

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x
Northwest Pipeline GP : Docket No. PF09-10-000
- - - - - x

Blue Ridge Pipeline Project
Pre-Filing Review
PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

Skamania Lodge
1131 SW Skamania Lodge Way
Stevenson, Washington 98648
Wednesday, August 12, 2009

The public hearing, pursuant to notice, convened at 7:15
p.m. before a Staff Panel:

JOHN PECONOM, FERC Environmental Deputy Project
Manager

RUSS REINEKE, U.S. Department of Transportation

DOUG MOONEYHAN, Entrix

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

COMMENTERS

Frank Backus, Chief Forester, SDS Company	16
Mary Repar	18
Tom Linde, local resident	21
Kim Antieau, Stevenson resident	22
Stuart Evans, architect	24
Glen Owen	26

1 environmental assessment for the proposed Blue Ridge
2 Pipeline Project and request for environmental comments.

3 Based on the speaker's sign-in sheet that was at
4 the front of the room in the beginning, a few of you are
5 interested in making comments about the proposed project.

6 I'd like to point out a typo in the Notice of
7 Intent that many of you may have received. On page 4, in
8 the requirements for construction the first sentence should
9 read: Construction of the plant facilities would affect
10 about 1733 acres of land for above-ground facilities,
11 temporary extra work areas, uncleared storage areas, and the
12 pipeline based on planned construction right-of-way that
13 typically would be 100 feet wide, the Notice of Intent
14 incorrectly states 75 foot wide.

15 Before I begin the comment portion of the
16 meeting, for those of you who may be unfamiliar with the
17 proposed Blue Ridge Pipeline project, I've asked Mr.
18 Jeremiah Ross with Northwest Pipeline to provide a short
19 presentation about the project.

20 Jeremiah?

21 MR. ROSS: Hello. My name is Jeremiah Ross, I'm
22 the Project Manager for the Blue Ridge Pipeline expansion.
23 I'm going to give a short, ten to fifteen minute
24 presentation very similar to the one we gave during the open
25 house, so I'm apologizing if you've heard a lot of this

1 before. I'll try and talk a little bit about some new
2 things with our scope.

3 First I'd like to start by telling you a little
4 bit about Williams. We're an energy company that is focused
5 on the production, transportation and distribution of
6 natural gas. Northwest Pipeline is one of the Williams-
7 owned pipelines. We transport natural gas mainly from the
8 Rockies, Four Corners area, to markets in the Pacific
9 Northwest.

10 In some ways we're kind of like a trucking
11 company; we don't own the gas that's in the pipeline, we
12 just ship it for our customers who purchase it, and then we
13 ship it up to markets. We have been operating the original
14 line since 1956 with many of our employees living and
15 working in communities we serve.

16 So the Blue Ridge Pipeline is an 119-mile
17 pipeline through the southern part of Washington, roughly
18 from Plymouth to Washougal. Our original scope of the
19 people is 156 miles, approximately; and we have reduced it
20 to 119. The reason for the reduction is the amount of gas
21 required in the market has gone down. So when less gas
22 needs to be transported, less pipe is required.

23 This can be a little hard to understand, but
24 because Blue Ridge is part of Northwest's pipeline system as
25 an integrated part of the system, we're able to install

1 pipeline loops along the system that increase the capacity,
2 increase the amount of gas. The more gas that needs to be
3 moved, the more pipe that needs to be installed.

4 These loops are determined by a hydraulic model;
5 through calculations we determine where pipe needs to be
6 installed and how much needs to be installed based on the
7 volume of gas and the required pressures at certain points.

8 In addition to the 119 miles, we're also
9 installing additional horsepower at two existing compressor
10 stations; our Washougal compressor station and our Klamath
11 compressor station.

12 So why is Blue Ridge needed? Pipelines aren't
13 built on spec; sometimes they can cost up to \$3 million - \$4
14 million a mile to build. So there has to be a demand for
15 the reliable energy that natural gas provides. Blue Ridge
16 is primarily driven by the need for natural gas fired power
17 generation.

18 Natural gas is generally the preferred fuel for
19 this type of application, because it is cleaner than coal,
20 it is reliable, and it is abundant in North America.

21 The new options such as wind, solar and
22 conservation efforts can and have helped to reduce the need
23 for fuels, but they don't meet projected demand for natural
24 gas, for new energy in the system.

25 So in addition to supplying the Northwest with a

1 reliable energy source, there will also be some additional
2 economic benefits. We expect the peak of construction will
3 be about 950 jobs, most of which will be local.
4 Construction will also stimulate the local economies with
5 demand for lodging and other services. Counties can expect
6 up to \$7 million in additional tax revenue, spread across
7 the five counties.

8 Our current time line, we expect to begin land
9 acquisition in 2012 and receive our certificate in 2011. We
10 plan on performing limited clearing in 2011 with
11 construction beginning in the winter of 2012 on the east end
12 where there are some agricultural lands. The project would
13 then be placed into service in November 2012.

14 So where are we in the process? We have already
15 held our open houses; we held those in June and July. We
16 are now going through the scoping meetings. Following these
17 scoping meetings, Williams will submit additional
18 information on the project, will file the formal application
19 for a certificate, and the creation of an EIS or an
20 environmental impact statement.

21 The environmental impact statement is the impact
22 on the natural and human environment that results from the
23 project, or the proposed alternatives.

24 So once this draft has been issued, further
25 meetings will be held to receive feedback from stakeholders.

1 Based on this feedback, changes could be made to
2 incorporate, changes to be made, incorporated in the final
3 EIS.

4 Finally, FERC would issue Williams a certificate
5 that would either approve or deny a certificate allowing
6 Williams to build the project.

7 I'd like to talk a little bit about routing, how
8 we go about our routing, how we go about evaluating
9 alternatives. Because nw pipeline is an existing system,
10 we start with trying to locate our pipeline along our
11 existing corridor. We've deviated from the corridor for a
12 couple reasons. The first reason is to maintain the safety
13 and integrity of the existing line. We believe in some
14 areas the integrity of the existing line could be
15 compromised during the construction of the new line. The
16 second is our ability to safely construct a new line, where
17 those areas we believe a new line cannot be installed
18 safely. When we have deviated from the line, our existing
19 line, we attempted to avoid and minimize impacts in the
20 environment, landowners, cultural resources and scenic
21 resources.

22 As part of the pre-filing process, we gather
23 information that is used to assess the proposed pipeline.
24 To gather this information we use surveys; we use civil
25 surveys where we survey the actual centerline of the

1 pipeline. In environmental surveys where we survey for
2 threatened and endangered species, wetlands and other
3 sensitive habitat; also cultural and scenic resources.

4 When a pipeline is constructed, we will typically
5 ask for a 50-foot easement to operate and maintain the
6 pipeline. That would be on any new right-of-way that is
7 obtained, would be 50 feet. In forested areas, we would
8 only maintain 30 feet of that 50 feet. For construction
9 purposes, our typical construction corridor is 100 feet. We
10 also may require some temporary extra work space along the
11 route. All of that work space will be given back once the
12 project is completed.

13 So safety is always our first priority. We
14 maintain a safe pipeline through a proactive approach, and
15 we do that by four ways: First, the routing. We try and
16 avoid landslides, erosion and other possible issues along
17 the route. We use advanced materials, we use pipe that is
18 designed to operate at a fraction of its maximum pressure,
19 and we use advanced coatings that prevent corrosion.
20 Through mitigation, we X-ray all welds, the pipeline is
21 hydro-tested and cathodic protections are installed also to
22 prevent corrosion. And through monitoring, aerial and land
23 inspection of pipeline, in-line inspection of the pipeline,
24 and detailed integrity management programs that maintain the
25 safety of the pipeline.

1 Pipelines are regulated by the Department of
2 Transportation and the Pipeline Hazardous Safety
3 Administration, or PHMSA. As a regulated pipeline, we are
4 required to comply with the safety and design regulations.
5 We are also audited on a regular basis to make sure that we
6 continue to comply with these regulations; and they also
7 audit us on our integrity and safety programs to ensure we
8 maintain a proactive approach for safety.

9 Again, my name is Jeremiah Ross, we have several
10 representatives from Williams, we have representatives from
11 marketing, environmental, land and our operations
12 departments. So feel free after the scoping meeting to come
13 back and talk to us and meet with us.

14 Just one correction; the land acquisition will
15 start in 2010; I believe I said 2012.

16 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, Jeremiah.

17 As Jeremiah said, Northwest staff will be
18 available after the meeting to answer any questions you may
19 have about their proposal.

20 We are here tonight for two reasons: One, to
21 provide you with information about how the staff of the
22 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reviews proposed
23 natural gas pipeline projects. And two, to hear your
24 comments and concerns about the proposed project.

25 As I said before, I'm on the staff of the Federal

1 Energy Regulatory Commission in Washington, D.C. The FERC
2 is one of the numerous federal agencies responsible for the
3 review of interstate natural gas pipeline projects. The
4 FERC is also the lead federal agency responsible for the
5 coordinated environmental review of the proposed project as
6 required by the National Environmental Policy Act. We are
7 working in coordination with the Bureau of Land Management,
8 the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers as well as
9 other federal and state resource agencies.

10 The FERC's environmental staff's primary
11 responsibility is to review Northwest Pipeline's proposed
12 Blue Ridge Pipeline project proposal, assess the
13 environmental impacts of the proposed project, consider
14 alternatives, if appropriate, recommend mitigation measures
15 to reduce any anticipated environmental impacts, and present
16 all this information for public review in an environmental
17 impact statement.

18 This environmental impact statement will also be
19 used by the BLM and the Forest Service in their respective
20 reviews for a right-of-way grant and a forest plan
21 amendment.

22 Our environmental review of a proposed pipeline
23 usually begins with the filing of an application for a
24 certificate of public convenience and necessity. However,
25 Northwest, as Jeremiah said, it shows a benefit to enter

1 into the Commission's pre-filing process. The pre-filing
2 process is a process that was designed by the Commission to
3 involve stakeholders, the general public resource agencies,
4 interested parties in the review process early on before an
5 application is filed.

6 We are in the very early stages of the pre-filing
7 process. As Jeremiah said, the company has sponsored open
8 houses to provide information to the public. We are here
9 tonight, as I said, to take comments on the project to help
10 us with our environmental review. The pre-filing process
11 generally runs anywhere from six months to a year. In this
12 case, the pre-filing process is a little bit longer on
13 Northwest's part because they chose to take a little more
14 time to develop their proposal.

15 The pre-filing process concludes with the filing
16 of an application for a certificate of public convenience
17 and necessity. Once we receive an application from an
18 applicant, we then take that application, review it for
19 completeness. An application would include environmental
20 information such as wetlands information, water body
21 crossing information, threatened and endangered species
22 information, geology, soils, safety, visual resources, land
23 use, recreation -- in this case talks of land management
24 plans by the various agencies. All this information will
25 be presented in the application. We will review that

1 application for completeness, determine if there is
2 additional information that we require in order to conduct
3 our environmental impact statement. We will coordinate
4 with the other agencies and share this information to
5 determine that it is complete.

6 We will then take that information, conduct our
7 environment review and analysis, prepare a draft
8 environmental impact statement with our findings, of the
9 proposed project. We will describe the impacts that we see
10 that results from the proposed project, and any
11 recommendations that we have for mitigation measures to
12 lessen those environmental impacts.

13 As I said, all the information will be put
14 together in the draft environmental impact statement which
15 will be issued for public review. The public will then have
16 90 days to review that draft environmental impact statement
17 and provide us comments on that. Based on those comments
18 and any additional information that may come to light, we
19 will prepare a final environmental impact statement.

20 The final environmental impact statement will be
21 used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to decide
22 whether or not to approve the proposed project. The
23 Commission can decide to approve the proposed project as is;
24 they can choose to approve the proposed project with
25 recommendations, and they can also choose to deny the

1 proposed project.

2 Once the Commission votes on a project, the
3 certificate would be issued to Northwest, and with that
4 certificate comes approval to construct the proposed project
5 and operate it.

6 That was a really quick overview of the FERC
7 process in terms of how we review interstate natural gas
8 pipeline projects. If anybody had any questions on the FERC
9 review process, I'd be happy to answer those at this time.
10 If you just wanted to come up to the microphone and state
11 your name and if you had a question about how FERC reviews
12 projects, I'd be happy to answer those. And if not, we'll
13 then move into the comment portion of the meeting.

14 So does anybody have any questions about the FERC
15 environmental review process?

16 (No response.)

17 I should also point out, I'll be available after
18 the meeting as well to answer any questions anybody has.

19 As I said before, the purpose of tonight's
20 meeting is to take your comments on the proposed Blue Ridge
21 Pipeline Project. Tonight's meeting is not a forum to
22 debate the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed
23 project; we are here to listen to your concerns so we can
24 consider them in our environmental review and analysis.

25 In our Notice of Intent, issued on July 28th, we

1 requested your comments and assigned a deadline of August
2 30th, 2009. We will take comments throughout our review of
3 the proposed project, but to adequately address your
4 comments and analyze and research the issues we ask that you
5 try to get those comments to us as soon as possible.

6 We have already received numerous comments about
7 the proposed project. As of today I think we have close to
8 30 comments regarding the proposed project. Several of them
9 regarding visual impacts, land use impacts, concerns about
10 environmental resources, concerns about threatened and
11 endangered species, concerns about impacts to land values.

12 A speaker's list was located at the back table
13 upon your arrival. For those of you that didn't want to
14 speak at that time, after the signed-up speakers have been
15 given a chance to talk, I will then ask if anybody else
16 would like to speak.

17 In addition to verbal comments provided tonight,
18 we will also accept your written comments. If you have
19 comments but don't wish to speak tonight, you may provide
20 written comments on the comment forms on the back table.
21 You can drop those off with us tonight or mail them; you can
22 also submit comments to us electronically at the FERC
23 website, through the FERC website.

24 At this time we will begin to take comments. As
25 your name is read, I would like you to come up to the podium

1 and state your name for the record. All of your comments
2 will be transcribed and put in the public record for the
3 project. The public record is available on our website,
4 www.FERC.gov.

5 In your comments, I ask that you try to be as
6 specific as possible. I thank you for your time and we'll
7 begin with Mr. Frank Backus.

8 MR. BACKUS: Good evening, my name is Frank
9 Backus. I'm a Chief Forester for SDS Company. Thank you
10 for the opportunity to be here this evening. Also these
11 comments are in writing; I've handed them in and they're
12 also comments for Broughton Lumber Company.

13 First of all, SDS Lumber Company is a locally-
14 owned, privately-owned timber company and has two wood
15 processing plants in the area; and Broughton Lumber Company
16 is a timber management company, they own their own
17 timberlands.

18 Both Broughton and SDS have two Bonneville power
19 line corridors through our property, and the Northwest gas
20 line corridor through our properties.

21 Over the years, I wasn't here when the gas line
22 and the power lines were put in, but I've heard that it
23 wasn't a real pleasant process; and over the years, though
24 as the Chief Forester for SDS, I have experienced problems
25 with access across the corridors and also increased

1 management cost of our timber lands adjacent to them because
2 of the corridors being there, and also maintenance problems
3 that have occurred when they've been maintaining those
4 corridors.

5 So in general, SDS and Broughton Lumber Company
6 are opposed to a new pipeline corridor going through our
7 area. If one is approved, we strongly ask that you ensure
8 that it's put in, number one choice, in the Bonneville power
9 line right-of-ways that are through the area, and if that
10 can't be done, then adjacent to the existing Northwest
11 pipeline corridor.

12 One of the reasons that we choose the Bonneville
13 power line is it already has taken lands out of timber
14 production, and it's already disturbed. The second choice
15 would be then, like I said, the Northwest gas line, and that
16 would entail taking more lands out of production, which we
17 don't want to happen.

18 In the corridor that they have laid out, many
19 places they have deviated from those options, in some
20 places, in very large and long distances, and it just
21 doesn't seem to me or to our companies that you can build
22 more miles of pipeline and do less environmental damage.

23 Over the long haul, it seems to us that there
24 would be far less damage done the shorter the pipeline you
25 can possibly create. Things that would be impacted;

1 deforestation, which would result in less carbon
2 sequestering and less wood fiber available over the long
3 term. Would fragment wildlife habitat, greater impact to
4 air and water quality, and loss of soil productivity.

5 Private lands are the major supply of wood
6 products in our area because the federal lands in this area
7 are not producing very much wood fiber for our operations
8 anymore. Therefore, every acre that is removed from forest
9 production has an impact, and we'd strongly ask that you
10 analyze the economic impacts of that loss of forest
11 production for our local mills.

12 So in closing, we are opposed to a new pipeline,
13 but if one is approved we believe that keeping it in a
14 location that already exists like the BPA, Rose would be far
15 preferable to a new route. And it seems to us, with new
16 technology and the modern equipment, it can be put in those
17 places because they did put the existing pipeline in with
18 far less abilities than they have today, and it survived
19 since it was put in.

20 So thank you very much. This is in written form,
21 and it has been handed in. Thank you for your time.

22 (Commission insert.)

23 MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

24 Next on the list is Ms. Mary Repar.

25 MS. REPAR: Thank you very much for giving me

1 this opportunity to speak this evening. I appreciate you
2 all coming here. I haven't attended previous meetings; I
3 will be putting in more comments by the August 30th session
4 as I become more cognizant of the true impacts of this.

5 I have just several comments here. In reading
6 the docket handout on page 4, that EIS process, I've read
7 that you're going to do an impact. What I did not read in
8 this was that you would consider cumulative impacts; and I
9 know NEPA demands cumulative impact analyses.

10 So I am hoping that somewhere in everything that
11 you do -- and I'm sure that you will -- cumulative impact
12 analyses are done under CEQ rules.

13 Secondly, I noticed you had some hazards, but I'm
14 not sure if you have landslides; but what about earthquake
15 hazards and some perhaps volcanic hazards? I know that we
16 have a soils handbook and I don't know if that has been
17 included, the types of soils that you will -- it's a very,
18 very good handbook, really big, and I use it quite a lot
19 when I'm looking for information. So soils analyses I would
20 like to see, too.

21 Number three, what is the projected carbon
22 footprint? We are now in the era of global climate change,
23 and I think every project on the planet probably will have
24 to have a carbon footprint analysis. What is it for this
25 one?

1 Number four, I know you've spoken of resources,
2 cultural resources, but we are in the national scenic area,
3 and natural resources, all natural resources. So the
4 cumulative list of natural resources should be considered
5 also.

6 Number five. I'm not sure about our Washington
7 eminent domain law, but I think that should be explained
8 very, very clearly. I know in our little city of Stevenson
9 we recently went through some questions about taking land
10 from somebody for a sidewalk, and you have to have money for
11 it. So I'm going to know more about that, how it's going
12 to impact owners who don't want this pipeline, and eminent
13 domain is exercised upon them.

14 Number six, I did not see anywhere recreational
15 impacts. I would like to see more on that.

16 And number seven, on page 5 of this handout which
17 is the docket handout, there are some bullet points; and
18 under endangered and rare species including the Northern
19 Spotted Owl and several salmonids, I think endangered and
20 threatened and those that are to be listed should be
21 included in that, not just the endangered portion of the ESA
22 listing.

23 Also sensitive areas. Not just sensitive water
24 body crossings and wetlands, there are other types of
25 sensitive areas, especially in Skamania County.

1 And finally, in your public participation
2 portion, you mention: your comments should focus on the
3 potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, et
4 cetera, et cetera. Well, one reasonable alternative is,
5 also under NEPA you must have a no-action alternative. So I
6 would like to see that addressed also.

7 And finally, number nine, and this is just a
8 comment: I frankly think we need to work more on the
9 efficiencies of our energy-producing systems rather than
10 ripping up the earth and putting in environmentally-
11 hazardous pipelines. And I don't know if that's your job,
12 but perhaps we need to do more on promoting efficiencies and
13 increasing the efficiencies in our system rather than
14 putting in this new pipeline.

15 You know, if it's so great, why not run it across
16 Highway 14, or along Highway 14 where the utility line
17 already exists, and masks it somehow? And get rid of the
18 old pipeline and the loop and let it go back to nature.

19 So again, I will be submitting my other comments
20 by August 30th, and thank you very much for giving me this
21 opportunity.

22 MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

23 Next is Mr. Tom Linde.

24 MR. LINDE: My name is Tom Linde. I'm just a
25 citizen of the local area. I reviewed your project, I've

1 received the mailers, I've looked at your maps and reviewed
2 the project.

3 I'm retired from the U.S. Forest Service, I'm
4 very familiar with the location you're proposing. I
5 personally support this project in its proposed location.
6 It's a far better location than your existing line because
7 of the ground stability; your existing line is in some
8 pretty unstable areas, and has a higher risk.

9 The project I think is a good project for the
10 public. I think it will create and help our economies
11 develop in the Northwest. Thank you.

12 MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

13 Our last commenter is Ms. Kim Antieau.

14 MS. ANTIEAU: Kim Antieau, I live in Stevenson.

15 I have a few things I'd like to put into the
16 record. One, we already have a pipeline. I didn't hear,
17 and maybe this is someplace, but Jeremiah mentioned that
18 there's a projected need for this gas line. I'd like to
19 know how that was figured out; and I also, with Mary, I
20 don't know that we need this. I'd like to see what we're
21 using now made more efficient and also he (Jeremiah) sort of
22 said that alternatives to this kind of energy aren't
23 feasible. Well, they'd better be feasible, because the
24 planet's going to go away if we don't figure out a way to do
25 it.

1 In Skamania County, so much of our land right now
2 is owned by the government, there's not a lot of land; and
3 so if we keep putting pipelines and power lines and -- we're
4 not going to have anything left. I think the environmental
5 impact, to me, is absolutely the most important thing.
6 We've been through this process before about so many things,
7 where the government comes in and asks us our opinion and
8 does an environmental impact statement; and most of the time
9 it's overridden, because they say "Well, it's for the public
10 good." Well, the public good is the environment. A lot of
11 us live here because we love it, and the environment is what
12 we breathe and we eat, that's where our water comes from.

13 And with this pipeline, one more pipeline,
14 there's going to be more pesticides used. Already the power
15 lines, they use pesticides -- and look at our counties,
16 we've got power lines are sprayed, the railroads are
17 sprayed, all of the county roads they spray pesticides, the
18 fence and the gas, they spray sometimes for noxious weeds,
19 so that's one more thing. So someone from the gas company
20 said "Well, yeah, we'll use a little bit." Well, you know,
21 there's a cumulative effect, and there's a lot of us who
22 live here who already have health disorders. We don't need
23 more pesticides.

24 And I agree with people who have said we don't
25 need any more disturbed land. Jeremiah also said that they

1 are going to maintain safety and integrity -- I know they
2 didn't have a lot of time, but I'd like to know what that
3 means.

4 Like I said before, I'm concerned because often
5 we come to tell what we need and what's good for the
6 environment or the impact statement, and then it's just
7 overridden by who's going to be making the money. Thank
8 you.

9 Oh, and one more thing, the local jobs. He
10 mentioned that there would be some local jobs; we're always
11 told that, too. Something new comes to town, that there's
12 going to be local jobs. I'd like to know, what is that? Is
13 that 99 percent? Or is that 10 percent. And also, that's
14 just for a year. So the environment, they destroy the
15 environment, it's gone. Thank you.

16 MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

17 Is there anyone else who would like to speak
18 tonight?

19 MR. EVANS: My name is Stuart Evans. I'm an
20 architect in Portland and a friend of the Columbia Gorge.

21 I didn't grow up here; I came out here in 1976,
22 drove across country through Wyoming and Idaho. I still
23 remember driving through the Columbia Gorge; it just hit me,
24 then I got a flat tire so I got to get out of my car and --
25 I've never seen anything like this; I'm from Philadelphia.

1 This Gorge is an absolute national treasure, on the line
2 with the Grand Canyon and other very significant national
3 treasures.

4 I've heard that there's 14 miles of this pipeline
5 that's going through the National Scenic Area. I don't
6 understand why we do a national scenic area -- I don't
7 really understand why we would run a pipeline through it;
8 that makes no sense to me at all.

9 I think Mr. Backus who spoke in the beginning had
10 some very good comments about going with the existing
11 rights-of-way or on existing roads. And I had a lot of
12 engineer friends, but I also had a lot of surgeon friends.

13 I think there's a way to think of these projects,
14 especially when we get into sensitive areas like this that
15 are national treasures, to think more like a surgeon, think
16 really smart about how to create something that has the
17 absolute least impact to an area like this. And I'm not
18 sure I'm hearing that with this project.

19 So I guess what I'm saying is, first of all --
20 and also, the other thing with the 100 feet of construction
21 -- it is 100 feet. In my lifetime it will be 100 feet, and
22 then I guess things grow back later on; but the clear-
23 cutting would be that width -- and probably most of my son's
24 lifetime it would be 100 feet and then grow back in. So
25 that's the reality of it.

1 So I would ask first of all that this pipeline,
2 no new clear-cutting in the National Scenic Area. We really
3 look carefully at existing rights-of-way and roads for this
4 project, and really respect the national treasure we have.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. PECONOM: Is there anybody else who would
7 like to speak tonight?

8 MR. OWEN: Good evening, my name is Glen Owen,
9 and I basically have three questions for you: When were the
10 projections of demand made, and were they made before the
11 current economic conditions? And if they were, and I'm
12 assuming they were because they have to be pretty far ahead,
13 how have they been updated based upon current economic
14 conditions?

15 You can get a whole lot of different
16 interpretations of what is going to happen, but I assume
17 that the effects of this current economic downturn are going
18 to be a whole lot longer term than any of the downturns
19 we've seen since, and what effect are the projections going
20 to have. How will these impact the future of demand, and
21 will there be the demand that they expect to see to feed
22 this pipeline project?

23 MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

24 Is there anyone else who would like to speak
25 tonight?

1 Well, if I can for just a minute, I wanted to
2 touch on some of the comments you all made. I've been very
3 impressed with the comments, and I've done meetings all
4 across the country; and those of you who spoke were very
5 informed, and that's really great, because it helps us with
6 our analysis.

7 When I gave a review of the process, I didn't
8 touch on all the resources, the earthquakes, soils, carbon
9 footprint, cultural resources; those are all things that, as
10 you said, in NEPA that we will look at. Unstable areas,
11 these are all things that will be covered. Purpose and
12 need, demand, as the gentleman just spoke about, were things
13 that we will also consider.

14 I don't have any answers for some of these
15 questions right now, but these are questions that we will
16 ask ourselves in our environmental review. These are
17 things that we will be putting in the draft environmental
18 impact statement. So your comments are very helpful; we
19 certainly appreciate them.

20 And at that, I think we'll close the meeting.
21 And as I said before, the rest of us will be available to
22 speak with you after the meeting. Thank you very much for
23 coming out tonight, and that concludes our meeting. Thank
24 you again.

25 (Whereupon, at 8 p.m., the scoping meeting

1 concluded.)

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24