

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

Oregon Institute of Technology
College Union Auditorium
3201 Campus Drive
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601

Thursday, October 30, 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'd like to
5 welcome you tonight. This is the fourth of four planned
6 public meetings that have been 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 proposed Jordan Cove LNG import terminal and Pacific
10 Connector Gas Pipeline Projects.

11 My name is Lonnie Lister. I'm a branch chief
12 with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Office of
13 Energy Projects. With me here tonight is John Scott. John
14 is a project manager with TetraTech Environmental
15 Consultants who assisted us in preparing the draft
16 Environmental Impact Statement.

17 A little background for those who might not be
18 familiar with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
19 FERC, I'll use those terms interchangeably. The FERC is an
20 independent agency with headquarters in Washington, D.C.
21 that regulates the interstate sale and transmission of
22 electricity and natural gas. Among other responsibilities
23 the FERC reviews proposals by private energy development
24 companies and authorizes construction of interstate natural
25 gas pipelines, gas storage facilities and liquefied natural

1 gas import terminals. The FERC is composed of five
2 commissioners who are appointed by the President of the
3 United States with the advice and consent of the Senate.
4 The commissioners serve five-year terms and have an equal
5 vote on regulatory matters. One member of the Commission is
6 designated by the President to serve as the chairman and as
7 the FERC's administrative head.

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

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

1 On September 4, 2007, Jordan Cove Energy and
2 Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline filed an application under
3 Sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act to construct and
4 operate new natural gas facilities, including the liquefied
5 natural gas import terminal, 229.5 miles of 36-inch diameter
6 gas pipeline, a 10,310 horsepower natural gas compressor
7 station and auxiliary-related facilities in Oregon. All of
8 the proposed facilities are more fully described in the
9 draft Environmental Impact Statement.

10 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide
11 each of you an opportunity to give us your comments on the
12 draft Environmental Impact Statement. We're here tonight to
13 learn from you. It will help us the most if your comments
14 are as specific as possible with respect to the analysis in
15 the Environmental Impact Statement.

16 During our review of the project, we assembled
17 information from a variety of sources, including the
18 applicant, the public comments, other federal, state, and
19 local agencies and our own independent analysis and field
20 investigations. We analyzed this information and prepared
21 the draft EIS. It was distributed to the public for
22 comment. A notice of availability of the draft EIS was
23 issued for this project on August 29, 2008. We're in the
24 midst of the 90-day comment period on the draft EIS. The
25 formal comment period will end on December 4, 2008. It is

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

5 We ask that you provide comments as soon as
6 possible to give us time to analysis and research issues and
7 provide an adequate response. I'd like to add that the FERC
8 strongly encourages electronic filing of any comments. The
9 instructions for this can be located on the FERC website at
10 www.FERC.gov under the e-Filing link. The website also
11 provides a free service called e-Subscriptions that provides
12 an e-mail notification to all subscribers whenever a formal
13 filing is made in a particular case. If you received a copy
14 of draft EIS, you'll automatically receive a copy of the
15 final EIS. If you did not get a copy of the draft and would
16 like to get a draft of the final, please sign our mailing
17 list at the back of the room or outside the door rather and
18 provide your name and address and we'll be happy to add you
19 to the mailing list.

20 It's important to note, though, that the EIS is
21 not a sole decision document for the FERC. It's being
22 prepared to advise the Commission and to disclose to the
23 public the environmental impacts of constructing and
24 operating the proposed project. When it is completed the
25 Commission will consider the environmental information from

1 the final EIS along with non-environmental issues such as
2 engineering, markets and rates in making its decision to
3 approve or deny the project, and the specific requirements
4 that the applicant will have to comply with. There is no
5 review of the FERC decision by the President or Congress
6 maintaining the FERC's independence as a regulatory agency
7 in providing fair and unbiased decisions.

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

15 In a minute we will begin the important part of
16 this meeting that's to get your comments on the impact
17 statement. When your name is called, please step up to the
18 microphone and state your name and affiliation, if any, for
19 the record. Your comments will be transcribed by a court
20 reporter here this evening to ensure that we get an accurate
21 record of tonight's meeting. A transcript of this meeting
22 will be placed in the public record at FERC so that anyone
23 can have access to information collected here tonight.
24 Okay. With that said, then we'll proceed. We have four
25 speakers on the list. And once we've gone through that,

1 we'll give anybody else who hasn't signed up an opportunity
2 to speak if they choose. So we'll just call the first
3 speaker Anita Ward.

4 MS. WARD: Anita Ward. I'm representing myself
5 and my consulting business, Arc-en-Ciel. I have been on
6 numerous federal advisory committees covering six counties
7 and I have been intimately involved with the background of
8 the Jordan Cove Project and the Williams Pipeline all the
9 way to proposed pipeline to Malin, Oregon.

10 I have numerous concerns. I guess number one
11 would be that the considerations for the environment do not
12 seem to respect the State of Oregon's various agencies. It
13 seems like that would contravene what our own state laws and
14 agencies would prefer. That would be number one. The idea
15 of condemning private property and some of these boundaries
16 have not been determined or they're in the process of being
17 reset doesn't seem to be fair to the private landowners, and
18 perhaps even to the public lands. The public lands would
19 have different boundaries than the buffers for private
20 lands.

21 The proposed dredging of the Coos Bay channel is
22 another thing that would adversely affect fishing, the
23 health and the habitat of the area. The studies on tsunamis
24 that have been recently released would say that the wave
25 heights would not come up to the proposed berms, but who

1 knows what might happen with tsunamis. You would have
2 catastrophic events happens and you could have that, and
3 it's an earthquake zone as well.

4 With the airport by Coos Bay, there is not much
5 air space or whatever and we've heard so many things as
6 recently as this past Tuesday of pipeline explosions. I
7 think we should be more humble in our understanding of what
8 can happen with forces of nature and our own lack of having
9 good technology, pipelines deteriorate over years and you
10 can have major problems.

11 And a concern with the pipeline is that the
12 natural gas would not be scented, odorized and it's not to
13 benefit Oregon as such. It has been denied in California in
14 the major market would be going to California. Why should
15 Oregon residents be penalized for the benefit of California,
16 especially when they don't want to take on the risk
17 themselves? I could go on with others, but I think that
18 gives just a short idea and I would like to hear what other
19 people have to say.

20 COURT REPORTER: Could I have the spelling of
21 your business?

22 MS. WARD: Yes, A-R-C hyphen E-N hyphen C-I-E-L.
23 Thank you.

24 MR. LISTER: Thank you. The next speaker is
25 Wanda Baker.

1 MS. BAKER: As stated, my name is Wanda Baker. I
2 have property in Douglas County. And my first question is
3 in your booklet on page 377 I'd like to know why my property
4 is not listed as to how or what is going to go on through
5 it? You jump from milepost 69.8 to milepost 82.7. You
6 can't answer that one, can you?

7 MR. LISTER: We're not in a position to answer
8 specific questions like that. But I will point out that
9 there are company representatives here this evening and they
10 have detailed maps out in the lobby and we can certainly
11 look into that after we've gone through the comment period.

12 MS. BAKER: Okay. Thank you. All right. The
13 next thing I don't feel that your impact statement has dealt
14 with the way you're going to impact the land as to the
15 steepness and what will happen with runoff. Now, I'm
16 speaking of Douglas County. Obviously, here in Klamath
17 we've got a little different situation. The other thing
18 that bothers me is that you're going to be dumping dirt on
19 other timber that is our personal timber that will be
20 impacted. I don't feel that that should happen. It should
21 somehow be taken out instead of dumped out onto the other
22 forestland.

23 Why are the right-of-ways larger for the private
24 sector versus BLM? You have a 50-foot right-of-way on BLM
25 where you almost 100 foot on public -- I mean on private.

1 We happen to have three major power lines running through
2 our property, and I mean major by coming from California, et
3 cetera. If you do logging there, because of its steepness,
4 some of it was suggested that it would be done by
5 helicopter. I'm not sure that you handled the safety issue
6 around these power lines very well.

7 The other thing that bothers me the most are our
8 rivers and streams that are going to be crossed, the impact
9 that it's going to do not only to the fish, but the
10 sediment, the washing away of our banks, et cetera. We have
11 a stream that runs through our property that you will be
12 going through. It's never been stated exactly how it's
13 going to be done because nobody has come to look at this to
14 see what type of impact it has during the winter.

15 I would also like to know why the State of Oregon
16 needs these extra lines. We've already got lines going
17 through the state. Why can't we hook up with those? There
18 is just a lot of questions that I have and I'm not sure I
19 really dealt with what you're asking from this environmental
20 impact, but I do feel that we have a lot of things going on
21 over there in Coos Bay that is not acceptable behavior and
22 we're kind of ram-rodding this through. I think you should
23 have given us more time to respond to this statement. You
24 haven't given us very much time. There's some information
25 here that's not totally complete. I haven't gotten through

1 it all yet. I just feel that you are really taking
2 advantage of the private person and to me it's criminal that
3 if we don't agree with what you want you're going to use
4 eminent domain and take our property. That's all I have to
5 say.

6 (Appause.)

7 MR. LISTER: Thank you. Malena Marvin.

8 MS. MARVIN: Hi. How's it going?

9 MR. LISTER: Great.

10 MS. MARVIN: I am Malena Marvin. I'm going to
11 tell you a little bit about the group I'm with, then I'm
12 going to tell you a little bit about why I'm here.

13 COURT REPORTER: Could you spell your first name?

14 MS. MARVIN: It's M-A-L-E-N-A. So I am with a
15 non-profit organization called Klamath River Keeper. We are
16 one group in an alliance of over 177 groups worldwide that
17 fight for water quality and watershed restoration. Our
18 mission here on the Klamath is to restore water quality in
19 fisheries throughout the watershed and to bring vitality and
20 abundance back to this river and its people. In order to
21 accomplish that mission we use expert, informed policy
22 advocacy within existing regulatory processes. We use legal
23 action. We use grassroots outreach and education. And we
24 also use scientific needs analysis and water quality
25 monitoring. In short, we have a pretty broad toolkit and we

1 use it effectively and often.

2 We do have an active membership of people from
3 all over this basin and we also have support from people who
4 love the Klamath and like to visit this watershed all over
5 the western United States and abroad.

6 I first heard about this project when I was out
7 in Coos Bay doing some organizing with fishermen who catch
8 our salmon coming out of the Klamath and I met a woman named
9 Jody McCaffree. She's the daughter of a second or third
10 generation commercial fisherman in Coos Bay. And Jody is a
11 family woman. I think a mom and a wife. And Jody has a job
12 that's totally unrelated to environmental issues and
13 fishing, but Jody's been working full-time to stop this
14 pipeline. And when she came to my meeting to learn about
15 our issues here on the Klamath that are affecting her
16 community, I wanted to learn about her issue.

17 And she spoke to me quite passionately and
18 clearly about how this project is affecting or has the
19 capacity to affect the place that she lives. And I decided
20 right then and there that we could do whatever we could from
21 our end to help her out and to help out her community in
22 fighting this project.

23 So I'm going to read a few comments that will be
24 submitted with my written comments. I'm not going to go
25 into all of our technical comments right now because we're

1 still compiling them and it would take too long. So I want
2 to say that Klamath River Keep believes the Pacific
3 Connector Pipeline to be inappropriate development project
4 for the Klamath basin. The mitigation measure proposed by
5 the applicants and FERC staff do not sufficiently compensate
6 for the adverse environmental impacts of the project. These
7 impacts are particularly unwarranted in the Klamath where
8 water quality and fisheries are already compromised and
9 requires significant restoration if they are to viable,
10 natural resources in the future.

11 This, in combination with the fact the project
12 itself may be unwarranted, given domestic alternatives for
13 natural gas supplies has prompted Klamath River Keeper to
14 disapprove of the project and to support any organized
15 grassroots, legal or regulatory efforts to oppose it.

16 Here in the Klamath we have a lot of endangered
17 fish and we're working hard to turn that trend around and
18 get our fish back on their feet, so to speak, and this
19 project is not going to help us do that. Your DEIS
20 explicitly states that the project is likely to have adverse
21 effects on endangered Lost River and Short nose suckers and
22 that's something that Klamath River Keepers simply cannot
23 agree with. And we're also going to note that these adverse
24 impacts to fish species indirectly impact the landowners and
25 land managers who must bear the burden of restoration and

1 other endangered species restrictions until these species
2 are fully recovered. In addition to use eminent domain to
3 devalue private property, the pipeline will leave landowners
4 and agencies responsible for the threats to endangered
5 species that is likely to incur.

6 The DEIS did not even acknowledge the fact that
7 the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife is advancing a
8 plan to reintroduce anadromous fish to the upper basin under
9 a court mandate. Over the next ten years, ocean-going
10 salmon, including endangered Coho will be in the upper basin
11 and will be utilizing the waterways that the pipeline is
12 proposed to cross, in particular, the Main Stem Crossing.
13 Spencer Creek that it crosses will also be used by Coho and
14 is a likely spot for manual reintroduction of spring Chinook
15 (phonetic). And even though the pipeline might be above
16 fish passage barriers, it's likely with how you describe
17 it's potential impacts that it will have an adverse effect
18 on water quality that could impact spawning and rearing
19 endangered fish.

20 One really important thing to us is that this
21 draft EIS makes absolutely no provisions for analyzing the
22 cumulative impact of this project in combination with
23 existing threats to endangered species and sensitive water
24 bodies. In the Klamath Basin, this lack of cumulative
25 impact analysis is particularly dangerous as the pipeline's

1 proposed pathway crosses the Klamath and its tributaries at
2 places that are already water quality compromised. The Main
3 Stem Crossing is within a 5-mile radius of all the major
4 point and non-point source pollution inputs to the Klamath
5 River, including Link River, the Klamath Strait Stream, the
6 Lost River Diversion, the wastewater treatment facilities
7 and two industrial wood products operations.

8 The Oregon Klamath is on the EPA's 303D list of
9 impaired water bodies for dissolved oxygen pH, ammonia
10 toxicity, chlorophyll A and temperature. The pipeline would
11 cross the river at a location that is either contiguous with
12 or directly downstream with these impairments. Klamath
13 River Keeper does not hold to the logic that degraded
14 waterways are appropriate locations for further degradation,
15 just the opposite. The states of Oregon and California as
16 well as the United States' EPA are investing considerable
17 resources in developing an implementing TMDL regulations for
18 the Klamath, which is already overburden by industrial and
19 agricultural pollution.

20 The Klamath River cannot reasonably absorb more
21 large-scale industrial development and expect to solve its
22 existing water quality issues, which are among the worst in
23 the State of Oregon. And I'll just remind you again that
24 when we have environmental problems on the Klamath it's the
25 people who live here who have to bear the burden, not your

1 company.

2 This project is meeting considerable resistance
3 throughout its geographic range, and I want to be clear that
4 Klamath River Keeper will work with all other environmental,
5 property rights, and citizens groups to ensure that the
6 natural resources and property rights of the Klamath basin
7 are not threatened by this unwarranted project that benefits
8 large, multi-national corporations rather than local people.
9 KRK will ground truth the maps in the DEIS and submit
10 written comments on all threats to water quality and
11 endangers fish species we encounter within the project and
12 on the ground. The Klamath River Keeper will also make sure
13 that every private landowner potentially impacted by this
14 project has the information necessary to fight the use of
15 eminent domain to devalue their private property.

16 A lot of other groups in your other hearings have
17 pointed out inconsistencies within the draft EIS in regard
18 to the expressed purpose and need for this project and we
19 are in agreement. Neither FERC nor the applicant adequately
20 explained the purpose and need for this project in relation
21 to the environmental impacts and risks it perpetrates on the
22 citizens and waterways of Oregon. We'd like to cite the
23 Oregon Department of Energy's own letter to Governor
24 Colengowski from May of this year stating, and I quote, "A
25 finding cannot be made at this time that a new LNG facility

1 in Oregon would be in the public interest or of benefit of
2 Oregonian."

3 The Department of Energy's research indicates
4 that domestic sources of natural gas will be readily
5 available and can utilize less risky pipelines with pre-
6 existing right-of-ways. Further, the Oregon Department of
7 Energy has shown that the carbon footprint of domestically-
8 produced natural gas will be far smaller than that of
9 liquefied and natural gas shipped from across the Pacific,
10 and this is especially pertinent to us because we're one of
11 those watersheds that's been impacted by climate change
12 pretty severely and our water quality issues are only going
13 to get worse as climate change gets worse.

14 FERC should take advantage of this comprehensive
15 research undertaken by the State of Oregon rather than
16 bending over backwards to serve the whims of a multi-
17 national energy company who stands to profit from an
18 unviable project that puts Oregon's natural resources at
19 risk.

20 So in conclusion, I just want to say that
21 agencies, private landowners and other groups are spending
22 millions if not billions of dollars to restore the Klamath
23 basin, it's water quality and its fisheries. We are working
24 hard together to bring back a river that was once the third
25 largest salmon producer on the West Coast and now has just

1 10 percent of its historic salmon runs. While economic
2 growth must be part of this restoration strategy, the
3 Klamath needs economic growth that benefits local people and
4 that are positively impacts our natural resources or
5 minimizes negative impacts.

6 The Pacific Connector Pipeline as proposed brings
7 no economic or social benefit to local people. Instead, it
8 devalues private property while adversely impacting
9 waterways and species who decline, in turn, adversely
10 impacts local people. The Oregon Department of Energy has
11 shown that the energy contributed by this pipeline could be
12 developed domestically and transported with less impact to
13 Oregon's environment and private property. The Klamath
14 Basin does not need to compromise itself for a project that
15 is not needed and whose only benefit is to a large, multi-
16 national corporation.

17 Further, we have numerous unexplored
18 opportunities for a renewable energy industry here and
19 that's what we need to jumpstart our economy and provide
20 jobs to people who actually live here. And on that note, I
21 just want to add that I think with a lot of people I'm sad
22 and dismayed to see FERC working hand-in-hand with a
23 corporation that seeks only to take profits and not to help
24 local places, and I would like to see FERC take a turn
25 towards investing in renewable energy and small-scale energy

1 production and helping out Americans with their actual
2 energy needs -- actual people, actual places rather than
3 your backdoor relationships and friends in big cities. And
4 as long as you continue to move forward with the way that
5 you're operating, hand-in-hand with corporations, you're
6 going to get a hell of a fight from all of us down here and
7 we're not going to give up.

8 MR. LISTER: Thank you. The last speak on the
9 list right now is Katherine Clark.

10 MS. CLARK: My name is Katherine Clark,
11 K-A-T-H-E-R-I-N-E, Clark without an E. I'm here as a
12 private property owner. When this pipeline first was coming
13 in, it was aligned up along a present electrical line and it
14 was up beyond any private -- well, it was on some private
15 property, but well beyond homes and someone -- one of their
16 geologist came by they told me and was running up the road
17 and looked up on the hill and saw that there was some shale
18 and it appeared to them that it was going to be too risky to
19 put it through the shale because it could move an
20 earthquake. Well, as you know, we've had an earthquake, a
21 pretty major one not too long ago. And when that earthquake
22 happened we were not home, but we came home in time for the
23 aftershock and that aftershock sounded just like a freight
24 train coming through the house and it moved everything all
25 over; fortunately, nothing was harmed. But my property that

1 they want to go through is right there and they're coming up
2 a side hill that's very steep and rocky. And the reason
3 they're doing it is because they didn't want to go through
4 that piece right down the road because of the danger they
5 thought it posed without any thought to the danger of coming
6 down my hill and right through my alfalfa.

7 This line, as they have it proposed, is going
8 through so much private property and so little government
9 property in our area, so little BLM that it seems totally
10 unreasonable why they couldn't have gone ahead and followed
11 that high power line instead of taking it down through all
12 of that precious farmland and down these hillsides that are
13 steep.

14 I'm concerned also because a meeting that I went
15 to about this pipeline over in Medford we were told that the
16 safety measures here in the country are not as rigid as they
17 are in the cities and the higher populated areas. I don't
18 think that's reasonable at all because there will be
19 tractors, diggers, everything going through my property that
20 could impact that pipeline and it will be with even heavier
21 equipment on the other farms that are around me. And with
22 their diminished safety features on that pipeline, I find it
23 much more dangerous than it is around town and I don't think
24 that's reasonable. I think it's way out of line.

25 And then I found that this CFR report by the

1 Pipeline Safety Trust says that there is a danger -- a
2 hazard area 900-foot radius around that pipe -- 900 feet.
3 They're only telling me they're going to take 90 or 95 feet,
4 but my neighbors was in the 900 feet have not been notified
5 nor was I because my home will probably fall in that 900-
6 foot area. My neighbor will probably be within 2 to 300
7 feet. I don't understand why they were not notified. Why
8 we weren't told this. I was not told this before.

9 I have a concern about a leak in that pipeline,
10 whether from equipment, whether from an earthquake, whether
11 from any source because that pipeline is not going to be
12 odorized and there's going to be no way on earth that we're
13 going to know if it's leaking and we have animals on the
14 property all around there, animals that are important to
15 you. And I asked about it -- I asked Williams about it just
16 here tonight and they said, well, that goes straight up. It
17 goes up into the atmosphere. But how do those animals know
18 where that is. They're probably walking on it or around it
19 all the time if it's leaking. I just think it's not
20 necessary. I went to the meeting in Malin a couple of
21 months ago that was put on by the pipelines coming from
22 Wyoming and Colorado with their own natural gas that will
23 connect at Malin at the same place that this Jordan Cove
24 Project will connect. It is not affecting private
25 landowners at all like it is this Jordan Cove one. They're

1 going through unpopulated areas to get it to Malin and
2 affecting very few owners.

3 It is our own gas. The thing that we're fighting
4 for now is to be self-sufficient. That's a big thing with
5 us now. Why do we need this imported gas when it is
6 affecting so many of us? I called them and asked them if we
7 could get -- if they put that through my property, if I
8 could get natural gas to my home. No, not from this
9 pipeline, you'll have to call Avista if you want natural
10 gas. There's no natural gas out in the country. There's no
11 pipelines out there for it, except the big one to send it to
12 California. I find it totally unreasonable. Thank you for
13 your time.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. LISTER: Thank you. Is there anyone else
16 who'd like to make a statement? Please state your name.

17 MS. ADAMS: Hi. You might remember me from last
18 night.

19 MR. LISTER: Yes, I do.

20 MS. ADAMS: My name is Leslie Adams and I am with
21 the Rogue River Keeper, but I spoke last night on behalf of
22 my professional capacity and tonight I'm here as an
23 individual. I live in Jacksonville, Oregon and I'm a
24 landowner that is not affected by the pipeline, but I'm here
25 tonight in solidarity with the landowners that are being

1 threatened through eminent domain and the seizure of their
2 land.

3 I think the last woman asked a really important
4 question, why do we need this project? I'm not going to say
5 all the things that I said last night. As I stated, I'm
6 going to be sending technical comments in, but I think there
7 are a couple of points I'd like to emphasize for folks here
8 in the room tonight. And the woman who spoke before me
9 asked the need for this project. Why do we need this
10 natural gas? And I think it is the fundamental question of
11 this entire process; and the answer is we don't need it.

12 It's clear that the era of fossil fuels is over
13 and energy companies know that, but they do see an
14 opportunity to make a profit for maybe 15 years, maybe 20
15 years, maybe 25. And they can make a lot of money and then
16 they're going to be gone. And the communities and the
17 landowners in southern Oregon are going to be left with the
18 mess of this proposal. One of the many troubling things in
19 this document, first of all, it is an atrocity. It is a
20 disgrace to the National Environmental Policy Act. I mean
21 there are so many discrepancies and holes and omissions in
22 this document. Again, I will state I can't believe that
23 you're going to proceed with it.

24 There are all kinds of mitigation measures that
25 are absent. We're suppose to trust you that you'll come up

1 with safety regulations for when wildfires come or when
2 earthquakes hits or how this pipeline is going to impact
3 Coho salmon and other wildlife. What's going to happen to
4 water quality? The mitigation measures are absent. But one
5 of the things that I'm really interested in is the insurance
6 for this energy company so when a problem does hit who's
7 going to pay for it? Who's responsible for it?

8 Again, the purpose and need of this document is
9 completely flawed, as was stated earlier. I want to
10 emphasize again for people in the room tonight the 2005
11 Energy Act took siting authority away from the states and
12 gave it to the federal government and that has made Governor
13 Colengowski and our representatives in Congress a little
14 concerned. And our governor asked the Oregon Department of
15 Energy to do a research report, which was released in May of
16 this year and the results said we don't need this energy,
17 that Oregon's energy can be supplied by existing natural gas
18 in North America. So why at a time when we understand
19 foreign governments that don't like us very much is not a
20 really good source of fossil fuels, why are we proposing to
21 build an LNG port and import more foreign fossil fuels to
22 our country when we can provide it for ourselves?

23 As was also stated, the carbon footprint and the
24 economic cost of liquefying and transporting and regasifying
25 this fuel is a huge burden compared to using natural gas

1 sources here in North America. So again, why is this
2 project needed? The purpose and need says that Oregon needs
3 energy. Well, the Oregon Department of Energy says that
4 Oregon can satisfy its energy needs here in North America.
5 What your document doesn't say is that this energy is going
6 to southern California. It's very clear that the voracious
7 energy appetite of southern California needs to be met
8 somehow. And FERC failed to site any LNG ports in
9 California. They tried and they failed because the State of
10 California did not want the risks and the burdens and the
11 impacts of LNG ports on their shores.

12 I find it highly offensive that FERC is trying
13 to, via these energy companies, push through an LNG project
14 in southern Oregon because you know what it's a rural area
15 here. And you know what, we're relative poor when you
16 compare us to southern California and I think it's going to
17 be a lot easier for -- energy companies think it's going to
18 be a lot easier to push through a project in a rural,
19 relatively poor area and then pump the energy to southern
20 California where it's been intended all along.

21 Another problem with the purpose and need is that
22 there is an overcapacity of existing LNG facilities in
23 America. The LNG facilities in the Gulf Coast and the East
24 Coast cannot get enough energy to fit their capacity because
25 the international market is sending liquefied natural gas

1 that can and will pay a lot more for it like Japan.

2 I also want to mention again that this proposal
3 is a national security threat. I think it's completely
4 absurd in this age that we are still building infrastructure
5 for fossil fuels. Bull string reliance on foreign
6 governments that don't like us very much is a really bad
7 idea. Iran, Russia and Qatar have 60 percent of global
8 liquefied gas reserves, and as the bumper sticker states
9 renewable energy is Homeland Security. And this proposal
10 and all the money that is going into it and the staff time
11 is diverting funds away from developing renewable energy,
12 which is really what we need to be doing.

13 Again, I have a lot concerns about impacts to
14 water quality and fish, but we'll submit those with my
15 technical comments. I do think that the fact that this
16 proposal is being pushed in southern Oregon when we don't
17 need it is ridiculous at best and probably criminal. And I
18 think that everyone in our communities is going to do
19 everything that we can to stop it because, as I stated, when
20 Williams is done and there is no more natural gas to come
21 over or the foreign governments that we're relying on aren't
22 going to give it to us anymore or there's a leak and there's
23 no insurance it's the American people that are going to be
24 left with the burden. It is not the energy companies. And
25 as we've seen recently, unfortunately, the government today

1 has privatized profits and socialized losses. And I will
2 not stand for this ill-conceived proposal to create a burden
3 on our communities and have an energy company walk away.
4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. LISTER: Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody
7 else who would like to make a statement?

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'd like to ask another
9 question. It was brought up at one of the meetings -- it
10 was my understanding that not only can this liquefied gas
11 come in and go through these pipes to California, but our
12 liquefied gas can then be reversed and ours go out and be
13 sold elsewhere. Is this possible?

14 MR. LISTER: I have to be honest with you that
15 was the first time I heard any suggestion in that regard was
16 at the meeting a couple of nights ago and last night as
17 well. That's not part of the proposal. Theoretically, it's
18 something that's possible from an engineering standpoint,
19 but there would certainly need to be additional facilities
20 at the LNG plant in order to liquefy gas off of a pipeline.
21 But that's not part of the proposal that's on the table
22 before the FERC, and if it were that would be the subject of
23 a separate environmental review and authorization.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there nothing that can be
25 done to stop that from happening now if it's proposed to go

1 through? You know, can't you restrict it that it cannot go
2 the other way?

3 MR. LISTER: Well, they would not have any
4 authority to do that. If the Commission authorizes this
5 project, there would be no authorities associated with that
6 authorization to export gas or to liquefy gas. As I said,
7 to liquefy gas requires some substantial, additional
8 equipment at the LNG terminal.

9 Okay. Any other statements?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. LISTER: Okay. Thank you all for coming.
12 I'll encourage you -- there are several representatives from
13 both Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector here this evening.
14 There are detailed maps out in the lobby and I would
15 encourage you if you any specific questions regarding the
16 engineering or specific locations of the proposed facilities
17 that information is available out there and I'm sure the
18 company people will be happy to speak with you about it.
19 Okay, then the meeting is closed. Thank you all for coming.

20 (Whereupon, at 7:20 p.m., the above-entitled
21 scoping meeting was concluded.)
22
23
24
25