don't do that anymore. I'm
2 not going to tell you what we've got them on. If you got
3 half -- if you got any smarts at all, you'll figure it out.
4 Nobody talks about that kind of energy. They don't want to
5 talk about that kind of energy. We don't need this LNG
6 plant. There are other ways -- well, I can't find him, but
7 he talked about geothermal and all this other stuff. There
8 are other ways. We don't need energy from foreign
9 countries. We're trying to wean ourselves off of foreign
10 energy dependence, especially countries that don't like us
11 very much.

12 So now you guys, Federal Energy Regulatory
13 Commission, government you work for me. You work for us,
14 yet you want to betray us and put this LNG terminal in here
15 and screw up the State of Oregon for the sake of
16 Californians. Now, they tried to put an LNG plant down in
17 Oxnard, California and as early as two years ago, May 2006,
18 it got voted down. They got a couple of high-powered
19 senators in California, probably had a hand in that. I
20 don't like them very much. In fact, that's why I left --
21 one of the reasons I left California, but they also tried to
22 put one on Long Island, New York. They got a couple of
23 high-powered senators there that I don't like very much
24 either, but they killed that. Maybe I ought to reassess who
25 I'm going to vote for.

1 You people work for us. You're supposed to do
2 what we want, not what some rich, fat cat oil company wants
3 so he can make some bucks. And I suspect -- I don't want to
4 step on any toes, but I suspect there's some green going
5 under the table and it ain't too hard to follow the money
6 trail.

7 Now, the other thing I don't like very much is
8 lawyers. Bt I suspect that some of these people that belong
9 to some of these environmental groups have some contact with
10 some lawyers. I'd like to see all you people sued. You
11 betrayed us. You keep on betraying us. Here we are we got
12 this stock market crash. We got this housing crash. We got
13 people who are supposed to look after that. They're
14 supposed to be the smartest people in the world. They let
15 it happen. They ought to be sued too or at least put in
16 jail, maybe tarred and feathered, run out of town, sent down
17 to California with all the rest of this LNG. You all are
18 lucky we don't do that any more, maybe we should.

19 I don't want this LNG plant. I think you know
20 that. I don't think anybody here wants it. So like I said,
21 you either do the right thing or I got a fisherman buddy
22 you're going to have to answer to one of these days and I
23 don't think his boss is going to like it very much. Thank
24 you.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

2 MS. HAIGH: Well, there's not a whole lot of
3 people left, but for the people who have remained -- and I
4 know this Jordan Cove has not entered the room once. I
5 think the PR guy is in the back, but they're afraid of us
6 apparently because they used to be in the same room with us,
7 but they decided to stay outside because they know they're
8 actually the big money makers.

9 FERC, even if this one representative from FERC
10 since there's five of them, even if he had a conscience and
11 did, you know, support us there are four others that are not
12 here. And I just wanted to let you know if you go on the
13 FERC website there are 46 terminals in North America, 33 are
14 approved of already and we're on the proposed list right
15 now. So just to let you know that there's been a lot of
16 movement. We're not alone. This is happening all over the
17 world. This is not just this one man sitting here. There
18 are companies just like Jordan Cove and Williams Pipeline
19 and they're probably actually all affiliated in some way.
20 There are all these energy companies. Just so you know
21 what's going on, it's not a little thing. It's a big thing.

22

23 And when we think about all the news about the
24 crashes, well, if you happen to go online it's really,
25 really interesting. If you Google OPIC that is Overseas

1 Private Investment Corporation, and it was really
2 interesting for me to see this is because most people don't
3 know about it. This is what it is. OPIC is an independent
4 -- this is just like FERC is an independent government
5 agency paid by taxpayers like us -- OPIC is an independent
6 U.S. Government agency whose mission is to mobilize and
7 facilitate the participation of U.S. private capital and
8 skills in the economic and social development of less
9 developed countries and areas and countries in transition
10 from non-market to market economies. So you know, you have
11 to realize this was started in 1971 by President Nixon.
12 Okay. So we can't blame it on Bush, but he utilized this
13 because if you look about the work around the world they're
14 involved in 150 -- our tax dollars are involved and private
15 corporations are putting their money, not in the U.S. -- 150
16 countries around the world are being developed with our
17 money. And if you look at the most recent thing, OPIC
18 announces mortgage lending program in the West Bank,
19 provides financing for electricity project in Jordan. U.S.
20 small business building homes in Iraq.

21 Some of these probably are some good projects,
22 but listen to the ones that are really expensive. President
23 Bush announces five OPIC funds for Africa totaling \$875
24 million. So where do you think these LNG terminals that is
25 shipping the LNG -- supposedly to here? They're being

1 developed overseas with this money. OPIC conference to
2 encourage investment in the Middle East, this is all online.
3 This is a governmental website that you can download. It
4 has all the projects and you can see the big picture of
5 this. So what I would say is, you know, this is where our
6 power comes in as people. We live here. This is bigger
7 than just this little project. It's all over the place.
8 You know, we all have money in a bank. Find out where your
9 banks are investing because that's whose funding Jordan
10 Cove. They're all funded by banks and probably all the LNG
11 that's supposed to be sent here is being funded by OPIC,
12 which is our government tax -- this is being paid by us.
13 This governmental agency assists private corporations,
14 private individual, private U.S. capital to go out of the
15 country to take advantage of us.

16 So you know, I didn't even know this was going on
17 and it's amazing how much money -- if you look online and
18 see what is here, you'd be amazed. You know, we talk about
19 need. Where was FEMA during Hurricane Katrina? Those
20 people are still out of their homes. They were never taken
21 care of. There is no accountability with our government at
22 this point in time. It's not just FERC. It's everybody in
23 the federal government. So where do we all start. You guys
24 have to start something as citizens. It's bigger than just
25 this. But since this is where we live, this is what we have

1 to stop because Jordan Cove is getting paid by big money,
2 that's why this is happening. That's why FERC is -- just to
3 let you know, in 1992, that's when Jeff Schilling, who was
4 one of the big upper managers of Enron created the stock
5 market for natural gas. That's when it all started
6 occurring. Then Enron was the largest buyer and seller of
7 LNG in North America. So you know, when Enron collapsed
8 there was a lot of money that was taken out before they
9 collapsed, that money was taken out, all those stockholders
10 were cheated. Well, guess where it's all invested because
11 OPIC allows negotiations between private U.S. capital, which
12 I'm sure all that Enron money had to go somewhere to be
13 invested overseas and it's still invested in LNG.

14 You were talking about how can we be smart? If
15 you watch the DVD "The Smartest Guys in the Room," it has
16 all the facts. It's a documentary on Enron and FERC. FERC
17 was started by the CEO, Kenneth Lay, of Enron. That's how
18 FERC started. Am I right?

19 MR. LISTER: I'm not sure what you're talking
20 about.

21 MS. HAIGH: Oh, you don't? Well, if you look up
22 the history, you will find out that FERC did not exist
23 before Enron did. The CEO started it and anyway this is all
24 a big moneymaking thing. That's where they're getting all
25 their money. All these housing issues we have the money.

1 It's going outside of the country, just so you know. And
2 this thing is being funded by big -- probably by the fallout
3 from Enron. Just so you know it's more to it than that,
4 just so you know FERC is actually not representing us. In
5 fact, I was going to ask you a question. Who enforces NEPA
6 regulations since you weren't threatened at all that you
7 were violating them at all when I read them all yesterday.
8 Who enforces NEPA?

9 MR. LISTER: The courts enforce NEPA.

10 MS. HAIGH: The federal courts, the state?

11 MR. LISTER: I believe it's federal court.

12 MS. HAIGH: You don't know. And you're a part of
13 FERC and you don't know who enforces --

14 MR. LISTER: Let me set the record straight on
15 one thing that you said at the beginning of what you
16 mentioned because I said this at the beginning of my opening
17 remarks. I am not a commissioner. I am not one of five --

18 MS. HAIGH: Oh, you're not. So we have no FERC
19 people here at all.

20 MR. LISTER: You have a FERC staff member here,
21 as I said at the beginning of this meeting and hope the
22 crowd does not think that I'm one of the Presidential
23 appointees.

24 MS. HAIGH: See, that's why everybody was being
25 so mean to you. Now, that says something right there.

1 There's really no official here at all. We can't even see
2 their face and they send staff here. You know, everyone is
3 trying to make money. I just want to let you know what Jeff
4 Schilling said. It's called the selfish gene. It's a
5 Darwinian view that all people do what they can to survive.
6 Schilling, who was one of the top guys in Enron believed
7 that money is the only thing that motivates people and you
8 can see it demonstrated with the Jordan Cove people out
9 there because they really don't care about us at all.
10 They're just lining their pockets and they're being paid for
11 by big business and by big banks and being funded. It's all
12 related.

13 Now, these FERC people they're just staff and
14 it's interesting.

15 MR. LISTER: I said it in my opening remarks. I
16 try to make it clear.

17 MS. HAIGH: And the fact that, you know, there
18 should be all five FERC people here really if this is a FERC
19 meeting, but again -- so who actually writes these reports?

20 MR. LISTER: The impact statement is prepared by
21 staff.

22 MS. HAIGH: So that's you too.

23 MR. LISTER: Well, us and our team of --

24 MS. HAIGH: How many people are on the staff?

25 MR. LISTER: On the staff or how many people

1 worked on this project?

2 MS. HAIGH: How many people worked on the writing
3 of the draft Environmental Impact Statement?

4 MR. LISTER: There's actually a list somewhere in
5 the document of all the preparers, but I would say 20 or so.

6 MS. HAIGH: Twenty people? Okay.

7 MR. LISTER: And that's the preparation team and
8 the staff. There are obviously lots of other people
9 involved in developing information and doing surveys and so
10 forth.

11 MS. HAIGH: So who is the overseer? Did any of
12 the FERC officials even read what you wrote?

13 MR. LISTER: I can't say.

14 MS. HAIGH: It's not required?

15 MR. LISTER: I don't know. I hope so.

16 MS. HAIGH: And is any of the staff technically
17 oriented.

18 MR. LISTER: Absolutely. Our team that produces
19 these are all a staff of scientists and engineers.

20 MS. HAIGH: So you just only wrote some of it.
21 Both of you just wrote part of it then.

22 MR. LISTER: I think that's fair to say.

23 MS. HAIGH: So the one that's hospitalized now,
24 is he an official?

25 MR. LISTER: No, he's one of my staff members.

1 I'm his immediate supervisor.

2 MS. HAIGH: So the FERC officials are basically
3 reviewing what the FERC staff creates.

4 MR. LISTER: That's correct.

5 MS. HAIGH: So we'll never see their faces, is
6 that right?

7 MR. LISTER: I don't know.

8 MS. HAIGH: So you're not the one making the
9 decision.

10 MR. LISTER: That's correct.

11 MS. HAIGH: Okay. So we know -- I guess that guy
12 left already. So you're not accountable for this. So who
13 ultimately is accountable, no one?

14 MR. LISTER: The staff is responsible for
15 preparing the impact statement. The commissioners are
16 responsible for making the decision on this project.

17 MS. HAIGH: So they're supposedly accountable and
18 they're the ones who actually -- if they are found guilty of
19 something, they're the ones who are accountable, is that it?
20 Or there is no one accountable, basically; is that what
21 you're telling me?

22 MR. LISTER: I just told you that the
23 commissioners are the decision-makers on these projects.
24 What you mean by accountability is up to you?

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Who do we put in jail?

1 (Laughter.)

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Who do we tar and feather?

3 MR. LISTER: Hopefully, nobody, but the
4 commissioners are responsible for the decisions.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Somebody needs to pay for these
6 mistakes.

7 MS. HAIGH: Well, you know what you said about
8 St. Peter --

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't even vote you guys out
10 of office.

11 MR. LISTER: That's correct. The commissioners
12 are appointed.

13 MS. HAIGH: Five years.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Damn, what a cushy job. You
15 can't be voted out. You can make these decisions that
16 impact whole states and whole communities and there's no
17 retaliation.

18 MR. LISTER: Would anybody else like to speak?

19 MS. McNAMAR: Just briefly, from Coos Bay --
20 well, actually, I live in North Bend. And to me, Jordan
21 Cove is simply a geographical feature out in the northern
22 part of the Coos Bay. So I was asleep at the switch for a
23 long, long time until I went to a meeting and I began to ask
24 questions and I got answers all over the map and all this
25 stuff about safety, which raised my curiosity. I'm going to

1 leave a copy of my letter to the editor with a p.s. and I'll
2 send this with you because I didn't read the postscript when
3 I was here before.

4 MR. LISTER: Thank you, ma'am. Okay. If there
5 is no one else who wishes to speak, thank you all for
6 coming. This meeting is closed.

7 (Whereupon, at 9:30 p.m., the above-entitled
8 scoping meeting was concluded.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25