

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

Umpqua Community College
Campus Center Dining/Room/Timber Room
1140 Umpqua College Road
Roseburg, Oregon 97470

Tuesday, October 28, 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 ladies and gentlemen.
4 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I
5 want to welcome you tonight. This is the second of four
6 planned public meetings that will be held this week to give
7 you an opportunity to provide comments on the draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the FERC staff
9 for the Jordan Cove LNG terminal and Pacific Connector Gas
10 Pipeline Projects.

11 My name is Lonnie Lister. I'm a branch chief
12 with the FERC. I'll interchange for FERC -- FERC and
13 Commission. It's all the same thing. I hope you bear with
14 that. Paul Friedman, who some of you might know, is our
15 project manager. He could not be here tonight because he
16 had a sudden illness and couldn't make it. Here with me
17 tonight is John Scott. John is the project manager for
18 Tetra Tech Consultants who assisted us in preparing the
19 Environmental Impact Statement.

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

1 facilities and liquefied natural gas terminals. The FERC is
2 composed of five commissioners who are appointed by the
3 President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The
4 commissioners serve a term of five years and have an equal
5 vote on regulatory matters. One commissioner is designated
6 by the President to serve as the chairman and is the FERC's
7 administrative head. The FERC has approximately 1,200
8 employees.

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 is
12 the lead agency for preparation of the EIS. Again, the EIS,
13 as most of you know, refers to Environmental Impact
14 Statement. NEPA requires FERC to analyze the environmental
15 impacts, consider alternatives and provide appropriate
16 mediation measures on proposed project.

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

1 way plans and required management plan amendments.

2 On September 4, 2007, Jordan Cove Energy and
3 Pacific Connector filed an application under 3 and 7 of the
4 Natural Gas Act to construct and operate the new natural gas
5 facilities, including the liquefied natural gas terminal
6 229.5 miles of 36-inch diameter welded steel pipeline, a
7 10,300 horsepower compressor station and associated
8 auxiliary facilities in Oregon. All of that is more fully
9 described in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. I
10 won't go into the details on that right now.

11 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to give each
12 of you an opportunity to give us your comments on the draft
13 environmental impact statement. We're here tonight to learn
14 from you. It will help us the most if your comments are as
15 specific as possible regarding the proposed project and the
16 draft EIS. If you wish to speak tonight, you didn't sign
17 the speaker's list, the sign-up, if you didn't get on the
18 list, please do so.

19 During our review of the project, we assembled
20 information from a variety of sources, including the
21 applicant, you the public and other federal, state, and
22 local agencies and our own independent analysis and field
23 work. We analyzed this information and prepared the draft
24 EIS that was distributed for public comment. A notice of
25 availability of the draft EIS was issued for this project on

1 August 29, 2008. We're in the midst of a 90-day comment
2 period on this draft EIS. The formal comment period will
3 end on December 4. It is during this period that we seek to
4 receive comments on the draft EIS. All written comments
5 received during this period or verbally tonight will be
6 addressed in the final Environmental Impact Statement.

7 We ask that you provide comments as soon as
8 possible to give us time to analysis and research the issues
9 and provide an adequate response. I'd like to add that the
10 FERC strongly encourages electronic filing of any comments.
11 The instructions for that are located on the FERC website at
12 www.FERC.gov. And you can look under there for the e-Filing
13 link. If you received a copy of the draft EIS, you'll
14 automatically receive a copy of the final EIS. If you did
15 not get a copy of the draft and would like to get a copy of
16 the final, please sign the attendance list in the back of
17 the room and provide your name and address. We'll be happy
18 to add you to the mailing list.

19 It's important to note that at the FERC the EIS
20 is not the decision document. It's being prepared to advise
21 the Commission and to disclose to the public the
22 environmental impact of constructing and operating the
23 proposed project. When it is completed the Commission will
24 consider the environmental information from the draft EIS
25 along with -- I'm sorry that's will consider the information

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

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

16 So without any further adieu, I think we will go
17 to the list of speakers that's the important part of this
18 meeting. When your name is called, I'd ask that you come up
19 to the podium to the microphone here, state your name
20 clearly and any affiliation you'd like to identify yourself
21 with. Your comments are being transcribed here tonight by a
22 court reporter to ensure that we get an accurate record of
23 tonight's meeting. The transcript of this meeting will be
24 placed in the public record at FERC so that everyone has
25 access to the information collected here tonight. So with

1 that said, we'll start the meeting and call the first name.

2 MR. SCOTT: The first speaker is Roy Hemingway
3 and next is Susan Morgan can be prepared as the second
4 speaker. We'd also like to ask that you try to limit your
5 comments to five minutes in the interest of allowing as many
6 people as possible to speak tonight.

7 MR. HEMINGWAY: My name is Roy Hemingway. I'm
8 representing the Jordan Cove Energy Project. Thank you for
9 this opportunity to testify. By way of background, I'm the
10 immediate past chair of the Oregon Public Utility
11 Commission, have the same role in the New Zealand
12 Electricity Commission. I was advisor on energy to three
13 Oregon governors and was an original member of the Northwest
14 Power Planning Council.

15 I will make oral comments tonight and will file
16 written testimony later on my comments. I want to talk
17 about the role of the EIS and FERC jurisdiction because
18 there have been a number of questions raised by others about
19 what FERC should be doing with respect to the EIS. First of
20 all, there's been an argument that FERC should do a needs
21 assessment with respect to the need for natural gas to the
22 Pacific Northwest, specifically in Oregon. Secondly, it's
23 been argued that FERC should use the EIS to analyze all
24 alternative projects and to essentially choose among those
25 projects and third, it's been suggested that the EIS should

1 contain a carbon analysis which should influence the
2 decision made by FERC.

3 First, on the question of need for gas there's no
4 question that the need for gas in Oregon is growing.
5 Despite a flat growth curve in the industrial sector gas
6 demand is growing in the residential sector and particularly
7 in the electricity sector. Though Oregon has passed a
8 renewal portfolio standard and we hope we will see more
9 renewals generating electricity in Oregon most of that
10 renewal portfolio will be at least in the near to medium
11 future will be wind generation and the hydro system is now
12 in a state where it is nearly at capacity for being able to
13 backup wind, which of course is an unpredictable and
14 variable resource. And so it will need to be other
15 resources built in order to be able to backup, come online
16 when wind isn't blowing and when wind drops off the system.
17 And the ideal resource for that generation is gas-fired
18 generation.

19 And in a carbon-constrained world on the
20 electricity sector, natural gas will be a necessary fuel.
21 If you will, a bridge to the future as we move away from
22 coal which has been the generation source for 50 percent of
23 the electricity generation in the United States. Secondly,
24 choosing among projects is FERC's role. I think FERC has
25 wisely decided that they will leave to the marketplace the

1 decision-making as to whether one project gets built or
2 another project gets built, specifically whether any of the
3 three proposed natural gas plants or LNG plants in Oregon
4 and any of the number of different gas pipelines coming from
5 the Rockies will get built.

6 The commercial arrangements around these projects
7 demand that in order to be built a project must have
8 financing and the financing is dependent upon the projects
9 having gas supply and gas customers locked in before the
10 project can be financed and then can be built. And so given
11 that there is likely to be demand only for the output of one
12 LNG plant and possibly one new interstate pipeline coming
13 into Oregon the commercial arrangements will decide which of
14 those plants will be built. It will not happen that one of
15 those plants will be built and then not be needed and then
16 stand empty. It will have a commercial supply of gas
17 committed before either a pipeline is built or an LNG plant
18 is built. And FERC has wisely chosen not to try to second-
19 guess the marketplace because the marketplace will make the
20 best decision for consumers.

21 And finally, with respect to carbon analysis,
22 carbon analysis is important, but there is no framework in
23 law by which FERC can make a decision based upon carbon
24 analysis and so it's an important point for all of us to
25 keep in mind but for one project to be slightly more carbon

1 intensive than another doesn't inform FERC about how it is
2 to make a decision with respect to those projects. There's
3 no framework in law or in practice as to how FERC should
4 weigh carbon versus cost in other things and when the
5 Congress eventually gets around to making decisions about
6 how carbon trade offs will be made in the United States then
7 that's the time in order to do that.

8 So in summary, I think FERC has been correct in
9 deciding to leave to the marketplace the determination about
10 the need for gas and which project gets built and at this
11 time there is not a framework by which carbon analysis can
12 be brought into decision-making. And keeping in mind that
13 regardless of what natural gas infrastructure is built,
14 whether it be LNG or gas coming from the Rocky Mountains,
15 the carbon output from those projects and the greenhouse gas
16 output from those projects will be much, much lower than
17 coal-generation, burning of coal for electricity which
18 accounts for so much of the generation in the United States.
19 Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

20 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Susan Morgan and then
21 next up Hilda Conrad.

22 MS. MORGAN: Thank you very much. For the
23 record, I'm state representative Susan Morgan and I
24 represent House District 2, which encompasses southern
25 Douglas County, the proposed location of the Pacific

1 Connector natural gas pipeline. I thank the Federal Energy
2 Regulatory Commission for holding these series of hearings
3 and giving the citizen of Douglas County and southwest
4 Oregon an opportunity to comment on the impact of the
5 proposed Jordan Cove Energy Project and the Pacific
6 Connector Gas Pipeline on our region.

7 Let me say very plainly that we have clear
8 expectations for the Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector
9 projects. Both of these projects must be engineered and
10 built to the highest levels of safety. We do not want to
11 put our people, our homes, our communities or our
12 environment at risk. We're depending on the FERC to be
13 certain that safety is a primary consideration. Rural
14 Oregonians have a great connection to our land. We've
15 historically made our living off the land, managing our
16 forests, farmland and fishing resources with an eye to
17 sustainability for future generations.

18 We care deeply about protecting the quality of
19 our environment and passing that legacy onto our children.
20 We're depending on the FERC to make sure these projects
21 conform to all applicable federal and state environmental
22 regulations and to Oregon's land use laws. In southwestern
23 Oregon we place a high value on our private property rights.
24 For many of us our land is our most valuable asset, not only
25 in its monetary value but also in the emotional attachment

1 that families have to their land. For the pipeline project
2 to succeed it must be respectful of our private property
3 rights. If we can put in place a safe and environmentally-
4 responsible natural gas delivery system that honors private
5 property rights, we'll open doors of opportunity for
6 southwest Oregon.

7 Currently, almost 80 percent of Oregon's natural
8 gas comes from western Canada. Demand for this gas in
9 Canada and in Midwestern American markets has been rising.
10 So southwest Oregon is currently challenged with our own
11 increasing demand in a declining supply. Southwest Oregon's
12 natural gas is delivered by a pipeline that comes down the
13 Willamette Valley paralleling the I-5. The pipeline ends
14 near Grant's Pass. Right now, that line is fully contracted
15 and during the winter months flows at its maximum capacity.

16 Large manufacturing companies like Roseburg
17 Forest Products who provide our best family wage jobs with
18 full benefits depend for their operation on an energy source
19 that can be cut off if residential and commercial customers
20 have large enough demand. Our manufacturing employers
21 currently only can receive natural gas if there is any left
22 over after residential and commercial customers are
23 supplied. So right now these manufacturers must agree to
24 shut down their gas-fueled operations during times of peak
25 demand like cold winter weather. Douglas County currently

1 has a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate that's more than
2 3 points higher than the rest of the nation. We're working
3 very hard to increase our manufacturing job base. We need
4 family-waged jobs to stabilize our communities, to give our
5 children and their children a reason to stay and raise their
6 families here. Manufacturing jobs are solid, family-waged
7 jobs with good employee and family benefits. These are the
8 kind of jobs that communities depend on.

9 We also need manufacturing jobs to stabilize our
10 tax base. Industrial and manufacturing facilities are
11 amongst the largest property taxpayers in Douglas County and
12 in southwestern Oregon. These much needed tax dollars help
13 provide funding for education, police protection and
14 services for elderly and vulnerable citizens. The income
15 taxes paid by businesses and individuals working in these
16 jobs are a major funding source for our state government
17 services. The pipeline itself will pay between 1 and 2
18 million each year in property taxes in Douglas County.

19 The high-paying jobs our manufacturers create
20 contribute to the stability of our communities. When
21 manufacturing jobs grow, then small businesses providing
22 goods and services to these core industries grow. When
23 manufacturing jobs grow, employees spend their paychecks in
24 our local communities. All businesses, whether they're
25 landscape nurseries, restaurants, machinists or building

1 contractors benefit and prosper when their customer base
2 grows.

3 Because we cannot offer a stable, long term, and
4 uninterrupted supply of natural gas, we lost a glass
5 manufacturing facility that was looking to locate in Douglas
6 County. Unless we have an uninterrupted supply of energy
7 we'll lose out on the solar energy equipment manufacturing
8 jobs that Oregon is working so hard right now to attract.
9 To add a predictable and stable increased supply of natural
10 gas to our region will put a valuable tool in our economic
11 development toolbox. It will enable us to attract
12 manufacturers who will provide us with family-wage jobs.
13 Further studies indicate that increasing the region's supply
14 will help hold down our costs for natural gas.

15 I respectfully urge the FERC to consider the
16 positive impacts on economic development, job creation and
17 retention this additional natural gas supply will have on
18 Douglas County and southwest Oregon. Additionally, please
19 allow me to submit the following comments on the FERC
20 process. We are all very uneasy about the process that we
21 find ourselves in. I have heard from many of my
22 constituents and from many people across Oregon who are
23 reacting very negatively to the process that FERC is charged
24 with overseeing.

25 Oregonians value a participatory process and we

1 greatly value local stakeholder involvement. I think there
2 is one group that has clearly been left standing outside of
3 this process and that's the small, private landowners. Part
4 of the pathway of the pipeline is through federally-owned
5 land. The Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest
6 Service have excellent capacity to deal with the issues
7 around safety, environmental protection and land values.
8 These agencies have worked closely with the applicants and
9 the FERC.

10 The State of Oregon has tapped several land-based
11 state agencies to work on mitigating negative impacts from
12 the state's regulatory perspective. The industrial
13 timberland owners also have the expertise and capacity to
14 work with the applicants and the FERC. It is the small,
15 private landowners who are left twisting in the wind. Their
16 communications with the FERC, the applicant and the state
17 have been very difficult and unsatisfactory. This is a
18 process where individual landowners are left to their own
19 devices to try to pull information out of the system. It is
20 not a process where questions are answered. It's a process
21 where these landowners end up looking for answers in an
22 overwhelming wall of data trying to interpret information
23 that's complex and highly technical.

24 Our landowners want to know how the project is
25 going to impact their property and the area around them.

1 They want to know how the process works and what their
2 options are. If the FERC is looking to improve this
3 process, it's in its accessibility and availability to the
4 private property owners that I see the greatest need.
5 Again, I thank the FERC for this opportunity to comment on
6 these important matters.

7 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Hilda Conrad and next up
8 Deanna Byers or Dean Byers.

9 MS. CONRAD: Thank you for listening to my
10 comments. Once again, my name is Hilda Conrad. I'm the
11 director of the Umpqua Economic Development Partnership.
12 Let me explain a little bit about who we are.

13 The partnership is a private, non-profit agency.
14 We're organized with the mission to assist companies that
15 are creating jobs for our community. The partners are the
16 City of Roseburg, Douglas County Industrial Development
17 Board, Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce, CCD Business
18 Development Corporation, Mercy Hospital, Umpqua Bank, Avista
19 Utilities, Pacific Power and the Cow Creek Tribe of Umpqua
20 Indians. We also have many collaborative partners that we
21 work closely with on projects, whether either expanding or
22 locating in our community and that are creating family-waged
23 jobs.

24 The partnership supports the Jordan Cove Energy
25 and Pacific Connector gas pipeline as long as the project is

1 environmentally safe, treats the community with respect and
2 is fair to all the property owners. We see the need for
3 natural gas in many of our industrial applications and we
4 want to make sure that we have reliable, cost-effective and
5 sustainable supplies of natural gas for projects that are
6 interested in locating in Douglas County. Natural gas is
7 for many companies a must have in the production process.
8 With the concern that the Canadian supply will be consumed
9 in Canada and there may not be a long-term supply for
10 Oregon, we see a need for an alternative source. The Jordan
11 Cove Project will give Douglas County another source that
12 could be accessible for many years.

13 The country, on a whole, is moving towards more
14 renewable sources of energy and we are seeing more wind
15 farms, solar applications and thermal heating systems coming
16 online. While these sources are good and will become more
17 reliable with improved technology, they still need backup
18 systems. Natural gas is a good backup for these renewable
19 systems. Large industrial users of natural gas need an
20 uninterruptible source to fuel the processes in the
21 manufacturing plant.

22 In the past when we have had the opportunity to
23 work with large natural gas users the issue has been access
24 to reliable, 24/7, 365 days a year of natural gas.
25 Unfortunately, we were not able to fulfill that for one of

1 the projects that came looking at Douglas County. The
2 partnership works with manufacturing companies that are job
3 creators. Our goals for Douglas County are to assist those
4 companies in creating jobs. Having access to an industrial,
5 cost competitive infrastructure is needed in order to meet
6 the needs of manufacturing companies and to attract large
7 projects to Douglas County in order to create family-wage
8 jobs. The Jordan Cove/Pacific Connector gas pipeline is one
9 of those solutions for our future. I thank you for taking
10 my comments.

11 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Dean Byers, then Dan
12 Serres.

13 MR. BYERS: Good evening. I'm Dean Byers. I'm
14 chairman of the Douglas County Democratic Party and we were
15 the first county Democratic Party that took a resolution
16 position against the LNG terminal in Coos Bay. We also
17 oppose them anywhere in Oregon because we think it's the
18 wrong way to go in energy in Oregon.

19 I want to talk to you about two areas. One is
20 about tsunamis. The other is about the airport in Coos Bay
21 -- actually, it's in North Bend. But first I'll start with
22 the tsunamis. Senator Wyden invited a number of us to a
23 meeting with John Wellenhoff, one of the FERC commissioners
24 in January of '08. At that time I presented Mr. Wellenhoff
25 with a copy of the excellent documentary that was aired on

1 the Discovery Channel. It's called "The Next Pacific
2 Northwest Mega Quake." And I told him that -- now at that
3 meeting we had to be generic. We couldn't be referring to
4 any specific terminal and at that time my comments that I
5 made were generic and I said that if you take to heart what
6 it says and what the images and the data that is presented
7 in the next Pacific Northwest Mega Quake you would not
8 consider it safe or wise to site one of these LNG terminals
9 anywhere on the Pacific Coast and particularly, not directly
10 on shore anywhere within the 700 mile run of the subduction
11 zone as it's called. That tsunami wave would hit Coos Bay,
12 Charles and North Bend in a matter of about anywhere from 20
13 minutes to a half an hour -- very little delay.

14 Now, what I also asked him to do was that the
15 mapping that is presently used that shows that the location
16 of the Jordan Cove terminal would be right smack in the red
17 zone of a tsunami zone the mapping that was used for that is
18 old technology and I called on him to use DOGAMI. That
19 means Department of Geology and Mineral Industries in
20 Oregon. They have a mapping technology that shows a much
21 greater inundation zone of tsunami wave than has previously
22 been thought. That needs to be done as part of your tsunami
23 study, which the LUBA Board -- that's Land Use Board of
24 Appeals. That was one of the areas that they found
25 deficient with the application for Jordan Cove is around the

1 issue of tsunami.

2 And the second thing is once you have this map,
3 then we have an excellent facility right here in Oregon. It
4 is one of the only in the world and it is at Oregon State
5 University. It is a tsunami wave simulation lab. And I
6 called on them to take the mapping and then to utilize the
7 Oregon State University tsunami simulation lab and model
8 what is presently there in harbor and in surrounding area
9 and the proposed development and then slam it with a tsunami
10 wave and study it and see what are you going to get out of
11 that. So I do hope that Mr. Wellenhoff saw that video. If
12 he hasn't seen it, I would be glad to send an additional
13 one. I don't have one with me tonight. Also, anyone else
14 who would like to get a copy of that please contact me and
15 I'll give you a copy of it.

16 The other position that I wanted to talk about is
17 the air space. I am also a instrument rated pilot and I
18 know for a fact that a missed approach, meaning on an
19 instrument flight plan coming into the North Bend runway the
20 -- missed approach means you get down to 200 feet of
21 altitude and you don't see the runway yet. You have to do
22 what is called a missed approach and there's a very specific
23 map direction and angles and turns that you have to make and
24 climbing altitude and so forth. And when you would miss
25 approach you would be going right out over the top of a

1 tanker if it happened to be coming in. Therefore, what that
2 means is that air space would be shut down while a tanker is
3 transiting, coming in to dock. That has not been looked
4 into and the reason why there's no rules against it is that
5 there must be actually an air space review called for. It
6 isn't just automatically done because in an instrument
7 approach plate it has all of the obstacles. This would be
8 an obstacle in its flight path and it would have to be
9 mapped.

10 Then after the air space review, then the Federal
11 Aviation Agency would have to propose rules, new rules about
12 how to operate in that air space. That's called a NOPRM, an
13 N-O-P-R-M, I believe it is, a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
14 which is provided to the pilot community so that then they
15 have a public comment period to comment about how this is
16 going to affect their utilization of their air space and
17 their airport. Now, this could also impact a championship
18 golf course that is at Bandon Dunes. You have professional
19 golfers coming flying in there, flying lier jets and stuff
20 like that. They're coming on an instrument approach. They
21 come in there and they get turned away once or twice it's
22 pretty expensive to go circle around with an airplane like
23 that. And they just get turned away once or twice from
24 being shut out from a tanker coming in and they're going to
25 find somewhere else to go golf. So that's another

1 consideration and an impact on that area that has not been
2 looked at, hasn't been studied.

3 COURT REPORTER: Could you spell your name,
4 please?

5 MR. BYERS: Yes, it's Dean, D-E-A-N, B-Y-E-R-S.
6 Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. SCOTT: Dan Serres and then David Lohman.

9 MR. SERRES: First name Dan, D-A-N, last name
10 S-E-R-R-E-S. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the Southern
11 Oregon Clean Energy Coalition, which is a group of groups
12 and individuals who are extremely concerned with the
13 negative impacts of this project which are ample and they're
14 obvious by looking around the room and seeing the number of
15 people with no LNG pins many of whom are going to be
16 affected landowners by the proposed pipeline. And one of
17 the common sense issues that a lot of people are asking
18 about with respect to the Jordan Cove Project and the
19 Pacific Connector Pipeline is, is the project needed for
20 Oregon? And I think it's important to acknowledge what
21 Oregon Department of Energy has already concluded about LNG
22 in Oregon. This isn't coming from the, you know, the anti-
23 LNG coalitions. This is coming from Oregon Department of
24 Energy which when asked by the governor to evaluate the need
25 for LNG because FERC wouldn't they did their own study and

1 they came up with this statement. "Liquified natural gas
2 applied to Oregon would likely cost substantially more than
3 natural gas produced in North America." It's important to
4 get that one on the record. That's page 2 of Oregon
5 Department of Energy's study on natural gas needs in Oregon.

6 When challenged on that conclusion, Oregon
7 Department of Energy came back and said in July of 2008 "If
8 anything, our report may have understated the amount of
9 Canadian natural gas which can serve Oregon and other West
10 Coast markets. For example, it is highly likely that
11 greater amounts of natural gas will be available from
12 British Columbia than our report anticipated." So we've
13 heard repeatedly from Jordan Cove and its proponents that
14 natural gas supplies are dwindling in North America. That's
15 simply not true. It doesn't bear any resemblance to reality
16 in the current North America natural gas market.

17 If you look at prices in Opal coming out of
18 Wyoming right now, prices are below \$5 per million BTU. If
19 you look at prices that were recently being paid in the
20 Pacific Rim gas market they're as high as \$20 per million
21 BTU. If you're looking for LNG as a method of job growth in
22 Oregon, whether it's on the Columbia River or in Coos Bay,
23 it's a failed idea. It's a failed recipe. And when Oregon
24 Department of Energy came out with this conclusion, you
25 know, they did it on firm facts and economic analysis.

1 The second thing they concluded about LNG versus
2 natural gas it's important for FERC to consider is an
3 environmental issue. FERC does need to consider the global
4 warming impacts of this project. LNG and natural gas from
5 domestic sources are very, very different than the
6 greenhouse gas emissions. Oregon Department of Energy
7 concluded that LNG was equivalent to coal in greenhouse gas
8 emissions when shipped over long distances, for example,
9 between the Atlantic and Pacific basins. Sixty percent of
10 the world's natural gas reserves are in Russia and the
11 Middle East. Those two sources are now forming a natural
12 gas cartel. Just last week they announced their intentions
13 to do so, which is probably going to have the effect of
14 driving up gas prices more.

15 So anyone who is looking at the natural gas
16 market globally can see that, you know, there are some
17 serious questions with this project. I just want to read a
18 few things that have come out recently in Industry Press
19 that I think are also instructive in this debate about --
20 you know, even if you decide we need more natural gas is
21 Jordan Cove Project the place to get it? But I think the
22 obvious, common sense conclusion is no. And if the answer
23 is no, then why are all these people being put under the gun
24 for eminent domain? And what's amazing to me is that FERC
25 will issue the right of eminent domain before they show that

1 the project complies with state and local laws.

2 Governor Kulongoski is preparing to challenge FERC
3 on that issue right now in the Bradwood Landing case and I
4 urge FERC not to issue a permit. It's illegal to do so, to
5 issue a permit, without showing that the project complies to
6 the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act and the Coastal Zone
7 Management Act. Not only that, but FERC needs to take a
8 hard look at the environmental impacts of this project,
9 which they also didn't do in Bradwood and they're not doing
10 here either. This EIS is deficient in so many areas and the
11 purpose and need is one big area.

12 So just a few quotes. "There's virtually no need
13 for LNG in the United States market at this moment." That's
14 Bernard Picchi Energy Analyst for Wall Street Access
15 explaining why Cheniere LNG is on the verge of bankruptcy,
16 May 29, 2008. So we heard earlier that there's no way that
17 a company would build a facility and then not have a supply
18 ready. Well, that's going on right now in the Gulf Coast
19 and that company is now asking to export LNG.

20 Quote number two, "With much higher prices in
21 Asia for natural gas, it's very unlikely LNG cargoes are
22 going to be coming to the U.S. for the foreseeable future."
23 Tom Mueller (phonetic), BP spokesman explaining why BP
24 suspended its Delaware River LNG import project, October 10,
25 2008 as quoted in the Oregonian. This is BP suspending an

1 LNG project saying we don't know where we can get the gas.
2 The global LNG market is so tight and precious. They're so
3 much higher there than they are here it makes no sense. And
4 again, the fiasco element of having three proposed LNG
5 terminals in Oregon, each terminal with the capacity to
6 bring in twice as much gas as we need. I think the question
7 of whether gas is needed in southern Oregon or not is a red
8 herring. You know, if there's gas needed in Oregon, we have
9 readily available alternatives just to the east in the
10 Rockies. And one of those pipelines on Sunstone is proposed
11 to largely follow an existing right-of-way.

12 With that, I just want to point out a few areas
13 of environmental concerns just to close with. They kind
14 display the fact that FERC has not taken a hard look at
15 environmental impacts of this project. One of the big
16 issues for some of the members of the coalition is all the
17 streams and water bodies that are going to be impacted by
18 this project. And there just isn't an adequate description
19 of some of these impacts in the Environmental Impact
20 Statement. For instance, on page 270 of the EIS, "All
21 necessary road improvements will not be identified until
22 closer to construction."

23 And then just immediately following that FERC
24 concludes that the erosion and sediment control plan, which
25 is obviously going to affect the healthy water bodies in the

1 area -- and this is on 2-73 -- is acceptable. If you don't
2 know what the project is and what roads you're going to be
3 building and improving -- some on private land; some on
4 public land.

5 And by the way, the breakdown of private and
6 public land affected by this pipeline is entirely sequed to
7 impact private landowners. You know, I think it's like
8 three to one or four to one in terms of private land impact.
9 But if you don't describe the project, you can't describe
10 the impacts. If you're not describing the impacts, how can
11 you tell if you're mitigation them. That's error is
12 replicated throughout this EIS and sort of promises for
13 mitigation plans we'll see later and promises for studies
14 we'll see later. That's not adequate. It has to be
15 resolved in the final EIS. It should be resolved in a new
16 draft EIS. We need to be able to see those things up front,
17 otherwise, people can't tell what's going to be happening on
18 their own property.

19 With that, I would close and really urge you to
20 consider reissuing a new draft Environmental Impact
21 Statement, one that complies with the National Environmental
22 Policy Act. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. David Lohman and then
25 Clarence Adams.

1 MR. LOHMAN: My name is David Lohman,
2 L-O-H-M-A-N. I'm here representing the Southern Oregon
3 Pipeline Information Project, which is a group of people in
4 the Jackson County area who are interested in getting the
5 word out about the impacts of this project. An EIS is
6 required -- among the many elements of an EIS is a
7 requirement to address the need. Several speakers ahead of
8 me have talked about that. I want to address that a little
9 bit.

10 The theory underlying this project is that we're
11 running out of natural gas in North America and that we can
12 get natural gas derived from LNG at a reasonable price from
13 foreign countries. That theory is barely backed up at all
14 in the DEIS. It should be thoroughly analyzed. Both sides
15 should be thoroughly -- both pro and con on that theory
16 ought to be analyzed in the DEIS. It is not. There is a
17 conclusion stated that we're running out of gas. That
18 conclusion is based on studies that are between two and four
19 years old and are now quite out-of-date. I have two pages
20 here of recent news articles. Let me just mention a couple
21 of them.

22 This is New York Times, August 25, 2008,
23 "American natural gas production is rising at a clip not
24 seen in half a century, pushing down prices of the fuel and
25 reversing the conventional wisdom that domestic gas fuels

1 were in irreversible decline." Wall Street Journal, August
2 11, 2008, "U.S. natural gas producing is soaring thanks to
3 high energy prices and new technologies that have unlocked
4 reserves considered too difficult or expensive to tap in
5 earlier eras. As some analysts have begun to toss around
6 terms like "gas glut" natural gas futures have tumbled 92
7 percent in the past two weeks."

8 This is from July 30, 2008, a press release from
9 American Clean Skies Foundation, which is a natural gas
10 industry group, "Latest research shows a rapidly increasing
11 supply of natural gas contradicting notions that the U.S. is
12 running out. A comprehensive study released today by the
13 American Clean Skies Foundation and Navagant (phonetic)
14 Consulting, Inc. indicates that the U.S. has natural gas
15 reserves enough to last more than a hundred years."

16 But it's not just that the need isn't there.
17 There's a problem that this represents a detriment, tying
18 ourselves to LNG is a mistake. Let me read from a couple of
19 recent articles. This is The Economic Times dated October
20 27, 2008, "Russia, Iran and Katar, the three nations
21 accounting for over 60 percent of global natural gas
22 reserves have agreed to set up a gas cartel on the line of
23 OPEQ." "Iran, it says, "wants the gas cartel to be modeled
24 after the original OPEQ, setting quotas for gas production,
25 thus, pushing prices up while further damaging the U.S.

1 economy."

2 This is from the Long Beach, California Press
3 Telegram dated October 27, 2008. It says -- this is
4 referring to the Coasta Azul Plant that was built in
5 northern Mexico to serve California. It says, "Even before
6 Coasta Azul could begin pumping gas into any part of
7 California, the gas that was earmarked for SEMPRA's facility
8 at Coasta Azul for the years 2010 to 2012 was redirected to
9 South Korea, which will pay \$4 per million BTU, British
10 Thermal Units, more than it could get for the gas in the
11 U.S." So that gas that was to go to California will now be
12 diverted to South Korea instead. And the article concludes,
13 "If California really needed this gas it would simply not be
14 there."

15 This is from an August -- excuse me, an April
16 2008 white paper put out by the U.S. Department of Energy's
17 National Energy Technology Lab. Two of the points in here
18 are "As prices are pushed higher the need for more LNG will
19 create closer links to the world oil price, thus, allowing
20 the marginal price of U.S. electricity to be set by the
21 whims of foreign oil LNG suppliers for the first time in
22 U.S. history." It goes on to say, "In order to attract
23 foreign LNG away from competitors in Asia and Europe, the
24 U.S. price of natural gas must rise substantially."

25 Part of the problem as this DEIS looks at

1 alternatives one of the arguments they have made is some of
2 the other alternatives, particularly, the pipelines that are
3 proposed to come from the Rockies are not going to serve
4 southern Oregon, but there's no discussion in this DEIS
5 about the need for gas in southern Oregon. Now, a couple of
6 previous speakers have referred to that, but there is not
7 analysis in this DEIS, and it's defective, to the extent
8 it's saying we need this alternative as opposed to other
9 alternatives because the need is here in southern Oregon and
10 there's no analysis of that whatsoever in this DEIS.

11 I'm going to move on to discuss the airport.
12 Dean Byers mentioned that briefly. I've got a couple of
13 different points to make. The airport discussion is in
14 Section 4.9 of the DEIS.

15 MR. SCOTT: You've gone over your five minutes.

16 MR. LOHMAN: I appreciate that. I'll be very
17 brief and I won't talk about all the airport issues, but I
18 do want to note that 49 C.F.R. 193.2155(B) says, "An LNG
19 storage tank must not be located within a horizontal distance
20 of one mile from the ends of the nearest point of a runway."
21 The DEIS at page 4.9-7 says the airport is less than a mile
22 from the LNG terminal site, figure 4.7-5 in the DEIS clearly
23 shows a one-mile radius from the Jordan Cove site includes
24 that east/west runway at the North Bend airport.

25 On the emergency response plan, it's

1 understandable that the emergency response plan can't be
2 covered in detail, but it at least ought to be discussed in
3 the DEIS in terms of what's in the public domain. In the
4 public domain are a number of comments that I will refer to
5 in my written comments about the Coast Guard, the lack of
6 capacity to provide safe passage of ships. That comes from
7 the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Coast Guard and
8 Maritime Transportation in the U.S. House of
9 Representatives.

10 If I may, I just want to mention the issue of
11 turning basin. At one point an early version of the
12 terminal provided for a turning basin. That was dropped,
13 but the DEIS in four different places talks about a turning
14 basin -- at pages 4.3-3 and 4.12-34. Actually, I think a
15 turning basin would be -- so there's some lack of clarity
16 here. The project proponents say there's no turning basin.
17 The DEIS talks as if there is. Actually, it would be a good
18 idea of there was. It would be much safer. The Society of
19 International Gas Tankers and Terminal Operators, Ltd.,
20 which is a gas group, international gas group talks about
21 the need of a turning basin of certain dimensions
22 essentially twice the radius -- twice the length of an LNG
23 terminal and there's no turning basin being provided by the
24 project proponents in this case. With that, I'll submit
25 further comments in the record. I appreciate your

1 attention.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Clarence Adams and next
4 up Sandy Lyon.

5 MR. ADAMS: Good evening. My name is Clarence
6 Adams affected landowner. Forgive me, I won't be quite as
7 eloquent as some of the other speakers, but I would like to
8 point out some of the problems in the DEIS by reading back
9 from the language in it. First of all, I'm of the opinion
10 that the DEIS is flawed at best and at worst it's a travesty
11 of environmental justice.

12 NEPA requires alternatives of which there are
13 none. So basically, FERC is rubber-stamping what Williams
14 Pipeline and Jordan Cove wants. Everybody complains about
15 big oil, but I maintain that we need to worry about big gas.
16 How can we trust this company to produce all the mitigation
17 measures with no real oversight? It's just not going to
18 happen. As I stated before, there is no real purpose and
19 need in this document. And in the body of the document
20 itself, on 4.765 it says -- it's discussing LLR travel or
21 travel through LLR on federal ground. And it says, "To make
22 sure the pipeline has public need and provided significant
23 public benefit the specific connector must apply for and
24 receive a certificate of public convenience and necessary
25 from FERC." I don't see anything in here like that.

1 Also, I really spent about four hours just
2 glancing through certain sections and I found these. I'm
3 sure there's more of them. The language is not real clear
4 in a lot of the places. On page 4.2-3 they're talking about
5 storage yards and in particular, the Klamath Falls storage
6 yard and it says, "Klamath and Camas Valley and basins MLRA,
7 which generally are well drained, but they may be poorly
8 drained or very poorly drained in the basins." That's
9 clear. "They're generally loamey and clayey, or sandy and
10 they're shallow or very deep." I'm sorry. That's not
11 cutting it.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. ADAMS: There are other examples of -- well,
14 I'm sure there are other ones. Also, as mentioned before,
15 there area requirements from FERC before the end of the
16 comment period is done that I seriously doubt all of us will
17 have a chance to see. One of them deals with -- let's see.
18 It says, "The Pacific Connector shall continue to consult
19 with the Forest Service and BLM regarding whether additional
20 acreage should be restored to offset the topsoil
21 segregation on USFS and BLM land. The Pacific Connector
22 should file the results on this consultation, including any
23 resulting restoration plans with the secretary before the
24 end of the comment period." Are we going to see that? With
25 their track records as it went before, somehow I doubt it's

1 going to be easy.

2 There's also a requirement the Pacific Connector
3 should conduct supplemental site hazard analysis, again,
4 before the end of the draft environmental period. So they
5 haven't analyzed all the areas they need to. And then
6 there's the few that are required prior to the construction
7 of the pipeline, which I love. This is good. "We
8 recommend," FERC, "Pacific Connector should submit its draft
9 transportation plan for non-federal lands," ours, "to the
10 DOT and appropriate county agencies for review before the
11 end of the comment period draft EIS. Pacific Connector
12 should file comments on this plan, revise the plan necessary
13 based on input from state and local official and file their
14 revised plan for review and approval of the director, OEP,
15 prior to starting construction." We won't have any comments
16 on this at all. This is out of our hands and this is
17 talking about our own county roads.

18 And again, in the document it says, "Pacific
19 Connector plan and address unanticipated discovery of
20 contaminated soil or underground water during construction,"
21 again, prior to construction of the pipeline. It doesn't
22 even mention in the draft EIS it has to be done. And last
23 and by no means least, "The Pacific Connector should
24 characterize potential landslide hazards through other means
25 in areas where LiDar and aerial photography coverage is not

1 available. This information should be filed with the
2 Secretary prior to construction." Unacceptable. Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Sandy Lyon and Dana Gaab.

5 MS. LYON: My name is Sandra Lyon, L-Y-O-N. My
6 family and I are landowners in the Days Creek area. We live
7 on a ranch, make part of our living off that ranch and have
8 a love for our natural resources. Our family has worked
9 since 1994 in restoring a creek that runs through our
10 property called Faith Creek. Excuse me if my voice quivers.
11 I'm not a speaker. I'm one of those small landowners that
12 this is referred to. We worked with local agencies to
13 restore salmon to Faith Creek where it had not been since
14 the covert on Days Creek Road had stopped salmon passage.
15 Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been placed in the
16 restoring of Faith Creek, in fencing on our property, on
17 off-channel stock water, two coverts have been replaces. We
18 have done riparian restoration with planting to produce
19 shade over the creek. The pipeline will go straight through
20 Faith Creek and my comment to you is we stated this to FERC
21 in a letter and in the environmental impact report statement
22 I see no comment on our comments and I'm concerned how many
23 other creeks are having this disregard for a great deal of
24 work. We have salmon spawning again in Faith Creek,
25 increasing our salmon, which has a commercial impact on

1 fishermen -- commercial fisherman, private fisherman, sports
2 fisherman. And I would ask you to please consider our
3 comments. And when we address these to the planner they
4 said they didn't hear us. They would not consider another
5 route. It goes straight through Faith Creek and I do not
6 see in the report enough comment on mitigation and no
7 mitigation is guarantee on our property. They may mitigate
8 somewhere else, but the work gone into little Faith Creek is
9 being ignored. Those salmon are being ignored. Those
10 fishermen are being ignored and our family is being ignored.
11 Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Next up Robert Oeleis.

14 MR. GAAB: Dana Gaab, D-A-N-A, G-A-A-B. My home
15 is the bay area, Coos Bay. I was at a meeting last night in
16 a big hall with about 250, 300 other people. A good
17 majority of them are members of Citizens Against LNG. I
18 want to state for myself and a majority of people that were
19 in that room that we were extremely displeased that there
20 were no representatives of FERC there. There were -- John
21 was there. Ronnie wasn't there. There were a few other
22 empty chairs there. I don't know who was supposed to sit in
23 them, but I believe that the community was really disserved
24 by your not being there.

25 I'm not going to get into repeating any comments

1 that I made last night. Suffice to say, though, that this
2 document is jammed full of would's, could's, should's. Look
3 through this thing. They're easy to see because they're all
4 the way through it. There's virtually no "will's." There
5 are, though, a number of "shall's." Unfortunately, for the
6 people that are impacted by this project the "shall's" are
7 all contained at the very end of this and it also says that
8 "shall do this," "shall do that" before the end of the
9 comment period. So how, in fact, would anyone that's
10 affected by this be able to respond to any of these
11 "shall's?"

12 Any realtors in the room? I'd like to say that
13 this document in realtors terms is a POS, Piece of Shit.
14 It's so full of holes that there is no way that this boat is
15 going to float. FERC needs to do their homework. FERC
16 needs to make the contractors do the homework because the
17 people of southwestern Oregon are not going to allow this to
18 happen.

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. LISTER: I'd just like to respond to the
21 comment about me not being at the meeting last night. I was
22 trying to get there. Some of you I'm sure have experienced
23 problems with airports. That's what happened to me
24 yesterday. I arrived in Coos Bay after leaving my house on
25 the East Coast at 5:30 in the morning. It was a very long

1 day, but I drove for two hours down to Coos Bay last night.
2 I attempted to be there, but due to the circumstances -- it
3 was not deliberate at all.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Leave a day earlier.

5 MR. GAAB: Should've, would've, could've.

6 MR. LISTER: Let me respond to that also because
7 that's a stylist issue with respect to how all of our impact
8 statements and environmental documents are written. When we
9 analyze a project it is a proposed project and the words
10 "would or should" and so forth are deliberate terms that
11 pertain to future projects. It is not approved yet. But
12 where you see the word "shall" the "shall" is in the
13 recommended conditions that the staff is suggesting that we
14 wish to impose on this project. So that's my answer to
15 that.

16 MR. GAAB: Are you going back to Coos Bay and
17 give them a another meeting?

18 MR. LISTER: Sir, you know, there is really no
19 need for another meeting because the transcript has been
20 taken. I and the rest of my staff will read the transcript
21 and it's really not that significant that I be sitting here
22 when you give your comments. We hear your comments and we
23 get those in the record and we address those comments. So
24 unfortunately, circumstances as they were, were as they were
25 and I did not leave my home to travel on Sunday because I'm

1 sure many of you would not, you know, travel on Sunday as
2 well. But in hindsight now, it turns out I should have. So
3 that will be taken under consideration the next time.

4 MR. SCOTT: Robert Oeleis and then next up Louie
5 Dykstra.

6 MR. OELEIS: My name is Robert Oeleis,
7 O-E-L-E-I-S. Just call me Ollie. I live on Highway 45 and
8 the map here shows my property being between 50.2 and a mile
9 plus 52 on their map. And the way they have -- I've talked
10 to the contractors back there and it will impact my property
11 in a major -- what I would consider major, but you know, I
12 appreciate you gentlemen being here honestly. I mean I'm
13 new at this. I've never been to this type of a meeting or
14 anything and so I'm not one of your normal type folk. But I
15 care about my surroundings. I care about neighbors and my
16 property.

17 And one thing I was talking about them about is
18 how they had to move this to this southern route because of
19 the Marble Morlet, which is right along side of me and
20 there's Old Road Timber where they're going through BLM is
21 the Marble Morlet and the King Cave Lupin (phonetic), which
22 are both kind of protected species, I believe. I'm not
23 positive, but -- and they're kind of rare. But what about
24 the people. I mean we can move all over the map here in
25 Oregon and still find rare species of plants and animals,

1 forna and flora that we're never going to get around, but
2 what about the people that you impact along the way? You
3 know, I mean myself it's a major impact on my property as to
4 my use, my livelihood on it, how I even look at my own piece
5 of property because it's going to have a pipeline right
6 through the middle of it and they're going to take out my
7 well or try to scoot around that maybe or take out my barn
8 and try to scoot around that. But they're taking out a
9 major portion of my land that makes it devalued and I
10 realize you guys set up elsewhere and you don't live in the
11 communities that we live in. I'm person that I care about
12 my neighbor down the way and it's because of my neighbor
13 down the way that I'm even here tonight because she called
14 me up and says, hey, did you know we're having a meeting. I
15 didn't know. I thought I was in this boat all by myself.

16 But you guys are there to represent I don't whom.
17 I don't know exactly what FERC is, but I think it's to help
18 the people and do we actually need this pipeline in Oregon?
19 Is this pipeline going to -- is the good going to outweigh
20 the bad? That's my question. And because it's going to
21 impact a lot of people as you're seeing. With all these
22 people in the room, you know it's impacting something some
23 place. Some people have different agendas. Mine is -- my
24 neighbor's and myself -- and my neighbor up the line some
25 place there. But also our environment, our whole Oregon is

1 different than California. I spoke with a gentleman down in
2 the bay area some place and they ousted out of California
3 the same pipeline adventure. How come they can oust it and
4 we have to put up with it in a more pristine country than
5 California, believe me?

6 But where do you live, if I may ask? If this
7 pipeline was coming through your home would you be for it or
8 against it? Would you be for it or against it? If it was
9 coming --

10 MR. LISTER: I'm not going to get into a debate
11 over --

12 MR. OELEIS: No, I'm just asking a friendly
13 question. I mean I'll tell you my personal opinion. I
14 don't want it in my front yard. That's where it's going and
15 would you not feel the same way if it was coming up your --
16 carving up your land? I mean and look I'm not a rare
17 species, but where they're going with the pipeline in the
18 BLM with Old Grove Timber sitting right there on my border
19 and I can walk out in there, and it's a beautiful forest,
20 believe me, and I like having that next door to me. I don't
21 disturb anything. It comes over and lives off of my land.
22 That I will accept, but where people are making money who's
23 going to get this money? Are we? Huh-uh. And I don't need
24 no money. If I thought this was helping other people, I
25 would let them have it for free.

1 I'm a volunteer first responder certified. I'm
2 also a volunteer fireman in the valley. I help people
3 because that's what I'm about. I don't need to be paid to
4 come to your aid and this is -- and if it was good for
5 Oregon I'd say, yeah, go for it. But from what I'm seeing
6 it's not good for all these people. It's not good for you.
7 I thank you for your time.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. SCOTT: Louie Dykstra and then Rick Goche.

10 MR. DYKSTRA: My name is Louie Dykstra and I
11 didn't bring any notes with me tonight. And if I might
12 sound mad it is because I am mad. I've been in the
13 construction industry for 46 years, worked on pipelines,
14 nuclear power plants, coal-fired power plants, gas-generated
15 power plants, cogens (phonetic), refineries, and I've worked
16 for all these big major companies and for the past two years
17 I've been listening to salesmanship saying what a good thing
18 LNG is.

19 So I've studied the pipeline systems that are
20 planned for this country. And I looked around and I
21 watched them and seen all these LNG plants that they've
22 built and they don't get LNG for them, so I'm trying to
23 think of what the advantage, why would I go out and build an
24 LNG plant if I had the money to do it and tell all these
25 people how great it would be if I can't get the LNG to serve

1 it? So then I'm thinking. And then I look at British
2 Petroleum. They cancelled their plant because out on the
3 East Coast they're not going to be able to get natural gas
4 to liquefy and ship out.

5 Then I read a little story about Canada. They
6 had an LNG plant to receive it too. What do they do?
7 They're switching theirs over and they're going to liquefy
8 it and send it out? I have to look over in Wyoming.
9 They're building all these pipelines out of Wyoming, but
10 what really surprises me is there's one going north into
11 Canada. Why is this, because Canada is going to sell LNG.
12 Well, they can get big bucks by sending it to Canada and
13 LNG. And I say this is wrong. We get 75, 80 percent of our
14 gas from Canada right now. I say let's take that pipeline
15 that they're going to put into Canada let's bring it to
16 Oregon if we need it so bad.

17 How about the Ruby Pipeline? Let's bring that to
18 Oregon. How about the Bronco Pipeline? Let's bring that to
19 Oregon. They plan on it. So I checked. All this gas can't
20 go to California. Oregon can't use it all. Washington
21 can't use it all. So what are we going to do? We're going
22 to go in the backdoor, build an LNG plant that's supposed to
23 bring it to us, but now we already have the plant. We don't
24 have to go through FERC for permits to make this thing, turn
25 it around and send it the other direction because it's

1 already sited.

2 I worked on an LNG plant in 1969. The guy told
3 me -- it was the head of the job. I asked him. I says can
4 you liquefy LNG and he says no we can only store it. We're
5 using it in peak periods. We will put it into the line.
6 And I said, well, what would it take to make this plant so
7 you can liquefy it. And he says, well, down the line we
8 have a plan on bringing a pipeline in. We'll put in the
9 compressors, the exchangers and whatever and we can liquefy
10 it and then we won't have to depend on the barges to bring
11 it up the Mississippi River.

12 If you want to check me out, LaCrosse, Wisconsin,
13 French Island, 1969, LNG plant. But what I'm saying is I
14 believe this is a backdoor plan of the gas companies to
15 build these LNG plants and then ship our LNG out. Now,
16 they're saying LNG right now can save us money and they
17 probably would take a beating on it for a year or two and
18 then wouldn't be able to get it and say, hey, you know, we
19 built these plants. We want the permits. We'll put some
20 more people to work. And oh man, for a job some people will
21 sell their souls -- not their soul, but every gas-burning
22 person in this country to raise their bill because why would
23 a gas company because they're good neighbors sell it at a
24 much lower price to an American citizen? It's not going to
25 happen. They'd rather sell it to China for four times as

1 much.

2 There is a thing that they say. If we take gas
3 out of Wyoming, we will be competing against the East Coast
4 where 75 percent of our population lives. Now, if they
5 compete and want the gas they say, well, we couldn't get it
6 so that's why we want the LNG. But I'm saying I want to
7 compete with the East Coast. West Coast to East Coast and
8 let's keep our money in this country, not Indonesia, not
9 China, not Japan, no place else but this country.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. DYKSTRA: Thank you. I think I burned up my
12 five minutes. Seriously, I need about five days, but I
13 could go over a lot more. Thank you very much.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Next up Magaret Vilas.

16 MR. GOCHE: Good evening. My name is Rick Goche.
17 I'm a commercial fisherman and --

18 COURT REPORTER: Spell your last name, please.

19 MR. GOCHE: G-O-C-H-E. And I'm a candidate for
20 House District 1 here in southern Oregon. I appreciate this
21 opportunity to weigh in on this extremely important issue.
22 I understand it really doesn't matter what any of us who are
23 either for or against this project say. The process is such
24 that we have little or no influence on whether or how it
25 proceeds, even so, as a member of this community I cannot in

1 good conscious remain mute.

2 There are so many questions yet to be answered
3 for or against it that I honestly don't know if an LNG
4 regasification terminal is a good idea or not. However,
5 tonight I've heard extremely compelling evidence that this
6 is a classic bait and switch that is going to end -- the end
7 result is going to be exporting our gas from the U.S. The
8 promise of jobs, energy, and guaranteed dredging is
9 attractive. What I'm know is I'm absolutely against the
10 heavy-handed manner in which the proposed pipeline is being
11 thrust upon landowners. I'm against the use of eminent
12 domain to benefit a foreign corporation and I am for the
13 protection of personal property rights. This pipeline is
14 offensive in the extreme on both points. The offer to pay
15 landowners fair market value for timber and land loses its
16 allure when both are at the bottom of the market.

17 As a commercial salmon fisherman, I have grave
18 concerns regarding the potential for habitat disasters and
19 destruction where the proposed pipeline crosses five major
20 salmon-bearing rivers and hundreds of smaller streams, most
21 of which are critical salmon habitat. I also understand the
22 entire length of the pipeline easement will be sprayed with
23 herbicides. Herbicides have recently been recognized as
24 damaging a salmon's ability to locate their stream of
25 origin, feed or mate and blunts their ability to sense

1 predators. Considering that coastal coho salmon are ESA
2 listed as threatened, I honestly do not understand how the
3 proposed pipeline is even under consideration.

4 Oregon's commercial and recreational salmon
5 fisheries are reeling from disaster after disaster caused by
6 haphazard management practices and fresh-water habitat.
7 This pipeline project promises to do damage that we and
8 salmon cannot tolerate and may not survive. FERC's refusal
9 to extend the comment period deadline shows total disregard
10 for the seasonal realities of harvest and winter preparation
11 of our rural communities. Were the deadline further it
12 would allow us to get through our busiest time of the year,
13 not to speak of an election many of us are involved in.
14 Then we'd be able to tackle the daunting task we common
15 citizens face in reviewing and commenting on a project that
16 will have immense, irreversible, and potentially negative
17 impact for generations to come. Thanks for your time.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. SCOTT: Margaret Vilas and then Bruce Gordon.

20 MS. VILAS: My name is Margaret Vilas and --

21 COURT REPORTER: Spell your last name, please.

22 MS. VILAS: Vilas, V-I-L-A-S. The need of this
23 gas line going through our area is negligible to us.
24 California kicked the gas line out of there because they
25 didn't want it along their beaches. We don't want it here

1 along our beaches. The gas eventually will be going into
2 California and Nevada on the eastern part of Oregon. The
3 benefit to us would be none and this idea of it being
4 reshipped to foreign countries is unimaginable. We need to
5 keep our economic growth here in this United States.

6 It also crosses the Coquille River. The Coquille
7 River runs through my property. It would degrade not only
8 the key habitats, the threatened cut-throat trout, the
9 threatened salmon species, would disseminate the flow of the
10 river and would also degrade the Indian artifacts, which are
11 on my property. The damages to farms and forestlands would
12 be immense as well as to wells and springs and other water
13 supplies. It prohibits planting over the pipeline a hundred
14 feet each side. The use of the area over the pipeline for
15 the forestry people -- we've got a shortage of jobs in
16 forestry and that will impact them big time. They won't be
17 able to replant trees over there. That means more loss of
18 jobs. That means more loss of people driving chip trucks.
19 That means more loss of having lumber to build homes. It
20 will also decrease forest operations and property values.
21 There would be no long-term management for problems such as
22 weeds and erosion and other impacts.

23 Spraying herbicidal sprays over the area of the
24 pipeline -- spray drifts. I raise organic lambs. It would
25 affect me. It would not only affect them, but it would

1 affect my horses. And when it comes to my animals, I'm a
2 fighter. And not only a fighter for my animals, I'm a
3 fighter for everyone in this room, which is going to be
4 impacted by this pipeline.

5 (Appause.)

6 MS. VILAS: The red-tailed hawks go along my
7 river. You start spraying it'll kill them. The merlet, as
8 the previous gentleman spoke, it would kill them. It would
9 kill other foliage. The safety hazards would be immense.
10 We have Highway 42 going from the middle of Roseburg to the
11 coast. That's our only way out. If you put a pipeline 3-
12 foot underground and don't weld that thing properly and get
13 a minuet leak, which I understand will not have any odor in
14 it to detect a leak, it would blow a hole right through
15 Highway 42, which is a major intersection for all the truck
16 traffic and people traffic.

17 It would also be a danger to all the property
18 owners along that -- anyone traveling over 42. Alaska last
19 week had a pipeline blow. It blew pipe 500 feet away.
20 Unknown how many people were hurt. I guess the people that
21 try and put this on don't care. They flat don't care about
22 our community, about the beauty of Camas Valley and the
23 dessigration of Wildcat Creek, Coquille River, which is the
24 main head tributaries of the Coquille, which runs to the
25 oceans and the highways that we have to live by.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Bruce Gordon and then M.A. Hanson.

3 MR. GORDON: My name is Bruce Gordon. I'm a
4 concerned citizen living within a half mile of the proposed
5 pipeline and I'm going to assume that the gas is going to go
6 out. I'm not going to take Louie's assumption because it
7 becomes a security thing. Right now, we're in the middle of
8 a presidential election and the two major candidates don't
9 agree on much, but what they do agree on is that we need to
10 get away from foreign energy.

11 One of them talks about foreign energy that goes
12 and supports terrorist, but now we're talking about
13 importing more energy from foreign nations, a direction that
14 the country does not want to go in. But yet, here we are
15 discussing this thing of importing this energy where we
16 shouldn't even be discussing it. We know this not the
17 direction the United States needs to go in. So that is one
18 of the things I'd like to talk about.

19 The other one is I live in Milo and the pipeline
20 is to cross the South Umpqua River approximately a mile from
21 my house. I don't see anything in the draft EIS talking
22 about crossing the South Umpqua River, nor do I see it
23 talking about the St. John's Creek that is adjacent to my
24 property. These things need to be addressed. It's an
25 important tributary, an important river that's actually the

1 lifeblood of our community. I do not want to see this thing
2 happen and really would wish this draft EIS was a lot more
3 inclusive. Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. SCOTT: M.A. Hanson and then Wendy Wong
6 Haigh.

7 MS. HANSON: M period, H period, H-A-N-S-O-N.
8 Hello. I have a degree in planning and I am thoroughly
9 trained in writing EIS's. I find this DEIS inadequate to
10 say the least. I'm not going to mention or repeat the many
11 requests that I made last night in Coos Bay about the
12 terminal. Tonight I'm talking about the pipeline. I would
13 like to request that the EIS -- I'm talking EIS now because
14 now it's going to be an EIS -- includes the many impacts
15 that this pipeline would have on the people and this
16 pipeline and the 100-foot easement that would accompany it.
17 Also, the impacts of the equipment and staging spaces that
18 may take up a considerable piece of land.

19 I would like the EIS to mention the fact that the
20 owners, potential owners and adjacent landowners of the
21 proposed condemned lands for the pipeline and the easements
22 that have already spent no less than two years studying and
23 attending meetings and worrying about the effects and
24 impacts that this is going to have on their land. I want
25 that impact mentioned in the EIS. This is valuable time

1 that these people have spent and worries that they have had.
2 I would like it to mention that they worry about the
3 probable property value reduction, the inability to market
4 and sell their property if they don't want to live on
5 property with a pipeline and its easement.

6 I would like it to mention that many of these
7 people have stopped investing to improve their properties
8 because they don't know what's going to happen. I would
9 like it to mention that they worry about their livelihood.
10 If, for example, they are organic food growers, and we have
11 many organic food growers in this area, that because of the
12 probability of herbicide and pesticide sprayed on the 100-
13 foot swatch that needs to be kept clear of plant overgrowth
14 this could ruin their organic food licensing. This is
15 talking their livelihood.

16 I would like it to mention that they worry about
17 the disruption of their live during the construction period.
18 I would like it to mention that they worry that the
19 alternative to having their land taken, eminent domain would
20 be 25 percent to 75 percent of their current market value.
21 Not many people are interested in selling their land right
22 now, but they face eminent domain and that is what they are
23 told they're going to get, 25 to 75 percent of the current
24 market value.

25 I would like to request that others here that

1 have already spent any time addressing their concerns about
2 the impacts of this LNG project please come up here and
3 mention them tonight. Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. SCOTT: Wendy Wong Haigh and then Diane
6 Phillips.

7 MS. HAIGH: Hi, my name is Wendy Wong Haigh
8 spelled -- okay. I'm so glad to see an actual FERC official
9 here. Thank you for coming. Yes, we have been very
10 emotional and I'm glad I got my emotions out yesterday so I
11 don't have to be so emotional tonight. I'm much more
12 contained.

13 I actually have a set of regulations called the
14 NEPA regulations that are based on the Council of
15 Environmental Quality, I believe is who put out these
16 regulations. And so I'll just read off the number of
17 regulations that have been violated by FERC in this DEIS.
18 The first violation is Regulation 1500.1(b) and it states,
19 "NEPA procedures must ensure that environmental information
20 is available to public officials and citizens before
21 decisions are made and before actions are taken. The
22 information must be of high quality."

23 Again, a number of us have actually read the
24 document and it very poor quality, so that's the first one
25 that's been violated. The second one that I will mention is

1 1500.2(b) where it states, "Environmental Impact Statements
2 shall be concise, clear and to the point and shall be
3 supported by evidence that agencies have made the necessary
4 environmental analyses." Again, there's practically no
5 analyses in there. There is a lot of "should's," "would's,"
6 and "could's." There are not any environmental analyses.

7 The next one is C of the same regulation, "FERC
8 must integrate the requirements of NEPA with other planning
9 and environmental review procedures required by law or by
10 agency practice so that all such procedures run concurrently
11 rather than consecutively." That means all of these things
12 that we should be reading -- all of the reports should all
13 be at once instead of, oh, how you have to wait for another
14 report. So a number of the reports that we're supposed to
15 have we're not even able to analyze yet. So they're in
16 violation of that one.

17 1501.2(b), "Identify environmental effects and
18 values in adequate detail so they can be compared to
19 economic and technical analyses, environmental documents and
20 appropriate analyses shall be circulated and are viewed at
21 the same time." That's almost like the other one -- "at the
22 same time as other planning documents." 1502.1, which
23 states, "It shall provide full and fair discussion of
24 significant environmental impacts and shall inform
25 decision-makers and the public of the reasonable

1 alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts
2 on enhance the quality of the human environment. That was
3 not done in the DEIS. Basically, everything is promoting
4 the Jordan Cove Project. We don't have any analyses of any
5 alternatives, except for alternative routes of the Jordan
6 Cove route and Pacific Connector Pipeline. That's the only
7 alternatives we are given. Plus, on the same Section 1502.1
8 it also says -- it's basically the same as the other one.

9 Okay. 1502.2, "Environmental Impact Statement
10 shall be analytic rather than encyclopedic." And also (G)
11 of that same 1502.2 says, "Environmental Impact Statements
12 shall serve as the means of accessing the environmental
13 impact of proposed agency actions rather than justifying
14 decisions already made." Again, it seems as if somebody's
15 already made up their minds and this is a justification for
16 something rather than -- it's supposed to be an objective
17 analysis to what we could or could not do. That has been
18 violated once again there.

19 (Applause.)

20 MS. HAIGH: 1502.5 - Timing, "The statement shall
21 be prepared early enough so that it can serve practically as
22 an important contribution to the decision-making process and
23 shall not be used," again, "to rationalize or justify
24 decisions already made." 1502.10 - Recommended format,
25 "Agencies shall use a format for environmental impact

1 statements will encourage good analysis and clear
2 presentation of the alternatives, including the proposed
3 action." Again, that was not included in the DEIS.
4 1502.14, Alternatives Including the Proposed Action, "States
5 rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable
6 alternatives and for alternatives which were eliminated from
7 detailed study briefly discuss the reasons for their having
8 been eliminated." Most of the time when they said that it
9 just said, well, it's just because we don't need that and
10 there isn't any good reason for eliminating whatever they --
11 when I write the letter to you, I will have every single
12 example in the book detailed out for you. I'm not going to
13 -- it would take a long time if I did it for everybody here.

14 B of that same 1502.14 states, "Devote
15 substantial treatment to each alternative considered in
16 detail, including the proposed action so that reviewers may
17 evaluate their comparative merits." We didn't get to do
18 that, did we? We only heard one idea. "Include reasonable
19 -- this is C of the same section, "Include reasonable
20 alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead
21 agency." So we haven't even heard about the alternatives
22 like solar and wind with any analysis whatsoever. "Include
23 the alternative of no action." That wasn't included in the
24 DEIS at all. What happens if we just wait and see really
25 what this LNG market is about? That would be the most

1 prudent thing to do is to just wait and not act at all, but
2 that's not even discussed in the DEIS. Again, that was
3 violated in the DEIS. So that is against NEPA law. 1502.14
4 Section E says, "Identify the agencies preferred alternative
5 or alternatives if one or more exists and identify such
6 alternatives in the final statement unless another law
7 prohibits."

8 Again, the way you identify the -- well, you
9 identify preferred identified routes of the same project
10 instead of any alternatives since you didn't compare it to
11 anything. Okay, 1502.16(A) --

12 MR. SCOTT: (Off mike.)

13 MS. HAIGH: Oh.

14 (Discussion off mike.)

15 MS. HAIGH: It's almost over.

16 (Discussion off mike.)

17 MS. HAIGH: Well, we just want to find out what
18 we have violated here, and these are very important
19 violations because this is what NEPA was created for. It
20 was created so that industry would balance environmental
21 issues with money-making basically, and this has been
22 ignored and this is why NEPA was -- actually, it was passed
23 by Richard Nixon in 1970, I believe. So we're actually
24 violating something that is already in the federal law
25 books. That's why these are so important. This is Section

1 1502.16(a), "The EIS shall include discussions of direct
2 effects and their significance." And there's also indirect
3 effects and their significance. Again, everything is just
4 pro Jordan Cove. C says, "Possible conflicts between the
5 proposed action and the objectives of federal, regional,
6 state and local land use plans, policies, and controls for
7 the area concerned, the environmental effects of
8 alternatives," again, that's not included, "energy
9 requirements and conservation potential of various
10 alternatives and mitigation measures."

11 They talked about the mitigation measures of
12 Jordan Cove's ideas, but they didn't talk about, again, the
13 various alternatives; again, natural or depletable resource
14 requirements and conservation potential of various
15 alternatives and mitigation measures. And the last -- no,
16 there's one more after this one. "Urban quality, historic
17 and cultural resources and the design of the built
18 environment, including the reuse and conservation potential
19 of various alternatives and mitigation measures." And
20 again, no action would be a conservation issue and that has
21 not been addressed.

22 1502.23 is about cost benefit analysis. It says,
23 "If a cost benefit analysis relevant to the choice among
24 environmentally different alternatives is being considered
25 for the proposed action it shall be incorporated by

1 reference or appended to the statement as an aid in
2 evaluating the environmental consequences." Again, that was
3 not done. So I think that's a lot to say to you all, but
4 I'm just letting you know how many violations have already
5 happened. And I really appreciate Susan Morgan's faith in
6 FERC, but I just want to remind you that FERC also was
7 involved with the Enron scandal.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. HAIGH: Also Williams Pipeline who is one of
10 the partners was also involved in a number of FERC what they
11 call "Fat Boy Practices," which is the practice involving
12 falsely reporting how much electricity would be needed in
13 the future. So what is the difference between that and LGN
14 or any kind of energy market? It says that made it appear
15 that power shortages loomed in the horizon to justify
16 charging California whatever Enron saw fit and manipulating
17 California's energy market. And I say what is the
18 difference between what they did back then and what they are
19 doing now? I would want you to consider that. Thank you
20 very much.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. SCOTT: Diane Phillips and then Neal Hadley.

23 MS. PHILLIPS: Hello, my name is Diane Phillips
24 and I represent Oregon Citizens Against the Pipeline. I
25 think you already have my name from last night. I have been

1 very busy thanks to you folks and so I have not prepared
2 anything for tonight. I had yesterday and I won't repeat
3 that again.

4 I'm a volunteer. I'm full-time actually. I sort
5 of call myself a professional volunteer and one of my jobs
6 is I'm on the board of the Azalea Fire Department. I'm
7 their secretary/treasurer. We just happened to put an
8 addition on our building and they had a meeting tonight.
9 And because of this meeting tonight, I was not able to make
10 that and it was an extremely important meeting for us. So
11 I'd like the DEIS to show that as an economic loss to our
12 community in Azalea because I'm here tonight versus being
13 there and this process -- the other people it's taking up
14 their livelihood to be at these meetings and through this
15 process of proposing this.

16 The fact that the need issue is not being
17 considered totally and it's just letting the market decide
18 is unfairly taxing hundreds and thousands of people who are
19 putting their time and energy -- volunteer, paid, otherwise
20 -- into something that is just not necessary and I think
21 that's a completely wrong thing.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. PHILLIPS: I'd also like to say that I would
24 like to ask for an extension on this DEIS. Last night when
25 I was at the meeting Williams Pipeline who I see is in the

1 back here had maps of some of the new proposed routes and I
2 went and wrote down all the names on those properties on the
3 proposed routes and I know the ones in Camas Valley. I was
4 told by Marvin Smoot -- thanks Marvin -- that he had not
5 contacted them. So they had not been contacted at all up to
6 this point, if he was being honest with me, which sometimes
7 I wonder if he is. Anyway, so I went ahead and made some
8 contacts and got a hold of some friends that I know in the
9 area and they called those people and that is why they're
10 here tonight.

11 So I think this is another reason that the DEIS
12 comment period does need to be extended. The reason given
13 to Ron Widen in the letter from FERC was totally incorrect
14 that affected landowners have had plenty of time to look at
15 this and discuss the impacts.

16 In fact, those maps because they were made from a
17 company that was contracted by the company -- by Williams or
18 whoever had a special program, as I understand it. So those
19 maps are not available to the public at this time except for
20 at these meetings. So I know those people that are here
21 today are not able to see how this is affecting them until
22 they go over to those maps right now and look at them. So
23 that's the reason I'd like that.

24 I'd also like to talk about an issue called
25 hydrostatic testing and that's where water is put into the

1 pipe, as you know, to bring it up to pressure to make sure
2 that it has no leaks. The DEIS says -- anyways they propose
3 to take different amounts of water from various water bodies
4 and other areas that are listed in table E-3 in appendix E.
5 Well, unfortunately, I don't have that because all I have is
6 a written copy of the DEIS and the only way I have that is
7 because a friend of mine gave it to me. Oregon Citizens
8 Against the Pipeline is an intervener in this process and we
9 have yet to receive a copy of the DEIS. So I please request
10 that and this is another reason I'd like an extension
11 because I don't have that table.

12 But anyway, I'd like to quote from the DEIS. It
13 says, "The SUFS has also expressed concern that hydrostatic
14 testing were the source and discharged locations were in
15 different water basins would potentially transfer exotic
16 organisms between basins." And it goes on -- this is what I
17 was stating before "Pacific Connector would obtain its
18 hydrostatic test water from commercial or mutual sources or
19 surface water rights owners and come from lakes, impounds
20 and streams and has identified 81 potential discharge
21 locations for the test water."

22 It further goes on to say, if I can find it,
23 "Pacific Connector would attempt to discharge water in the
24 same USGS water basin as the source of water, but some
25 cross-basin transfer would occur because of the linear

1 nature of the pipeline. To minimize the potential for
2 cross-basin transfer of organism, but the intake and
3 discharge points will be screened. However, we believe that
4 additional planning and design considerations may be
5 possible to reduce cross-basin contamination." But they
6 haven't even filed for these or no one seems to know exactly
7 if they have permission that I'm aware of. I know someone
8 on the water basin is on the board and he hasn't heard
9 anything yet about requesting water. So I have some serious
10 concerns that all that information is really missing in this
11 DEIS and those permits have not been gained yet.

12 And I'm worried about the cross-water
13 contamination issue, across-basin issue, and I think that
14 needs to be much more in depth because there's a whole lot
15 of information there. Water is a real scarce resource for
16 us and I doubt we have a whole lot to spare and I think this
17 pipeline -- I don't know what the -- I think I read
18 somewhere a long time ago that it was like 8 million gallons
19 or something and you know, that's a huge amount of water.

20 I'd also like -- nowhere in the DEIS written copy
21 that I have could I find the number of private properties
22 that are affected and I would like that to be included, not
23 just the acres but the number of private properties
24 affected. I was told in a meeting it was like 380
25 something. I can't remember if it was 86 or 87, but we need

1 to know that because that goes to the economic impacts and
2 that's another issue which was not addressed in the Eco-
3 Northwest Study did not go into the impacts of people living
4 on the pipeline as mentioned before and so that needs to be
5 in there.

6 I feel that the DEIS did not cover global
7 warming, carbon impacts and I believe there is a -- I have
8 actually read studies and submitted comments that LNG
9 because of the distance it has to travel and all the energy
10 it takes to bring it from the source to where it's used that
11 this falls, you know, between coal and regular natural,
12 domestic natural gas. So there is a carbon impact there and
13 I think that needs to be addressed in the DEIS.

14 Lastly, one of the volunteer things I do is I'm
15 on the Native Plant Society and in Myrtle Creek, Oregon
16 there's a flower called Mariposa Lily or Cox's Mariposa Lily
17 who was founded by a guy that lives in Roseburg, Oregon and
18 it's only found in a narrow strip in Myrtle Creek on the
19 ridge there. It's called Calachortus Cicoxii and I've been
20 up there to look at that flower when it was in bloom and
21 here it says the proposed pipeline crosses that population
22 of Calachortus Cicoxii Mariposa Lily and the BLM ministered
23 land in the Roseburg district. The last observation of the
24 plant was in 1992, but that they go on. I know that the
25 Pacific Connector they've surveyed -- they've contracted

1 surveys for two years over there. The first one -- this is
2 in resource reports. They went in there in April and the
3 plants don't bloom until late June, so I don't know what
4 they saw when they were there. Also, this year I don't
5 believe they actually saw those plants either. They weren't
6 in there at the right time. So they bloom actually at the
7 very end or the last Mariposa Lily and they bloom late in
8 the season.

9 And in the DEIS it says the Pacific Connector
10 should develop a mitigation plan that would avoid or
11 minimize adverse impact on known locations of cocoxii
12 Mariposa Lily. The mitigation plan should address both
13 construction and operation before the end of the comment
14 period on the draft Environmental Impact Statement. And I
15 don't see how that's possible because they haven't looked at
16 those plants yet and they're not going to be abloom again
17 for quite a while.

18 I know plants are on both sides of the road.
19 I've heard in the resource reports I've read that there was
20 possibly -- they could dig them up and replant them
21 somewhere else and that just isn't proven. And on behalf of
22 the Native Plant Society, I would like to suggest to the
23 people proposing this project that they contact them and
24 they're a great resource for avoiding impacts to that plant,
25 finding the plant, documenting it and looking at alternative

1 ways to avoid that impact.

2 Lastly, Representative Morgan talked about the
3 need for gas in Oregon and Commission Wellenhoff is one of
4 the five commissioners that make decisions on these projects
5 with FERC and with the Bradwood Project he voted against it.
6 And in his letter that he sent and his reasons why he tells
7 us some facts and I'd like to quote some of those. He noted
8 in his statement that "From the studies submitted in
9 Bradwood that the Northwest estimated increase in gas demand
10 is .1 to .2 billion cubic feet per day. Now, keep in mind
11 that the Pacific Connector -- I mean Jordan Cove is
12 proposing to send out 1 billion cubic feet per day. So
13 that's a lot more gas than they need in both Washington and
14 Oregon.

15 MR. SCOTT: Ms. Phillips --

16 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.

17 MR. SCOTT: -- can you wrap it up?

18 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, I'll wrap it up. Even if the
19 potential declined -- and they're saying in there in some of
20 their studies, you know, they're proposing that there may be
21 decline in gas supply from Canada. So they say that even
22 with the -- he says with the potential decline in Canadian
23 imports of .25 billion cubic feet per day were assumed to
24 reduce supplies to the Pacific Northwest. The total
25 increase in gas demand would be .35 to .345 billion cubic

1 feet per day or less than have of what Jordan Cove would
2 produce in a day. So the demand in the Pacific Northwest is
3 just really not there, so that comment was not based in
4 fact. Thank you very much.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. SCOTT: Neal Hadley and then Carol Gale.

7 MR. HADLEY: N-E-A-L, H-A-D-L-E-Y, Neal Hadley,
8 secretary for the Umpqua Valley Chapter of Native Plants
9 Society of Oregon and Diane already mentioned the
10 calachortus Mariposa Lily. I was wanting to add a little
11 bit more to that. It is roughed terrain where the pipeline
12 is going over on ridge top --

13 COURT REPORTER: Could you spell the Latin word?

14 MR. HADLEY: Calachortus? It's C-A-L -- let's
15 see. I misspelled it in the past. I want to say with an A
16 -- C-H-O-R-T-U-S, cocixii, C-O-C-I-X-I-I.

17 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

18 MR. HADLEY: It lives in a very restricted range
19 because of the soil types it's endemic to in which it can
20 resist competition from other species. So ideas of moving
21 it other places are not be the first choice. I mean it
22 would be amazing for that kind of thing to actually succeed.
23 And then as well as the steep ground, so any construction
24 project is going to have a huge footprint in that area.

25 Well, I'll go to the second point in the DEIS. I

1 think it inadequately identifies along the route in national
2 forestlands the late successional reserves which are the
3 older ecosystems that harbor a number of sensitive species
4 in our eco region that without that assessment it would be
5 very hard to judge the impact on some of our critical
6 species. Of course, the spotted owl is probably the poster
7 species there.

8 So just to be short and to close, I'll say that a
9 lot of the safeguards or alternatives that are inadequately
10 addressed in the DEIS are looking -- it's setting the FERC
11 up to decide upon the impacts based on what seems to a fair
12 amount of hand waving and future assurances and not hard
13 surveys and exhaustive surveys. Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Carol Gale and next up Victoria
16 Rodriguez.

17 MS. GALE: Hello. Good evening, I'm Carol Gale,
18 a property owner near Dade Creek and my friends and I have
19 been invested in this farm for over 30 years. And there
20 will be half a mile of pipeline through our land that will
21 cause a 100-foot clear cut. It will require these
22 herbicidal applications on a periodic basis that is going to
23 imperil our organic farm. The peace and tranquility of this
24 land that we have put a lot of time and energy into and our
25 whole ethic of environmental protection is really feeling

1 just trampled on by this project. It's as if what we've
2 worked for over this long period of time it can just be put
3 aside by a private energy corporation that wants to bring in
4 fossil fuels when our country really needs to move in a
5 direction away from fossil fuels.

6 And I feel, you know, it not only contaminates
7 our organic garden it's our health, it's the soil, the other
8 species, our neighbors. Taylor Creek that runs by our
9 property and feeds into Wood Creek and then into the South
10 Umpqua, the salmon fisheries are affected and so we are
11 actually connected to the commercial fisherman down in the
12 ocean and along the rivers because these species are us.
13 When they start dying out, it's also because we will be
14 impacted and so all these different aspects just seem to be
15 irrelevant according to this so-called need for foreign
16 energy and yet, you know, we're involved in a war right now
17 that is to get more foreign energy here and we're losing our
18 sons and our daughters in it. And it really seems that this
19 is the wrong direction to go.

20 I heard a story from a mother of a Marine who was
21 disabled in Iraq after serving two times in that war and
22 she's starting an alternative energy company because she
23 doesn't want to send any more of our children across the
24 world to fight for fossil fuels and this LNG is going to
25 mean we have to get this gas from Russia, Iran, Qatar,

1 Indonesia and then transport it half the world away, which
2 uses a lot of fossil fuels and the energy required to
3 liquefy it and then regasify it, all these things are just
4 using up even more so the carbon footprint is even higher.

5 So all the environmental aspects of our farm that
6 we've worked so long to improve and fix into the natural
7 cycle are just being wiped away by this project and I feel
8 like as a property owner we don't have enough power in this.
9 We aren't really heard and it doesn't seem that your
10 environmental impact report when it violates NEAP in so many
11 aspects is really given our citizens, our resources a fair
12 shake and instead it's once again it's the energy
13 corporations. So that's my statement. Thank you for
14 listening.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. SCOTT: Victoria Rodriguez and then Steve
17 Scott.

18 MS. RODRIGUEZ: My name is Victoria Rodriguez,
19 R-O-D-R-I-G-U-E-Z. I'm not a landowner, but I am affiliated
20 with Oregon Women's Land Trust that owns our farm in Dade
21 Creek area. Some of my dearest friends are board members.
22 That property -- I own property, my home in Rosebury. But
23 I'm here because I am a concerned citizen and no, not only
24 this group of women, a band of women who have owned this
25 land since the early '70s, but also other people in our area

1 that owned the land. So I'm here to support my neighbors --
2 those that I know and those that I do not.

3 I want to start by saying I'm really grateful for
4 the citing all of the NEPA violations and I want to add one,
5 an overall NEPA guideline that NEPA has for all the federal
6 agencies is that they must practice common sense. FERC has
7 violated this basic guideline of common sense in all of
8 their practices in the EIS, so I am asking for a new EIS or
9 a review of the EIS based on that guideline that NEPA
10 requires for all federal agencies to use common sense.
11 Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. SCOTT: Steve Scott and then Ron Howell.

14 MR. STEVEN SCOTT: Good evening, my name is
15 Steven Scott. I'm a small woodland owner in the Camas
16 Valley area. And you know, we've heard a lot of comments
17 that address, you know, birds, bees, flowers, trees, fish
18 and fur and that's all well and good. But I haven't heard
19 that much really dwelling on the people element except for
20 comments that Margaret Vilas made and she touched on some of
21 my points also.

22 We're looking at jobs that may come in and
23 locate. What about the jobs that are here now that are
24 being forsaken because of a reduced timber market that we're
25 currently experiencing, a reduced timber harvesting on

1 federal lands, casting that timber harvest burden onto the
2 private landowners. Granted, there have been talks about a
3 decline in property value, but what about the investments
4 that these landowners have made in that property to develop
5 a timber management plan should there be woodland owners.

6 I did some quick figuring over here and for every
7 mile of pipeline that goes through commercial timber ground
8 we're going to lose about 12 acres plus of potential harvest
9 and timber yield. That's volume of logs that will not be
10 sawed by the loggers. They will not be transported by the
11 truck harvest. It will not be processed in the mill and
12 they will not be distributed throughout the United States.
13 So this issue ripples far beyond just our immediate area.

14 We talk about the job loss, income loss. The
15 news is covered daily about our overall economic situation.
16 I know we've heard many times in the past, you know, it's
17 not a lot of other things. It's the economy. But to force
18 landowners to harvest an immature crop before it's ripe for
19 picking, so to speak, not only lowers their anticipated
20 revenue so that's a cost directly to them. It also
21 compromises any investments that they have made in stand
22 management to bring that stand up to harvest to develop and
23 manage according to approved plan of forest management.
24 It's taking timberland out of production.

25 As I say going back to that 12 acres per mile, if

1 you're looking at cropland, that's significant impact on the
2 farmer's production of food that feeds this country. And
3 with that, I just thank you for letting me make my comments.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. SCOTT: Ron Howell and then next Karen Phol.

6 MR. HOWELL: Yes, hello. My name is Ron Howell,
7 R-O-N, H-O-W-E-L-L. I think we heard a lot tonight that
8 there's a lot of reasons why this pipeline isn't any good
9 and I believe the big money behind this know those reasons,
10 too. And what I want to say is that there is a more
11 important reason than any of those reasons talked already
12 and that reason is the people don't want it.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. HOWELL: This country either belongs to us or
15 it belongs to the money that's pushing this pipeline. Now,
16 I'm asking you -- I'm almost telling you to please have the
17 moral fortitude to say no. Don't accept the money. There's
18 more important things than money. Our land, our property
19 means life and our future, okay. Whoever you report to take
20 it to the top guy everybody the people here want their land
21 and they're not going to roll over easy on this one. Thank
22 you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. HOWELL: And I'm a conservative. I don't
25 vote liberal, but the country belongs to us too and we'll

1 fight for it.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. SCOTT: Karen Pohl and then next Richard
4 Chasm.

5 MS. POHL: My name is Karen Pohl, P-O-H-L. And
6 when we first learned about all of this going on we received
7 a little notice to come to a meeting down in Canyonville.
8 And when we attended the first meeting my husband and I was
9 quite shocked at what was going to be happening and it's
10 been going on now for about two years and we had some plans
11 and they've been put on hold waiting to see what's going to
12 happen here with our land and all of our neighbors. And
13 what I'd like to say is how long do we have to wait? How
14 long before we know what's going to happen? And how long
15 is it going to take for them to -- do you see what I'm
16 saying? We're waiting and waiting and waiting and every day
17 you never know what's going to happen. And we're back in a
18 canyon and I heard another lady speaking about a way to get
19 out. It's going to cross right over the road that my
20 husband and I live on and we won't have a way out if
21 something happens and there's a leak or anything like that.
22 And it's ruining the trees we planted. We came in and we're
23 small woodland owners too and we planted 8,000 trees and now
24 this is coming right through the thicket of them and it's
25 just -- I don't know. What's going to happen and when? We

1 want some answers and we feel like we finally read in the
2 paper what's going to happen before we know.

3 When we first were notified it was a sneaky
4 situation then. Nobody was involved in this except the
5 actual people that it was going through their property. Our
6 neighbors didn't know, only the ones that were affected. I
7 went to a city council meeting in Myrtle Creek. They didn't
8 even know and the fire department didn't even know. I mean
9 it was like everything was very sneaky coming through and
10 all we want to know is when is this going to stop. If it's
11 going to go through, let it go through and let us go on with
12 our lives so that we can be put off hold.

13 We don't want it to go through, naturally, but
14 this is ridiculous. Two years of nothing. How long are we
15 going to wait? And I thank you for your time and hopefully
16 you will understand how we feel. Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Richard Chasm and then
19 next up Reuben Escalera.

20 MR. CHASM: Good evening, my name is Richard
21 Chasm,
22 C-H-A-S-M. I live at 730 Hoover Hill Road. I made comments
23 last night in Coos Bay. It was extremely deleterious for
24 FERC to not be there. I've been stuck in airports before,
25 but it was a very contentious meeting. This gentleman was

1 on the hook and this is a huge and irretrievable commitment
2 of southern Oregon. You should be catching on how important
3 this land is to us. You know, if I was forced to come up
4 with the money I could probably scrap up a few thousand
5 bucks, but I got timber on my property worth a million
6 bucks. And most of us are cash poor and asset rich. This
7 is where we have invested our lives and we hear about all
8 this investment and free enterprise and capitalism and all
9 this other happy stuff, but we're doing it on our land.

10 I'm a member of the Partnership for Umpqua
11 Rivers. This is a group chartered to restore the fisheries
12 and there's a watershed council in every watershed. This is
13 for the Umpqua. We spent the day in Reeseport (phonetic)
14 discussing how we can restore the fisheries. This has got
15 every part of our community -- the timber industry, the
16 fishing community, environmentalist, landowners. I
17 represent a little irrigation district and we've all come to
18 the table and have worked hard to build faith, to build
19 working relationships and to restore the salmon. That is a
20 huge economic issue to us. And they talk about economic
21 development, if you want economic development in southern
22 Oregon, restore the salmon and economic development will
23 come to you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. CHASM: Now, I would like to say too that I

1 respect everybody that has been involved in one of these
2 pipelines. I know that they're going to do their best, but
3 I have some real problems with FERC. And Mr. Hemingway got
4 up the very first and said that he thought was wise. Wise
5 in just letting all these procedures, all these proposals
6 come forward. That's not true. FERC would have been much
7 wiser to sit down and prioritize which one of these
8 pipelines and proposals is most likely to serve the public's
9 good and proceed with that. Instead, we've got three liquid
10 natural gas proposals in Oregon, three pipelines, there's
11 half a dozen proposals down on the Klamath River.

12 This is a huge, huge burden on private citizens.
13 It's kind of tough to make a living in southern Oregon in
14 the best of times. This is not the best of times. This has
15 been a huge sacrifice for many, many people. This EIS has
16 come out at the worst possible time for rural people. We're
17 harvesting our crops. We're canning what we harvest. You
18 know, they're people that are hunting. They're not hunting
19 because -- well, they love to hunt, but they're depending on
20 having an elk hanging so they have meat to eat. We raise
21 our food. This is more important to us than money.

22 These trees are our asset and to have this fall
23 and have this come at this time of the year is a terrific
24 negative impact on our ability to function as a rural
25 community and I really, sincerely believe that you -- that

1 FERC doesn't comprehend what a rural lifestyle is. And one
2 thing about it is I can look across this room and I can --
3 especially when everybody was here, I can see almost every
4 perspective and opinion and persuasion you can imagine. But
5 there's one thing -- actually, two things that we all hold
6 in common. We love our land and we help one another. We
7 come as a community. We come as a group.

8 And to say, well, the pipeline is going through
9 this property here, so just because you're an adjacent
10 neighbor you don't have nothing to say about it. It's not
11 even on your property is bologna and it is completely
12 contrary to our concept of where we live. If this pipeline
13 comes through Olalla, it comes through my home. If it goes
14 over Hoover Hill, it comes through where I live. If it's in
15 southern Oregon, it's in the place that I choose to live and
16 I choose to be part of a community where we care about one
17 another. And we might have an argument over a fence last
18 week, but if you need help, if somebody's hurt, you call me
19 and I'll come running. And there's not another person in
20 here -- that gentleman that got up and had the beaded jacket
21 he said it far better than I can. And these communities are
22 being severely violated by this FERC process. And to give
23 us at the busiest time of the year this phony/bologna EIS
24 that is absolutely 100 percent bound for a lawsuit. It is
25 an insult to civil government.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. CHASM: There are so many economic issues
3 that the pipeline people and you guys can't even comprehend.
4 The price of timber -- what's the value of a log? If you
5 cut it at the wrong time of the year and let it sit or you
6 bucket a few feet too long or too short, you can devalue it
7 50 percent. This pipeline, if it gets built, is going to
8 put millions and millions of board feet of our timber on the
9 ground when the price is bad. Who the hell knows how
10 they're going to cut it up because they don't know. And who
11 is going to sell it to who? How is this going to be
12 handled? And so if they buy it now, but they don't
13 actually cut it in ten years, what's the market going to be
14 in ten years? That's has direct, direct impact on our
15 economic vitality in this community right now because the
16 value of my timber is my asset and if the price was up I'd
17 be cutting, but it's terrible and it's going to get cut next
18 year when they're going to come and give us fair market
19 value.

20 The question always gets down to what you going
21 to do about it and I would like to tell the landowners here
22 and now the best thing you can do is say we will not sell.
23 If you want to take us to court, take us to court. They
24 can't use eminent domain on all of us. We're going to go to
25 Senator Wyden and the recent letter that the commissioner in

1 charge of FERC sent him and said buzz off I'm going to write
2 him a letter and say see what we mean. You're not
3 listening. The 700 comments that have been received I wrote
4 one of them. There was a whole series of very important
5 specific issues about what happens when this comes through
6 our lands, our grounds, our water system. We know them. We
7 know what's going on out there. And every single point has
8 been glossed over, ignored, or deferred to later when we
9 have another report. If these companies have the right of
10 eminent domain, we have the right to see the entire project,
11 the full cost, the entire ramifications laid out in a
12 reasonable pattern so that we can see it.

13 So in terms of this meeting tonight and our
14 comments on the EIS, it is grossly inadequate and we're
15 going to make something of it. And FERC needs to send it
16 back to Jordan Cove and Williams Connector Pipeline and tell
17 them to finish it. It's not done. It's not ready. It's
18 incomplete. And adding a few more weeks to it is just
19 missing the point.

20 I do appreciate your coming. I do appreciate the
21 opportunity to comment, but I also think that you should
22 spend a week down in Tiller and see how living in the
23 country really works. This meeting tonight is an example.
24 It's a convenient location. We all know where UCC is. We
25 got people from Klamath Valley, people from Milo, people

1 from Tiller, people who have had to drive an hour to get to
2 the freeway to be here and there's a lot of those people
3 that can't be here. They don't have the money. They don't
4 have the rig. But when you go out on the hills and you
5 start telling them you're going to take their ground, this
6 meeting is going to be -- there's going to be real problems.
7 And the instant that FERC gives them their approval they're
8 immediately going to come after a right-of-way and it is not
9 ready for prime time and you're going to have some real
10 problems in these hills.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. CHASM: And what is going to happen is we're
13 going to sue you. So why are we doing this? Why force us
14 to sue a federal agency to observe a well-known and simple
15 and elementary law?

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. Reuben Escalera and then
18 Suzie Evans.

19 MR. ESCALERA: My name is Reuben Escalera and I
20 live in Clark Branch and the pipeline is going to go through
21 right in the middle of my property. I really believe we
22 don't need the pipeline for a couple of good reasons. I've
23 been watching the news lately and I notice a Pickens and a
24 Mack Clinton from the CNG Natural Gas. They've been having
25 commercials showing how much natural gas this country has

1 and they said we don't even have to get gas from out of the
2 country. And I can't see putting this country in the same
3 position we are with the oil by trying to get natural gas
4 from another country.

5 And on the safety issue, I notice that they're
6 not going to put any odor in the pipeline. So a good
7 example of them not putting the odor in Texas a few months
8 ago they had an explosion and it took out, I believe, three
9 homes. When I say, "took out," flatten them and there were
10 a few people that had to be hospitalized with three-degree
11 burns and I don't think -- they're not looking for our
12 safety. That they're not going to be doing the odor on the
13 gas. And impact on my property would be in the sense of
14 there's a fault line in my area. My two neighbors they dug
15 at my two neighbors and the one that's closest to me they
16 said they couldn't put the pipeline there because there was
17 a fault line there, so I can't see them having gone through
18 my property. The value of my home will be nil. And when I
19 explained that to the pipeline, they shrugged it off, oh no.
20 But when I went back and spoke to the realtor about it
21 saying what they told me and they said -- I won't repeat
22 exactly the words they used, but they said the way the
23 pipeline is going to be on my property I might as well live
24 there and I'm going to die there.

25 And for me to sell it I have to disclose that

1 pipeline. And as close as the property is -- I mean the
2 pipeline to my house nobody wants to buy it, plus they're
3 splitting my property in half and I can't see having someone
4 put a pipeline in my property and then I have to turn around
5 -- they're spitting in my face by making me pay the taxes on
6 it on a property that I can't use. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. SCOTT: Suzie Evans and then Liz Matteson.

9 MS. EVANS: So what I'm going to do is I'm a
10 member of the Oregon Citizens Against the Pipeline also and
11 I'm just going to go through a list of concerns and it's
12 somewhat of a summary of a lot of what's been said and a few
13 things that haven't been said.

14 The tsunami threat to proposed area of terminal
15 is obvious and has been blatantly back burners. Why has
16 there been no air space review? North American Natural Gas
17 is both more available than formerly assumed and much less
18 expensive than LNG. Why has the global warming impact been
19 so ignored? The Department of Homeland Security lists LNG
20 tankers as terrorist targets of opportunity. Prized birding
21 habitat will be lost on the north spit, including
22 Henderson's Marsh. It is impossible to drill through the
23 hundreds of streams, creeks and river crossing without
24 avoiding polluting with the equipment and pipeline
25 lubricants and therefore you cannot avoid damaging salmon

1 spawning habitat.

2 The DEIS states 59 million gallons of water will
3 be needed to check this pipeline. An LNG tanker is the
4 length of three football fields and burns 170 metric tons of
5 fuel daily. That's natural gas and diesel. The proposed
6 Jordan Cove terminal in Coos Bay would dock at least six to
7 seven tankers each month. It is virtually impossible for
8 the members of the FERC to have any true concept of the
9 environmental impact of this pipeline on the residents that
10 it affects, both those whose property it is invading and
11 those who live near and far just in our area.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. SCOTT: The last speaker to sign up is Liz
14 Matheson.

15 MS. MATHESON: My name is Liz Matheson,
16 M-A-T-H-E-S-O-N. And I have been too busy so far to read
17 the DEIS, but hope to and I hope to make comment, and I also
18 ask for the comment period to be extended because I'd really
19 like to give it a thorough analysis.

20 I do want to make comment tonight that whenever I
21 explain this pipeline and the ramifications of this pipeline
22 to friends that don't live in this area they say it's
23 insane. It's crazy. Why would they ever do that? Why
24 would anybody ever want to do that? I also remember when
25 Williams first came and first spoke in Canyonville. They

1 said if you don't want it, we'll leave. And I feel like we
2 don't want it -- you know, I feel like the Williams people -
3 - you know, I met some of them and talked to some of them
4 and I don't feel like you're bad, evil, necessarily, people.
5 But I feel like there's a strong sentiment here of we do not
6 want this pipeline for so many reasons.

7 (Appause.)

8 MS. MATHESON: I was moved to tears by Sandy Lyon
9 what she commented on and it was -- a thought I had driving
10 up here was -- what I really wanted to say was mitigation
11 doesn't replace all the impact that this pipeline will have
12 on people's lives and on the land that -- you've heard how
13 much we care about the land down here. I'm new to this land
14 and within two years I have developed a lot of love for this
15 land, and mitigation -- I'm sure the DEIS is filled with
16 mitigation. I'm sure there are lots of things people will
17 be made up for if they lose their homes or you know whatever
18 the different impacts for the streams and the forests, but
19 mitigation does not replace what is lost and what is
20 destroyed.

21 And when I was sitting out in the room, it's kind
22 of corny, but I kept thinking the line "build it and they
23 will come." And kind of a corny film but it was kind of
24 interesting that that kind of kept going through my head
25 because that's a film about community and it's a film about

1 what people -- you know, vision that they have for their
2 community and I thought, well, build the pipeline and what
3 will that bring? And I feel like communities are adversely
4 impacted and I think you've been given a lot of really good
5 examples of how we feel about how this will impact our lives
6 and I don't -- it's not coming right through my land but
7 it's coming close enough and I've always been concerned in
8 an area that I've moved down to that is prone for forest
9 fires. When I tell people about, yeah, they're wanting to
10 put a pipeline through. And you know, yeah, in Montana or
11 some place. I can't remember where some pipeline a guy on a
12 tractor hit a pipeline, created a big explosion and if he'd
13 been in the area where I live now that would have been
14 billions of dollar -- I may be wrong about that. I don't
15 know, but many, many dollars of damages because of the
16 forest and people's land.

17 I remember at the first meeting in Canyonville a
18 woman who lived up in the Tiller area saying it's insane
19 that they're going to put the pipeline in what -- she said I
20 live up there. I've seen how geologically unstable that
21 land is. They're going to put a pipeline, you know, right
22 in the most unstable areas and a lot of the land -- I
23 learned it after I moved here that there's a lot of
24 geologically unstable areas that the pipeline is proposed to
25 go through. So I say we don't want it and we would be happy

1 if you leave.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. SCOTT: We've gone through the list of folks
4 that signed up to speak when they came in. Is there anybody
5 else that would like to speak?

6 MS. ESCALERA: I would.

7 MR. SCOTT: Okay. Please come to the podium and
8 state your name.

9 MS. ESCALERA: Hello. My name is Laura Escalera
10 spelled E-S-C-A-L-E-R-A. My husband spoke earlier, but --
11 and he gave you a map of our property there. I have one
12 concern that he forgot to bring up that I do want to bring
13 up and our property, if you look at the map that we got
14 there, I-5. Our property follows the I-5 freeway and we
15 went to ODOT and we asked ODOT, you know, did they approach
16 you? Did Williams or anybody approach you to see if instead
17 of going through all the property, which involves about six
18 or seven ranches, if they could have gone down the side of
19 ODOT going south and then it would cross over into nothing
20 but grazing land for thousand of acres, just cattle there.
21 ODOT said nobody ever even approached them to ask. Nobody
22 from Williams approached ODOT to see if they could do that.

23 The people we spoke with, which was at the
24 counter, said that they don't think that there would have
25 been a problem, but they were never even asked. Now, if

1 they didn't even bother to do that and it could have saved
2 seven possible ranches that could have completely detoured,
3 how many other ranches could be out there where there are
4 alternative areas that they can go through, whether it's
5 grazing land, could BLM where some of these ranches are not
6 even affected where it's just -- if it's just going to be
7 grazing because Rodney had told me that it would be all
8 right. And Rodney -- I'm sorry -- is with Williams, I
9 believe, Williams Connector. That it would be all right for
10 animals to graze on this land after the pipe is in the
11 ground, that it would be safe, that you could plant and
12 still utilize that land for grazing. Therefore, those
13 farmers may not be as affected unless they're organic beef
14 or organic livestock. Then there would be a huge impact.
15 But if it's not, then they would just have to hold their
16 animals back a certain amount of days before butchering so
17 that, you know, any pesticides or chemicals wouldn't
18 hopefully be in the product, which I don't believe is true.
19 But it's done all the time.

20 That's one of my considerations I would like for
21 you to think about. If you can go over their proposed route
22 they're going through and see if maybe they took those into
23 consideration. You know, if they did take alternative
24 routes or if they just said, no, this seems to be the
25 shortest way or we could not have to spend as many dollars

1 to get their. In the process of them trying not to spend
2 money they're basically affecting hundreds of families.

3 Another thing that I am concerned about the
4 animals that we do have on the property when they're going
5 to be going through my husband and I have horses. Other
6 people have other livestock that are going to be disrupted.
7 The area that we're going through they're going straight
8 through our pasture, an area that we have our horses in.
9 Again, Rodney told me that if that's a concern that they'd
10 be happy to pay for boarding out our animals at full care at
11 another facility. So out of curiosity I went to check. I
12 went to several facilities. The cheapest I found for full
13 care per animal is \$325 per month. I'm wondering where does
14 that come into the aspect of who's paying for that? I mean
15 even if Williams paid for it they'd have to put it in the
16 expense of the product. Everything that they spend and some
17 how they're going to want to get that money back. That's
18 just how it works. And everybody does that, you know, it's
19 just not going to be feasible. I just don't see it
20 feasible.

21 It's just a concern. My biggest concern and what
22 I wanted to come up here for is for you to mostly just go
23 ahead and review, review their route and see -- you know,
24 maybe check with ODOT and see if there are other areas that
25 they can go through where it's not going to affect the

1 people here and their ranches. And I thank you very much.

2 (Applause.)

3 MALE VOICE: I'd like to add something to hers
4 because I just live up the road from them.

5 MR. SCOTT: Okay. This gentleman would like to
6 speak.

7 MR. BYERS: My name is Dean Byers. I spoke
8 earlier. We'll put this under the category of late breaking
9 news. I'm just looking at the World Newspaper commenting
10 about yesterday's meeting over there. There's a statement
11 here that says -- this is by John Briggs on behalf of the
12 North Bend Airport, "To date we have found nothing that
13 could affect the daily operations of the Southwest Oregon
14 Regional Airport to the point of restrictions or closure."

15 Yes, that may be so but the reason why is because
16 a FAA, Federal Aviation Administration, form 7460 is the
17 form that must be requested in order to do an air space
18 review. If an air space review has not been done, then in
19 fact, there are no regulations against this sort of thing
20 and in any development, any proposed development that
21 potentially would affect air traffic everything has to be
22 considered -- what would be built and what these
23 obstructions -- these would be considered obstructions to
24 the airway -- would have to be considered. The original
25 safety zone around these tankers, as we were first told, was

1 2 miles behind, 1 mile ahead and 500 yards on each side.

2 So I called and talked to a FAA inspector from
3 the Seattle FAA station and I proposed to him -- I said,
4 well, you know, the 500 yards also means a dome over the top
5 of these tankers. That 500 yards is 1,500 feet at sea level
6 altitude, pattern altitude is 1,000 feet. So therefore any
7 airplane that is operating in the vicinity and in the
8 pattern while one of these tankers is transiting, coming in
9 possible even maybe while it was unloading. I don't know.
10 Those terms would have to be spelled out by the FAA as a
11 result of filing an FAA Form 7460. You need to look into
12 that because the idea that there are no restrictions against
13 it is because every single air space in the world is unique
14 to whatever is there and so if anything is being proposed
15 that gets added to it you have to look at everything of what
16 is already there and what you plan to add and how would that
17 impact the pilot community. And as I said before, then the
18 FAA would have to make up rules in relation to the safety
19 zone around these tankers and what's there and what's
20 proposed to be there and then proposal a rule.

21 They have to present that to the pilot community
22 and the pilot community has to have a specified, by statute,
23 amount of time for public comment. This needs to be
24 considered in relation to this whole project too in relation
25 to the public comment time that goes with this. So you

1 cannot go forward with this thing without also including
2 that because it will affect the economic aspects of North
3 Bend, Coos Bay, Charleston and even Bandon with the
4 championship golf course, which I mentioned before. So
5 these things must be considered.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. DYKSTRA: Back to the other route that that
8 pipeline could run.

9 COURT REPORTER: Your name, please.

10 MR. DYKSTRA: Louie Dykstra. I was involved with
11 the -- they asked me about surveying on the property and I
12 told them you won't come to the property unless I'm there.
13 I want to know what you're doing. They said when is that
14 possible. I said Thursday afternoon at the earliest. So I
15 went to the coast. We got home Thursday morning and I see
16 flags everywhere. Some of these flags are 75 feet from my
17 house and I live on a big rock up on the mountain that would
18 be very unstable after they put a pipeline in.

19 I called them up and I blew up. They were out
20 there in about 30 minutes. And they started telling me a
21 bunch of lies. Being running pipelines from in the '60s to
22 the late '90s, I said who do you think you're trying to kid?
23 Oh, so they had to get somebody else to talk to me. And we
24 were up there and he says, well, this is our best route. He
25 says the best route for a pipeline is to run it on top of

1 the valley. And I says, yeah, if you run it through rock,
2 but if you're running through sand, then rock and whatever
3 you're creating landslides. So I said why don't you just
4 take a look at a different route and I took him down, showed
5 him this a different route. I said either along the freeway
6 or just follow that existing pipeline right-of-way; turn and
7 you've got five straight miles. Well, we can't do that. I
8 says why can't you do that? I said any sensible person
9 would run it that way because now you're not going to cause
10 any slides because the water collects there and when we get
11 35 inches of rain those pipeline right-of-ways collect a lot
12 of water. It's got to go somewhere.

13 So they talked to my neighbors. My neighbors
14 said, no, you can't run through here because you're going to
15 cause a slide. They went and checked it out and says you're
16 right. We cannot run through here. It'll cause a slide.
17 Well, they were going by a map that was taken by an
18 airplane. The property lines were approximately 100 feet
19 off. They found out that they didn't own that property. It
20 was on somebody else's. So what did they do? The line
21 comes right straight back through there again. They
22 wouldn't listen. I spent a lot of time because this
23 pipeline where it's coming, where it crosses through their
24 yard it affects 12 homes in there, not necessarily on their
25 property, but going next to the house, close to their house,

1 blocking their routes in and out, plus going across the top
2 of a hill that is dirt. It comes off of rock and goes into
3 dirt and that is going to collect a lot of water. And I
4 already know what a little change in that ground up there
5 will cause them slides. These people had pictures of a
6 slide that was coming down where they plan on going in and
7 working and cause it to be more of a slide area.

8 So when I took him over and I told him, I says,
9 you know, you've got to make about nine turns coming from
10 that freeway to get to the top of that hill and you only
11 have to make one if you go along the freeway or go along the
12 existing pipeline, turn, go underneath the freeway and you
13 can go for five or six miles straight. And I figured it out
14 on the map using a scale, figured it out and it was probably
15 about a half a mile or a mile closer to a certain point
16 where they wanted to turn and go southeast more if they
17 stayed away from all these homes. There were too many homes
18 to be affected. There would have been one if they followed
19 the other existing pipeline route. If they followed the
20 freeway, none. No, that was just unheard of. They couldn't
21 do something like that.

22 Do you know why? Do you know the excuse they
23 gave me? We've already made our decision. We can't change
24 it now. But you know what, they come and see me a couple of
25 times. They ever come back. They moved all their ribbons,

1 the ones that I hadn't torn down. They're going around me.
2 And how they're going through my neighbor's front yard.
3 That makes me mad. In fact, they're going through two of my
4 neighbor's front yards because I knew what they were causing
5 -- the problem they were causing. They thought I was going
6 to make a big stink. Well, I made a big stink anyhow
7 because I've been to Salem and around and these guys are
8 trying to sell these people a bill of goods. They even told
9 one of my neighbors that they could get cheap gas because
10 they could tie into that pipeline. Well, there is no way.

11 So when them come out to see me, I hit them with
12 that. Oh, I don't know at Williams would tell them like
13 that. I didn't tell her that I knew she's the one that did
14 it, but she was the one that told them, oh, you could get
15 cheap gas. Remember that?

16 FEMALE VOICE: (Off mike.)

17 MR. DYKSTRA: Cheap gas, 4040 psi pipeline with a
18 1-inch line tied into the side of it, if the valve slips
19 out, it'll blow your house completely apart. You won't have
20 to worry about a thing. But these people have lied. And
21 some of the stories that people have told me in these
22 meetings I knew what kind of crap they pulled, but I just
23 didn't realize how much that stuff they pulled -- different
24 stories. And there was a lady -- I haven't seen her here
25 tonight, but they planned on going through her property and

1 they're taking her out because of a spotted owl I believe
2 about two miles away. Now, I have a lot of respect for a
3 spotted owl, but I guarantee you that if it comes between a
4 human life and a spotted owl, sorry spotted owl but you're
5 gone and that's all I can tell you about that. Believe me,
6 I like owls, but they didn't even bother telling her, but
7 they changed her mind.

8 Most of her property will be a 300-foot wide path
9 because of the fact that it -- what they call uncleared
10 storage area and boy am I against that because they take
11 their rock and their crap and their stumps and all their
12 junk and push it off on your land and they leave it there.
13 And I've been at a lot of pipeline right-of-ways right after
14 they've been built and long after they've been built and you
15 know what, they're just a crappy ten years later than they
16 go through with the pipeline. The only difference is a lot
17 of the stuff has rotted and the rocks are still there. But
18 is that land useable, no. And I think that's a lot to think
19 about.

20 I feel that these pipelines when they come
21 through or if they build a road or they put a power line in
22 that if this timber that's cut for these pipelines or power
23 lines or any kind of right-of-way that they should have to
24 pay double for it. And if they remove rocks and push them
25 off to the side and leave, they should have to haul them

1 rocks to a stone place to have them ground and the counties
2 get that rock or the people that they take the rock off
3 their property gets that rock for driveways or whatever and
4 they should put it back. They shouldn't be allowed to store
5 that just out there in vacant land. What would the private
6 citizen do if they went and started dumping his garbage off
7 of a pipeline or in somebody else's property? He's get
8 prosecuted. But yet, these gas companies can do this. It's
9 not quite right. And then they're going to have foreign gas
10 in here and I think this country belongs to the people of
11 the United States. I don't think it belongs go big gas, big
12 oil and it doesn't belong to our government because in the
13 Constitution the only thing that our government has to
14 answer to is the people and I'm asking right now that our
15 government stands up and answers to the people, even though
16 we're only a few.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. DYKSTRA: I feel that this is a Catch 22.
19 Our tax dollars pay folks wages, pays the President's wages,
20 pays the governor's wages, pays all the public servants
21 wages and we turn around and have to fight because they want
22 to use eminent domain and come and take our property for
23 just a few to get very wealthy and I don't think it's fair.
24 I don't thin it's fair that I have to pay taxes on property
25 that they take and they're making millions and we don't even

1 get enough to pay our taxes for a few years.

2 Now, I don't know how many people here that might
3 think that would be fair, but I damn sure don't. This
4 country belongs to the people. Our government should answer
5 to the people.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. DYKSTRA: One more thing. I'm all for jobs.
8 I've been a union member all my life and I don't like to
9 take work away from my brothers and sisters, but when I feel
10 that a project is wrong, and if I've ever seen one it's LNG.
11 It's completely wrong.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. DYKSTRA: Thank you for your time.

14 MR. CHASM: Yes, my name is Richard Chasm. I'd
15 like to make some additional comments. And I'm sorry I got
16 a little excited before, but this situation that Louie and
17 the Escaleras are talking about is extremely significant
18 because this is where the pipeline route goes under the
19 South Umpqua River down there by Wigall (phonetic) Road and
20 to the right side is open pasture and in proposed route
21 would tie into the north/south gas line there at Clark's
22 Branch. The reason that the pipeline, I feel, is going
23 through the Escaleras and through the whole Wagon Tire
24 Estate subdivision is because they right of eminent domain.
25 The ground I was alluding to and the ground that Louie's

1 talking about belongs to the Cow Creek Tribe and they don't
2 have eminent domain over there, but it is obviously a much
3 flatter, sweeter route. It impacts little or nobody. It
4 doesn't go by any houses. It's a big ranch, the K-Bar
5 Ranch, but they don't have eminent domain. As I said
6 earlier, I serve on the Partnership of Umpqua Rivers with a
7 number of state and federal fisheries and Forest Service
8 officials and I've had several of them -- and not just
9 recently today, but over the last few months tell me that
10 because this pipeline does not have the right of eminent
11 domain on federal land they have been able to actually push
12 them around and say, no, you can't do that. You're going to
13 do this and force them to respect their properties.

14 And I'm not going to name the guy, but he's an
15 official in the BLM, to me at a meeting that the result is
16 that we have pushed the pipeline over onto private property.
17 There are five major rivers crossed seven times. Every
18 single crossing is on private property where they will get
19 the right of eminent domain. I was told today by a
20 fisheries official that he's meeting with the pipeline to
21 discuss fisheries mitigation that he was talking about the
22 habitat is a stream. It's the headwaters to the estuary and
23 everything in between. And he told me we were told
24 empathically, in no uncertain terms you have authority on
25 federal lands only and you got nothing to say about what

1 happens on private property.

2 So the net result is that our private citizens
3 are being isolated. Instead of having a state agency that
4 carries the ball for us or federal agencies that carry the
5 ball for us, what's happening is by demanding respect
6 they're shifting more and more and more of this over to
7 where they can force us to take their price for our land.

8 In conclusion, mitigation is a big issue. We
9 have spent a lot of time and effort to restore the salmon in
10 these streams with some real success. And again, this needs
11 to be in writing. We need to see it. We need to know what
12 these agreements are and mitigation needs to occur in the
13 river. The same root wads and stumps and rocks that Louie
14 was alluding to mitigation is literally to put them back in
15 the stream and create habitat, but that takes a little too
16 much time and money and they just want to heap it up and ram
17 her through.

18 But the mitigation, in spite of all our protests
19 and this gets built and for the jobs, the salmon are not
20 going to go away and the issue is not going to away, but the
21 emphasis on mitigation -- and I'm really sorry Susan Morgan
22 isn't here to hear this -- the mitigation will shift from
23 the pipeline where the deed is done to the logging woods
24 where we can shut down the woods because of the damage that
25 this pipeline does. And when we went up to Salem on

1 February 6, I meet with my friend Jeff Cruz and I told him,
2 Jeff, I can't look you in the face and swear that this
3 pipeline will force the Coho and the Chinook (phonetic) into
4 an endangered species listing. But neither can you look me
5 in the face and tell me it won't. Are we ready to risk our
6 salmon on promises and what's written in this EIS? I don't
7 think so. And there are a lot of proponents of this that
8 say we need to do this that are very uneasy, but they're
9 going with the flow. And I'm tired of talking to people --
10 I had a good friend tell me you're wasting your time.
11 You're pissing on your shoes because they're just going to
12 do it.

13 The vast majority of people in this community
14 don't want this, but they're not going to buck the chamber
15 of commerce and the push from up. But if this was put to a
16 vote to the people in the affected counties, I predict 70/30
17 against.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. SCOTT: Ms. Hanson?

20 MS. HANSON: Hello. Getting to know me, uh. Can
21 you hear me? Okay. My name is M. A. Hanson. Okay. I too
22 am very sorry that Susan Morgan is not here to hear at least
23 90 percent of those of us who spoke tonight. That shows me
24 that she is really concerned about this. As a matter of
25 fact, at Coos Bay last night after about seven people spoke

1 who are in favor of this project, all of which I never saw
2 one of the EIS books in their hand and they never once
3 mentioned the EIS. I think I said that before, but they're
4 just show. They have no -- they don't care. They don't
5 care.

6 They're talking about jobs. We're talking about
7 our lands and our livelihood. And they don't even have the
8 story right about jobs. More jobs are going to be lost than
9 are going to be made. Please mention in your EIS that the
10 gas must be scented so we have a chance to escape if
11 something happens.

12 Also, I'd like to mention something about
13 mitigation. Mitigation just doesn't work when you're trying
14 to do something with Mother Nature. Like I said, they're
15 going to move this Mariposa Lily somewhere else. It grows
16 only where grows because that's the only place -- it needs
17 serpentine -- I'm also in the Native Plant Society and it
18 needs serpentine lands and it grows where it grows. It's
19 the only place in the world it grows. You don't mitigate by
20 moving it somewhere else.

21 And I'd like to say another thing about
22 mitigation. I was standing behind Mr. and Mrs. Pohl -- my
23 goodness, it seems like a year ago in Canyonville and I can
24 see why she is just so upset about please do something and
25 that's why I'm saying us people -- I have given two years of

1 my life to this and this isn't even going across my land.
2 It's going across people's land -- if you put it anywhere in
3 the United States, I'd probably be there fighting it because
4 I'm for alternative energies and this is not an energy we
5 need on this land.

6 Do you realize when you first started this the
7 first advertisements or whatever you put out, brochures you
8 put out you said this was a bridge to alternative energies.
9 Well, we called you on that. You don't spend the billions
10 of dollars that you're spending on this project, and I
11 haven't heard anything for a long time about this being a
12 bridge to alternative energies. You're here to stay and my
13 belief is you're here to ship our gas out of this country.

14 I would like to also say that last night in Coos
15 Bay -- I've been told as I've been walking around the people
16 are saying please say this. Please say this, so I'm trying
17 to get it all. But last night one of the last people that
18 spoke in Coos Bay, and I believe he may have been the last
19 people who spoke, said to Mr. Braddock, Mr. Braddock, you
20 said in the beginning that you and your company would leave
21 if we asked you to. He asked you to last night and I'm
22 asking you to now because if your terminal isn't built we
23 don't have to worry about any of the rest of this because
24 without the terminal there will be no pipeline, so please
25 leave.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Is there anybody else who would like
3 to speak tonight?

4 MR. DYKSTRA: I'd like to spend the next three
5 days speaking about it.

6 MR. SCOTT: You said five days earlier.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. LISTER: Excuse me just a second. Mr.
9 Dykstra, you mentioned an alternative route that you had
10 suggested before. Can you provide us with a map showing
11 that?

12 MR. DYKSTRA: Yes, I did. I can show you on that
13 map or I can send it to the FERC.

14 MR. LISTER: You have? Okay.

15 MR. DYKSTRA: I sent it to Peter DeFosio
16 (phonetic). I sent it to everybody I can think of. I even
17 sent it to my neighbor.

18 MR. LISTER: Okay.

19 MR. DYKSTRA: I really did because I wanted him
20 to see it. I got one answer, nothing from FERC, nothing
21 from Williams.

22 MR. LISTER: Well, was it filed with FERC as a
23 comment and a map showing --

24 MR. DYKSTRA: Yes, it was and more than once.

25 MR. LISTER: Okay. We're going to have to check

1 into that.

2 MR. DYKSTRA: It should be pretty much on --
3 well, I guess it's not. It's not on that.

4 MR. LISTER: You can show us on the alignment
5 sheet then.

6 MR. DYKSTRA: Sure.

7 MR. LISTER: Great. Thank you. Anybody else?

8 MS. HANSON: I know I said something about I was
9 standing behind Mr. and Mrs. Pohl about a year ago in
10 Canyonville when Williams Pipeline would sit all around the
11 room and when you went to talk to them nobody knew what they
12 were saying to you. So we finally got them to stand in
13 front of people so everybody knew what they said. But I was
14 standing with Mr. and Mrs. Pohl and I think that they have
15 left and they were telling about -- she said something about
16 here comes this across their road. How are we going to get
17 out? And they said, oh, don't worry. We'll be there in two
18 hours and don't worry. It'll just sound like a big plane
19 has hit your house, but that'll go away and there's no fire.
20 They said, oh, okay.

21 Well, then he said, well, I got 8,000 trees up on
22 this ridge that I planted there because somebody had taken
23 all the trees down, so I put them up there and you're going
24 right through them. What are you going to do about it?
25 Well, Rodney Gregory told them we're going to move your

1 trees to a better spot. That's mitigation. He stood there
2 and told this man that he didn't put his trees on the best
3 spot he could have. So I don't believe in mitigation.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. LISTER: Okay. Anybody else? Last call.
6 Okay.

7 MS. LYON: Sandy Lyon from Dade Creek. They may
8 have touched on it, but I'm just curious if we could have a
9 comment as to why the gas could not be scented. It's a
10 great concern to all of us whose pipeline this goes right
11 through our houses. Our house it makes a "U" around our
12 house within 400 feet and we have cattle in those fields and
13 people -- my son, my husband. Why can't they scent it? Is
14 it a matter of cost?

15 MR. LISTER: That's a good point and we've heard
16 that from a number of people and we'll certainly address
17 that comment.

18 MS. LYON: Okay. We'd like an answer.

19 MR. LISTER: Others? Anybody else? I see a hand
20 back there?

21 MS. HAIGH: I guess I needed to point out another
22 specific thing from the EIS on page 5-30. It's about the
23 liability and safety. Okay. There is a paragraph. It's
24 the first one there on thermal radiation and flammable vapor
25 hazard distances were calculated for an accident or an

1 attack on 140,000 ME LNG carrier and then you -- I'm just
2 going down to the end where your conclusion of this
3 paragraph is. Basically, it just says, "The likelihood of a
4 cargo containment failure and subsequent LNG spill from a
5 vessel casualty, collision, grounding or allusions is highly
6 unlikely." That's really scientific, I think, isn't it?

7 So then I'm just going to cite some LNG blast
8 history. In Algeria there was gas blast from LNG in January
9 19, 2004, which killed at least 20 people. Let's see.
10 There was at least 27 dead at a facility, an LNG blast seen
11 at Mobile -- oh no, what is this? This is the same LNG
12 facility. I had a whole list. Where is it? Hold on a
13 second. Sorry. I don't have it here, but I will submit it
14 as well. But there are at least -- I had a whole page of
15 LNG accidents, spills around the world that have been
16 documented and they just say it's highly unlikely. And so I
17 would like to address that and I will write all the
18 specifics down. But I just wanted to let you know that
19 that's a really big concern is an LNG spill and they haven't
20 covered it adequately, the DEIS about the safety hazards.
21 And also, there's evidence that there aren't -- I heard that
22 you had denied access to safety studies done for an LGN
23 spill, is that true?

24 MR. LISTER: I'm not familiar with exactly what
25 you're referring to, but there is certain information that

1 is not available to the general public, yes.

2 MS. HANSON: Right. And that's because it was
3 information done on a terrorist. What would happen if a
4 terrorist attack happened at an LNG facility and that was
5 not revealed to the public because of the dangers involved,
6 which makes sense because you know we don't want that kind
7 of information getting out. But the fact that it's that
8 dangerous means that if a terrorist did attack an LNG
9 facility it would be very dangerous and that's not even
10 included in the DEIS.

11 MR. LISTER: We also would like to give the
12 terrorist any ideas as well. That's one of the reasons for
13 protecting information.

14 MS. HANSON: Right. But anyway that should be a
15 concern to all of us as well.

16 MR. LISTER: We have the room until 10 p.m. One
17 more opportunity if anybody has anything to say.

18 (No response.)

19 MR. LISTER: Okay. Thank you all for coming.

20 (Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the above-entitled
21 scoping meeting was concluded.)

22

23

24

25