

1 MOLALLA CAPACITY REPLACEMENT)
2)
3 PROJECT SCOPING MEETING)
4)

5
6
7
8
9

10 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

11 * * *

12 St. Mary's Public Elementary School

13 March 1, 2011

14 590 East College Street

15 Mt. Angel, Oregon

16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 SINEAD R. WILDER, CCR

24 Court Reporter

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

APPEARANCES:

For FERC: MS. KELLEY A. PARSE
 MR. CHARLES T. BROWN
 MR. PAUL FRIEDMAN
 888 First St., N.E.
 Washington, DC 20426

For Cardno Entrix: MR. DOUGLAS M. MOONEYHAN
 50 Glendale Parkway
 Suite 600
 Atlanta, GA 30328

MS. KATEY GRANGE
 111 SW Columbia Street
 Suite 950
 Portland, OR 97201

Also Present: Various representatives of
 Northwest Pipeline
 Members of the public

INDEX

PAGE NO.

Presentation by Ms. Parse
 combined with discussion
 by members of the audience 3-45

1 MT. ANGEL, OREGON; TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2011

2 6:40 p.m.

3 * * *

4 MS. PARSE: Okay. We'll get started, if
5 everyone's ready.

6 MR. BROWN: Okay. Let's get started.

7 MS. PARSE: I apologize. I don't have a
8 microphone tonight. So I'm going to have yell at you.
9 If I'm not loud enough, let me know.

10 Let the record show that the Molalla
11 Capacity Replacement Project Scoping Meeting in
12 Mt. Angel, Oregon commenced at 6:40 p.m.

13 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
14 Commission we thank you for joining us tonight for the
15 scoping meeting for the Molalla Capacity Replacement
16 Project proposed by Northwest Pipeline.

17 My name is Kelley Parse, and I'm the project
18 manager. Here next to me at the table is Charles
19 Brown and Paul Friedman, our culture resource expert.
20 Working at the table is Katey Grange, and here
21 checking my sound is Doug Mooneyhan. They're a
22 third-party environmental facility firm assisting us
23 with the preparation of the environmental assessment.

24 The primary purpose of this meeting is to
25 provide you an opportunity to comment on the project

1 or on the scope of the environmental analysis being
2 prepared for the Molalla Capacity Replacement Project.

3 Before we begin, can everybody turn off
4 their cell phones for me. I appreciate it.

5 I'm going to describe the federal process
6 for you. But briefly, I'm going to have Al Michini
7 with Northwest provide a brief overview of the project
8 description.

9 MR. MICHINI: Thanks, Kelley.

10 Hopefully everyone can see this map. This
11 is a two-part project. The first part is abandoning
12 in place our 16-inch line from our Oregon City
13 compressor station down to mile post 36 down here
14 (indicating). That's about 15 miles. Along with that
15 they're going to replace that capacity lost with the
16 abandonment of that 15 miles of 16-inch pipeline with
17 a new 20-inch pipeline, a 7.75-mile pipeline down here
18 south of Molalla between our mile post 41 and 48.77.

19 We're doing this for a couple reasons. The
20 first is that we've had a lot of ongoing maintenance
21 work on this abandonment section, and we've been in
22 digging the pipeline quite a bit. And we felt that it
23 was -- the project was best served -- or I should say,
24 our company was best served by decommissioning that
25 line in terms of landowner impacts, environmental

1 impacts related to the digging on that line or
2 repairing it with the new line further south down here
3 (indicating).

4 We want to do this to strengthen our overall
5 service reliability and, of course, lessen the
6 environmental and landowner impact in terms of
7 continuing to maintain that 16-inch lot.

8 In terms of construction, we're going to
9 start the project at our existing valve site here
10 (indicating) on Kropf Road and end it at the existing
11 valve site at Marquam Road. We're going to drill
12 Butte Creek and Rock Creek, and we are also --
13 generally speaking, the pipeline is going to be offset
14 from the 16-inch. And typically, there's going to be
15 an additional ten-foot of right-of-way acquired
16 related to this pipeline construction.

17 In terms of schedule, we submitted our
18 filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
19 in January. Last month, in February, we started our
20 land acquisition process. Pending FERC action, we'd
21 like to start the project in July and complete the
22 project in November, before the -- before the rainy
23 season. So that, in a nutshell, is the project.

24 MR. SKILES: May we ask a question of you?

25 MR. MICHINI: Yes.

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Just speak loudly so the
2 stenographer --

3 MR. SKILES: Oh, okay.

4 When you say this part of the Molalla
5 section is going to take up the capacity that you're
6 abandoning, how large is the pipe that you're
7 abandoning?

8 MR. MICHINI: 16-inch.

9 MR. SKILES: 16-inch?

10 MR. MICHINI: Correct.

11 MR. SKILES: And that was put in at the same
12 time that the existing pipeline in the Molalla section
13 was put in?

14 MR. MICHINI: Yeah, yes.

15 MR. SKILES: And you're saying you're having
16 troubles with the corrosion or decay of that 16-inch
17 pipeline?

18 MR. MICHINI: Well, based on our -- based on
19 our internal integrity assessment, we've had to do a
20 lot of maintenance on it to the point where it's
21 very -- been very intrusive to the landowners in this
22 area. So we wanted to do this project to avoid having
23 to continually going in to these landowners and
24 disrupt them year after year. So that's why we're
25 doing this project.

1 MR. SKILES: Well, the existing pipeline
2 that is along the new piece in the Molalla section,
3 will that be torn out at some point or abandoned?

4 MR. MICHINI: No.

5 MR. SKILES: I don't understand how you have
6 a 20-inch section, and you're putting in a 20 and a 16
7 that's still going to operate; how is that going to
8 take up the capacity?

9 MR. MICHINI: Well, the 20-inch diameter is
10 larger, so --

11 MR. SKILES: Yeah.

12 MR. MICHINI: -- we can essentially maintain
13 our full capacity of our line with a shorter section
14 of 20-inch than we would in the longer section of 16.
15 So because it's got a -- a bigger diameter, you can
16 obviously fit more volume through that.

17 MR. SKILES: All right. But you still have
18 the 16 -- the 16-inch pipe in the ground also.

19 MR. MICHINI: Right. Right now we do not
20 currently have a 20-inch down in this section
21 (indicating).

22 MR. SKILES: No. That's what you're putting
23 in.

24 MR. MICHINI: Right. We have a 20-inch and
25 a 16-inch that comes through here (indicating). And

1 the existing 20-inch ends right here (indicating) at
2 mile post 41. And what we're simply doing is
3 extending that 20-inch down to mile post 48.77.

4 MR. SKILES: But there will be gas in both
5 the 16 and the 20?

6 MR. MICHINI: Yes.

7 MRS. SKILES: But yet, you only have the
8 Oregon City to Molalla with the 20-inch; is that what
9 you're saying?

10 MR. MICHINI: Yes.

11 MRS. SKILES: So you'd have a 16 and a 20
12 from Kropf Road to Mt. Angel.

13 MEMBER OF PUBLIC ONE: I think -- I think
14 mile 14 to Oregon City, the area over there on the
15 top, which you're, you know, decommissioning and -- so
16 there are two pipes there?

17 MR. MICHINI: Right.

18 MEMBER OF PUBLIC ONE: So one will be
19 decommissioned?

20 MR. MICHINI: Right.

21 MEMBER OF PUBLIC ONE: One you will continue
22 to operate as it is?

23 MR. MICHINI: Yes.

24 MEMBER OF PUBLIC ONE: And in terms of the
25 easement to the lots, will it remain the same or --

1 MR. MICHINI: Yes.

2 MEMBER OF PUBLIC ONE: So that it won't
3 affect any of the -- in any way the property owners in
4 that area?

5 MR. MICHINI: We've got a couple of sites in
6 through this -- this decommissioned section
7 (indicating) where we have to physically isolate
8 existing 16-inch line where it's got a metering
9 facility, for example; where there's a -- a valve
10 setting. We have to physically isolate that line.
11 But for the lion's share of that 15-mile segment there
12 will be no impact whatsoever.

13 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC TWO: Sir, the part
14 that you're -- you eliminated earlier, what year was
15 that put in, versus the 16-inch down below towards
16 the --

17 MR. MICHINI: I don't -- I don't have exact
18 dates in terms of when the 16-inch was installed.

19 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC TWO: Yeah. The part
20 that's deteriorated, that you -- was that put in the
21 same time, then, as the other?

22 MR. MICHINI: As the other 16-inch?

23 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC TWO: Yeah.

24 MR. MICHINI: I believe so.

25 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC TWO: Well, how come

1 that part is deteriorated, and this other part in the
2 field isn't? You've checked and all that, I'm sure.

3 MR. MICHINI: Well, there's a few different
4 reasons why we think that this is deteriorating
5 faster. And we've actually assessed the section
6 between Oregon City and Molalla. It could be due to a
7 few different reasons. But you know, I -- and all our
8 data shows that the -- all of our issues are basically
9 in here (indicating), not further south.

10 MR. SKILES: Would '59 sound about right for
11 when you put the pipeline in?

12 MR. MICHINI: Probably. With the 20-inch
13 going in later, '90s.

14 MR. SKILES: Yeah.

15 MS. PARSE: I believe it was 1960.

16 MR. SKILES: 1960.

17 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: So I don't
18 understand how all this line was. You had 16-inch
19 initially at this bottom here, is that right, only one
20 pipe, 16 inches?

21 MR. MICHINI: Right. From here (indicating)
22 south only one pipeline.

23 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: The 16 inches?

24 MR. MICHINI: Right.

25 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: And over there

1 16 inches and 20?

2 MR. MICHINI: Right.

3 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: So how much flow
4 you're taking -- you know, you have only have one
5 capacity at the bottom.

6 MR. MICHINI: Right.

7 MEMBER OF PUBLIC ONE: Which way the gas is
8 flowing?

9 MR. MICHINI: Predominantly the gas flows
10 north to south.

11 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: So over there
12 then it's out of -- it's coming into two pipes, one 20
13 inches and another 16 inches. And it was compressing
14 through to carry down the 16-inch pipe? How the
15 capacity is being handled?

16 MR. MICHINI: Well, the way that we look at
17 it is we break our pipeline down in segments. So this
18 segment we've got Oregon City compressor station here
19 (indicating). We've got McMinnville pressure station
20 there (indicating). We look at that segment as a
21 whole and say, what is the available throughput we can
22 move through our pipeline in that segment.

23 So really for us, it doesn't make that much
24 difference if that pipeline's here (indicating) or up
25 here (indicating). If you look at that larger

1 segment, we can manage the compression at Oregon City
2 or at McMinnville to maneuver the gas as we need it.

3 MR. SKILES: So you're basically going to
4 use the old 16-inch pipe as a storage area,
5 underground storage area, so you can --

6 MR. MICHINI: No, no.

7 MR. SKILES: -- move that back and forth?

8 MR. MICHINI: No, no, no. The 16-inch
9 that's going to be abandoned between here and here
10 (indicating) is going to be --

11 MR. SKILES: No, I'm talking the lower
12 16-inch.

13 MR. MICHINI: The lower 16-inch is going to
14 remain in service.

15 MRS. SKILES: Why?

16 MR. MICHINI: Because we need the capacity.
17 And that pipeline has -- in terms of integrity is --
18 based on our integrity assessment is fine.

19 MRS. SKILES: That makes no sense.

20 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: I don't know how
21 this -- how long gas goes to this, but the 14-inch
22 diameter --

23 MR. MICHINI: We've got connections between
24 the 20 and 16 at the various locations in either -- in
25 either segment. So there will be a connection between

1 the 16 and 20 here (indicating) and then again down
2 there (indicating). So again, we have the ability to
3 maneuver the gas between the two pipelines.

4 MR. HAMMELMAN: So is, in essence, what
5 you're saying is that you're using the existing
6 16-inch that's at the bottom and -- to gain lower
7 pressure loss, so that you can make up for the higher
8 pressure that you're going to have to push through the
9 single line above?

10 MR. MICHINI: There will be -- there will be
11 greater pressure loss in this section (indicating)
12 than it would be in here (indicating), because you've
13 got more of the -- more of the volume, more capacity.

14 So yes, you are correct. We are -- we're
15 offsetting the pressure losses here (indicating) with
16 reduced pressure losses here (indicating).

17 MS. PARSE: We're still going to get an
18 opportunity to allow you to talk more. There are
19 other folks here from Northwest that can put out
20 alignment sheets, can maybe break it down further. We
21 can get things on the record. So this is not a lost
22 opportunity. We appreciate that you're asking
23 questions. That's exactly why we're here.

24 I'm going to move forward and get you
25 through the FERC process. And then we're going to

1 come back to your questions. And the goal is for you
2 to leave here with your questions answered and allow
3 Northwest to better explain maybe some of those fuzzy
4 areas for you. Is that okay?

5 MR. SKILES: Yeah.

6 MS. PARSE: Okay. So for those of you who
7 don't know, FERC is an independent agency comprised of
8 five Commissioners appointed by the President. The
9 five-member Commission is responsible for making a
10 determination on whether to issue a Certificate of
11 Public Convenience and Necessity to the Applicant, in
12 this case, Northwest Pipeline.

13 FERC reviews proposals and authorizes
14 construction of interstate natural gas pipelines,
15 storage facilities, liquified natural gas terminals as
16 well as licensing and inspection of hydroelectric
17 projects.

18 As a federal licensing agency, the FERC has
19 the responsibility under the National Environmental
20 Policy Act to consider the potential environmental
21 impact associated with a project which is under
22 consideration. With regard to Northwest Molalla
23 Capacity Replacement Project, the FERC is the lead
24 federal agency for the NEPA review and the preparation
25 of the environmental assessment.

1 As I said earlier, the primary purpose of
2 this meeting tonight is to give you an opportunity to
3 comment on the project or on the environmental issues
4 that you would like to see covered in the
5 environmental assessment. It will help us the most if
6 your comments are as specific as possible regarding
7 the potential environmental impacts and reasonable
8 alternatives of the proposed project.

9 These issues generally focus on the
10 potential for environmental effects, but may also
11 address construction issues, mitigation and the
12 overall environmental review process. As Al
13 mentioned, and as I said before, you will have an
14 opportunity to meet with the Northwest representatives
15 to ask them questions and get more detailed answers
16 and information about their proposed facility
17 locations and construction plans.

18 So tonight I'm going to go through the
19 environmental review process and FERC's role, take
20 time to answer your questions, which is the most
21 important part. And if any of you have signed up to
22 speak, we'll give you a chance to come up and voice
23 your opinions or your comments. And that goes on the
24 record.

25 Did everybody get a chance to go to sign up

1 at the sign-in table, if you wanted to speak tonight,
2 make any comments? I've got a list here with two
3 folks. So if you want to -- if you want to get on
4 that list, let me know.

5 Okay. So if you were able to grab one of
6 the folders, there should be a flow chart to kind of
7 give you a description of where we are in the process.
8 And we are in the very beginning.

9 So where we are now is Northwest entered
10 into the FERC process on January 11th of this year,
11 which began the review of the facilities that we refer
12 to as the project. The FERC, along with other
13 federal, local, state agencies have begun the review
14 of the project. And on February 16th FERC issued a
15 notice of intent to prepare an environmental
16 assessment for the project. And we initiated a
17 scoping period. The scoping or comment period will
18 end on March 18 of this year.

19 During our review of the project we will
20 gather information from a variety of sources,
21 including Northwest; you, the public; other state,
22 local and federal agencies; and our independent
23 analysis and fieldwork. We will analyze this
24 information and prepare a draft EA that will be
25 distributed to the public for comments. This will

1 include an examination of the proposed facility
2 locations as well as alternative sites.

3 We'll assess the project's effects on water
4 bodies and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife,
5 endangered species, cultural resources, soils, land
6 use, air quality and safety issues. Once scoping is
7 finished we will continue our review and address any
8 additional issues that have been identified during the
9 scoping period, which will end March 18th.

10 When we complete our analysis of the
11 potential impacts, it will be published as an EA and
12 presented to the public for a 30-day comment period.
13 The EA will be mailed to all interested parties. That
14 means that you will receive a CD unless you otherwise
15 specify that you'd like a hard copy. So please be --
16 let us know what would be more convenient for you.
17 But due to the size of the mailing list, we will send
18 CDs out, unless you tell us otherwise. Again, you can
19 indicate that on our attendance sheet tonight which
20 one you prefer.

21 If you received the NOI in the mail, you are
22 on the mailing list, and you will remain on the
23 mailing list to receive the EA, unless you return the
24 mailer attached to the back of the NOI and indicate
25 you wish to be removed. There are copies at the table

1 of the NOI. If you did not receive one, I apologize.
2 Again, we do have copies here.

3 I would like to add that we encourage
4 electronic filing. We have a sheet over here that
5 will give you directions on how to do that. You go to
6 www.ferc.gov.

7 If you're submitting a comment, please
8 include our internal docket number for the project.
9 And that docket is on the cover of the NOI, which
10 would be CP11-59-000. And that's on the cover of the
11 NOI that you can refer to.

12 If you decide to send us a comment letter,
13 please put that number on it. That will ensure the
14 members of the staff evaluating the project will get
15 your comments as soon as possible.

16 So the EA that we're going to prepare will
17 describe the project facilities, associated
18 environmental impacts, alternatives to the project,
19 mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts, and our
20 conclusions or recommendations.

21 The EA is not a decision document. It is
22 being prepared to disclose to the public and to the
23 Commission the environmental impact of constructing
24 and operating the proposed project. When it is
25 completed the Commission will consider the

1 environmental information from the EA along with
2 non-environmental issues such as engineering, markets,
3 rates, in making its decision to approve or deny
4 Northwest Pipeline's request for certificate.

5 At this point do you have any questions
6 regarding the FERC process in specific to what we do
7 in our role?

8 MR. SKILES: I do. Has Williams and the
9 Palomar Pipelines -- any connection between the two?

10 MS. PARSE: No.

11 MR. SKILES: Not at this point or --

12 MR. BROWN: You mean this particular project
13 here?

14 MR. SKILES: Yes.

15 MR. BROWN: You mean the way this project's
16 proposed?

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: The answer is no, there's no
18 association between Palomar and this particular
19 project.

20 MR. SKILES: But in the future could there
21 be? And maybe that's the wrong question. Maybe the
22 question should be is Williams using this project to
23 then move into an agreement with Palomar?

24 MR. MICHINI: I can answer that. The answer
25 to that question is no.

1 MR. SKILES: Can you put that in writing?

2 MR. MICHINI: I just did.

3 MR. BROWN: It's on the record.

4 MS. PARSE: That's why we have our court
5 reporter.

6 MR. SKILES: Okay.

7 MS. PARSE: So it's all going to be on the
8 record.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: In the future when you ask
10 the question -- we don't want to discourage you asking
11 questions. We just want you to state your name so
12 that the transcriber can --

13 MR. SKILES: Oh, I'm Dale Skiles.

14 MS. PARSE: Okay. Dale, did you have any
15 additional -- you signed up to speak.

16 MR. SKILES: Yes, a couple of concerns. One
17 is -- oh, I think they can hear me.

18 The creek that you're going to cross on my
19 property or the adjacent property, there are
20 red-legged frogs that have been identified in that
21 creek. And if you're going to be boring Rock Creek, I
22 think you could probably also bore the two creeks that
23 have these red-legged frogs in them. And that's one
24 thing.

25 The other thing is that in the existing

1 pipeline I'm finding what I believe is coal tar from
2 the pipeline that was put in in 1959 or '60. And I
3 don't -- I mean, I don't know how it's showing up all
4 over the surface of the ground, but it is. And it's
5 been there for -- since we've owned the property,
6 30 years. So I guess I would expect Williams to try
7 to clean that up in the future -- or when they're in
8 there doing their additional pipeline.

9 MS. PARSE: Can you say again where exactly
10 you found --

11 MR. SKILES: Pardon?

12 MS. PARSE: Can you tell me exactly where
13 you found your --

14 MR. SKILES: Well, it's in the -- laying on
15 the surface of the ground.

16 MS. PARSE: Okay.

17 MR. SKILES: And I don't know if you want to
18 look it. I don't know if you --

19 MS. PARSE: Let the record show he brought
20 up some examples. Okay.

21 MR. SKILES: And there's quite a bit of that
22 out on the ground.

23 The other thing is that when Williams
24 originally came in, they were making phone calls
25 asking for permission. And I never gave them

1 permission to survey across my property or anything.
2 But yet, there are stakes on my property.

3 And part of the existing easement that is
4 there, I have not seen anything that has designated
5 what I can and cannot grow on that easement. But at
6 the last meeting on February 3rd I found out that the
7 crop that I grow is no longer -- can no longer be
8 grown on the property. And what I grow is fir trees
9 for timber. And they have not cut the trees off of my
10 place yet, but they did cut the timber trees off of
11 the adjoining property. And I understand that they
12 said, Oh, it's just an overgrown Christmas tree farm.
13 Well, mine is not an overgrown Christmas tree farm.
14 It was planted as a timber crop.

15 MR. BROWN: Now, let me get this straight.
16 The trees are growing over the pipeline?

17 MR. SKILES: They're adjacent to the
18 pipeline. There's probably --

19 MR. BROWN: Adjacent or over the top of the
20 pipeline?

21 MR. SKILES: There's probably one over the
22 top.

23 MR. BROWN: If they're over the top of the
24 pipeline, DOT will not allow you to do this. They're
25 going to -- FERC will not allow that. That has to go.

1 You've got to have a 15-foot-wide swath through there.
2 It's got to be clear. Because tree roots will damage
3 pipe every time.

4 MR. SKILES: But I mean, like I say, up
5 until this point -- now, that may be your regulation.
6 But up until this point the easement that I've seen
7 where they originally came through does not designate
8 what -- what you can and can't --

9 MR. BROWN: Does it say they have a right to
10 maintain that easement?

11 MR. SKILES: Does it what?

12 MR. BROWN: Does it say they have a right to
13 maintain that easement?

14 MR. SKILES: Yeah, it probably does.

15 MR. BROWN: Then they have the right to
16 maintain that easement. That's part of the three --
17 that rule is a part of it.

18 MR. SKILES: So no trees are allowed to grow
19 across the top of the pipeline?

20 MR. BROWN: No, that's right.

21 MR. SKILES: How about filbert trees?

22 MR. BROWN: How about what?

23 MR. SKILES: Filbert trees.

24 MR. BROWN: No, no filbert trees.

25 MR. HAMMELMAN: Brian Hammelman.

1 There are a lot of hazelnuts currently on
2 top of the pipeline, one of the fields being mine.
3 You're saying that a cultivated crop of trees cannot
4 be grown on top of it?

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct.

6 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: How deep is the
7 pipe, generally? What's the depth of it?

8 MR. BROWN: Well, it depends. If it's in
9 ag, it's usually a five-foot cover over the top it.
10 And if it's not ag, it's usually three feet.

11 MR. SKILES: So three to five feet?

12 MR. BROWN: Right. And again, it depends on
13 when the pipeline was constructed, whether it was ag
14 there at the time. Sometimes the agriculture comes in
15 afterwards.

16 MR. SKILES: No, it was ag.

17 MR. BROWN: We've got one instance here
18 where there's a reservoir that was built over an
19 existing pipe. So things do happen over time.

20 MR. SKILES: It has a house over the
21 pipeline at one point.

22 MR. BROWN: That wouldn't surprise me. I
23 wouldn't want to be in there.

24 MR. HAMMELMAN: Again, does that mean that
25 hazelnuts will not be allowed to be replanted in the

1 field that they're being removed from?

2 MR. BROWN: Probably not.

3 MR. HAMMELMAN: And who has --

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Within 15 feet of the
5 pipeline.

6 MR. BROWN: Within 15 feet.

7 MR. HAMMELMAN: Who has authority of that or
8 regulation of that, or who would be --

9 MR. BROWN: It's probably in your easement
10 agreement.

11 MR. HAMMELMAN: No. It says they can
12 maintain the pipeline, but it says nothing about
13 restriction of growing crops over it.

14 MR. SKILES: I've seen the way Williams
15 maintains their pipeline. They let blackberries grow
16 up over it and everything else.

17 MR. BROWN: Well, blackberries --
18 blackberries and trees are two different species. And
19 the one -- if you've got firs that go down eight, nine
20 feet on pipe, that's not good. I don't know. I think
21 maybe the hazelnut is a shallower root. Maybe that'll
22 get -- if it's a five-foot cover, they can probably
23 get by with that. And if they allow you to do that,
24 they're doing it at their own grace. Because, I mean,
25 DOT could make them remove it. It's at their risk.

1 MR. HAMMELMAN: But it's not their risk;
2 it's my crop that I'm going to lose.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Rodney, do you want to talk
4 about this?

5 MR. GREGORY: Yeah, I wondered if it's okay.

6 My name's Rodney Gregory. I'm the land
7 representative for Williams Northwest Pipeline.

8 The filbert trees are a shallow-rooted tree,
9 so they don't have that effect on pipelines like
10 conifers do. So the fact that the Hammelmans are
11 growing that crop in the vicinity of the pipeline is
12 not a problem for the operation, maintenance or safety
13 of the pipeline.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

15 MS. HAMMELMAN: Bernadette Hammelman.

16 Part of the pipeline proposed goes through a
17 different part of my field. He's referring to a piece
18 of property that he owns. What's my assurance that
19 whatever we choose down the future to plant over this
20 new easement you're requesting, which is not in an
21 existing right-of-way, what -- what kind of
22 protections do I have for whatever I might want to
23 plant there in the future?

24 MR. BROWN: Go ahead, Rodney.

25 MR. GREGORY: Rodney Gregory with Northwest

1 Pipeline.

2 Our new easement agreement is the
3 opportunity for you, as the landowner, to stipulate
4 the things that -- crops that you want to grow. There
5 is no agricultural crop that you could grow there that
6 would have an adverse impact on the pipeline. We may
7 want to negotiate with you on your spacing, so that if
8 you had a deeply-rooted plant, that wouldn't be
9 directly over the center line of the pipeline. But
10 most of our agricultural activities in this vicinity
11 are all acceptable practices in our right-of-way.

12 MS. HAMMELMAN: Would that include a hops
13 field or --

14 MR. GREGORY: That's true. And we want
15 strategically for you to put your poles and the other
16 structures so that they wouldn't be right on the
17 center line of the pipe. But I believe that, you know
18 we could, within our agreement, put some language in
19 there that would protect you from added expenses
20 for -- for the impacts of the pipeline.

21 MS. HAMMELMAN: Okay. So once again, what I
22 need to do as the landowner is to come up with every
23 possible scenario I can think of of what I may do in
24 the next 50 years on that place?

25 MR. GREGORY: If that's what you want to do.

1 I think a general statement would probably take care
2 it. And you know, and we have the land representative
3 here. And I'm sure that, between the two parties,
4 that we could come up with an agreement that would
5 give you the flexibility you need to manage your
6 farming.

7 MS. HAMMELMAN: Okay.

8 MR. BROWN: Now, under William's proposed
9 action here, they're going down 8 feet. So I mean, if
10 something is five foot of cover over top of that pipe
11 and ag, then that's for that purpose, so you can
12 continue to utilize the fields. Generally, it's three
13 feet. So I mean, they're going down an extra two
14 feet. And that's one of the reason why the
15 right-of-way is 110 foot wide, because they've got to
16 have some area where they can put that soil -- that
17 top spoil.

18 MS. HAMMELMAN: But by the same note, that
19 is a big right-of-way. And so as he's saying, he
20 had -- was unaware of that trees were an issue.
21 That's an ag -- you know, for production, it is an ag
22 activity as well. So you know, how do we know what's
23 okay or illegal, I guess?

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: We'll tell you how you know.
25 There's two ways. One is that Northwest has agreed to

1 follow the FERC plan and procedures. And our plan and
2 procedures talk about where trees are not allowed over
3 pipelines. That's clearly stated in our plan and
4 procedures, and that's available on our website.

5 MS. PARSE: We have copies here as well.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: And we have copies here.

7 And the other place it's going to appear is
8 our environmental document is going to have a
9 discussion of this exact issue.

10 MS. HAMMELMAN: Okay.

11 MR. SKILES: So no matter how deep the
12 pipeline is, I cannot grow fir trees over the top of
13 it?

14 MR. BROWN: No.

15 MR. SKILES: Where it crosses my place the
16 pipeline --

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Within 15 feet.

18 MR. BROWN: It can't be over center. You've
19 got to be -- you've got to be -- you can have it
20 adjacent. You can't plant trees over the center line
21 of the pipes. There's 15-foot offset on each side of
22 the pipe, so that's 30 feet.

23 MR. SKILES: Even though the fir trees in
24 this country, their roots only go down, maybe two,
25 three feet?

1 MR. BROWN: Some do; some don't. Some go
2 deeper. So I mean, it's just -- fir trees wouldn't be
3 acceptable. I can tell you that right now.

4 MR. SKILES: Well, what they said at the
5 last meeting was the reason those fir trees got
6 removed from it, because when they were flying the
7 pipeline, they couldn't see down through the canopy.
8 It had nothing to do with the roots -- or that's my
9 interpretation. They were more concerned with
10 obscuring the pipeline than the depth of the tree
11 roots.

12 MR. BROWN: They came back in -- let me see
13 if I understand your question.

14 You're telling me they came back in and
15 removed the trees, because the helicopter couldn't see
16 the center line?

17 MR. SKILES: That's what I was told at the
18 last meeting.

19 MR. BROWN: I find that hard to believe.
20 Whoever told you that, that's not true. We do not
21 allow any trees over the top of the center line. And
22 DOT won't allow it, too. I mean, it's a safety issue.
23 I mean, I can see them coming back in and clearing the
24 trees, because they're not supposed to be here. It
25 might have been a recurring ten-year maintenance that

1 they do, generally, on something like that, going in
2 and remove -- they have the right to remove. Again,
3 it's back to safety.

4 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: In terms of
5 the -- residentially, the supposed pipe is going to
6 the residential areas, and the easement is 15 feet.
7 So the 15 feet can cover the backyard of the
8 residential area; or it has to be, you know,
9 completely off the residential area?

10 MR. BROWN: Even when a pipeline goes
11 through a residential area, you still cannot build any
12 structure up top of the pipeline.

13 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC ONE: Yeah, so -- but
14 that 15 feet --

15 MR. BROWN: That generally applies. But you
16 can go in most neighborhoods, and I can guarantee,
17 you're going to have a deck that's going to be close
18 to it. Stuff happens. Encroachment happens over
19 time. It happens. I've seen it all over the country.
20 So I mean, especially when you get into these
21 neighborhoods where it's really tight. But it's not
22 safe.

23 Are you done where we can bring up the
24 speakers?

25 MS. PARSE: Well, our two speakers, Brian

1 Hammelman and Mr. Skiles, already shared.

2 Mr. Skiles, is that correct? Are there more
3 comments you'd like to make, sir.

4 MR. SKILES: What's that?

5 MS. PARSE: Are there more comments you
6 would like to make.

7 MR. SKILES: No, I think that's --

8 MS. PARSE: Can you go back to the part
9 about the frogs? Can we address that?

10 MR. SKILES: Red-legged frogs in Oregon is a
11 sensitive species. And in this creek -- it's called
12 Cedar Creek that they're going to be trenching
13 through. And then the next little drainage over,
14 which is maybe 200 yards away, there are red-legged
15 frogs in that drainage also. And it seems to me like
16 rather than trenching through this area, they can bore
17 under those. They're going to do it at Rock Creek and
18 whoever -- there's another creek -- Butte Creek, I
19 guess. Why not just go through -- or under these two
20 also? You're going to have the equipment in the area.

21 MR. BROWN: Could you, after the meeting,
22 get with us and let us get an exact location for that?

23 MR. SKILES: Sure.

24 MR. BROWN: And what we'll do is we'll
25 evaluate that in our environmental assessment.

1 Thanks for bringing that up. That's exactly
2 the kind of comment we need to hear. Because you
3 folks live here, and you know this area better than we
4 do. And those are the kind of comments we need.

5 MS. PARSE: Maybe after the meeting we can
6 look at some alignment sheets and see exactly where --

7 MR. SKILES: Okay.

8 MS. PARSE: -- you're referring to.

9 MR. SKILES: Okay.

10 MS. PARSE: Because then maybe we can --
11 these are all things that will be -- as we said, we
12 are going to address in our environmental review
13 process.

14 Is there anybody else that would like to
15 come up to speak? Do the Hammelmans have any more
16 issues they would like to raise?

17 MR. HAMMELMAN: Yes. I guess I am concerned
18 from a safety standpoint, two issues; one, if there's
19 a deterioration of the line above us to the north that
20 was put in at the same time, and what is our security
21 of safety of an existing 16-inch through our
22 properties is my first concern; the second being that
23 there are some sections of the proposed line that are
24 going outside of the existing right-of-way putting two
25 high-pressure lines in different areas. It seems a

1 little dangerous not knowing where the line will be in
2 the future.

3 Right now you can pick two yellow posts
4 across any property and know that the gas line goes
5 between them. When they're in separate easements,
6 right-of-ways, there could be yellow posts in any
7 assortment of patterns, and accidents can happen. And
8 I -- I don't like seeing things that get more
9 complicated and harder to keep track of in the future.

10 MS. PARSE: Does Northwest want to address
11 Mr. Hammelman's concerns with regard to the safety and
12 location of the pipelines?

13 MR. MICHINI: I can address that. This is
14 Al Michini, project manager from Northwest Pipeline.

15 Both the 16-inch and 20-inch are part of our
16 integrity assessment -- our integrity management
17 program. We'll be actively managing the integrity,
18 inspecting the line. We are very aggressive in terms
19 of how we maintain these lines, and we're being -- the
20 whole reason why we're doing this project is it's a
21 proactive step related to our 16-inch through the
22 north. And we will obviously take the same care in
23 monitoring the integrity of the lines in this area
24 where you live.

25 Related to the deviations that we're talking

1 about here, it is simply a matter of trying to balance
2 the interests of the land -- of the various landowners
3 to make sure that we -- we minimize the impact as much
4 as possible in terms of farming and that kind of
5 thing. And that's just the way it worked out. So --

6 MS. HAMMELMAN: May I address that, that
7 last statement of yours? Bernadette Hammelman.

8 If you're concerned about impacting the
9 farms and the landowners, the least -- why is the
10 proposed new easement through one of our places a
11 brand new easement, when we have part of the pipeline
12 currently going through part of that property? That
13 goes smack dab through the middle. There is no
14 easement there now. The existing pipeline does not
15 run that way.

16 MR. MICHINI: Again, it was balancing -- and
17 I believe we're talking about a parcel that is
18 adjacent to some other farm locations. And we're
19 trying to, again, find an acceptable solution for all
20 parties involved in terms of routing this pipeline.

21 MS. HAMMELMAN: What if it's not acceptable
22 to us?

23 MR. MICHINI: I guess we'll have to work
24 through those issues.

25 MS. PARSE: Ms. Hammelman, these -- these

1 are good questions, and that's something we're going
2 to address in the alternative section. So I mean,
3 again, that's part of our environmental review
4 process.

5 MR. BROWN: Let me say -- I don't mean to
6 interrupt you. Let me make sure I understand your
7 question. The existing corridor that the pipeline
8 goes is over here (indicating), let's say, and you're
9 saying the new one is going to go here (indicating) on
10 your property. So what you want us to do is to look
11 at that and see why they don't put that here
12 (indicating) versus over here (indicating)?

13 MS. HAMMELMAN: (Nodding in the
14 affirmative.)

15 MR. BROWN: Okay. We'll do that. We'll
16 look at that as an alternative.

17 MS. HAMMELMAN: Thank you.

18 MS. PARSE: Can I get you to file something
19 in regards to an alternative that you think would be
20 more suitable?

21 MS. HAMMELMAN: I missed the first part.

22 MS. PARSE: Is it possible for me to get you
23 to submit something on record about maybe an
24 alternative that you think would be more suitable?

25 MR. BROWN: Yeah, just a drawing of what you

1 think would be better suited on your property. Let us
2 know that, and we'll look at that, okay?

3 MS. HAMMELMAN: Okay.

4 MR. BROWN: And get it filed as soon as you
5 can.

6 MS. HAMMELMAN: Okay.

7 MS. PARSE: Does anybody else have any more
8 questions or --

9 MRS. SKILES: Has Williams pipeline proved
10 that they actually have to put this through again,
11 that we have to -- I mean, to FERC, have they proved
12 it to FERC that this is really necessary?

13 MR. BROWN: What they've proven to us so far
14 in the application is -- what we have here is we have
15 a safety issue. We have a pipe -- on old -- 1960 year
16 old pipe that's sitting here that's had quite a few
17 problems. And it's a safety issue. So what are we
18 going to do? Are we going to abandon and leave it
19 there, or are we going to keep operating until
20 something maybe happens? So yeah, we're going to look
21 at that. We'll evaluate that also. But I mean --

22 MRS. SKILES: And you'll look at our section
23 where we have that same 50-year old pipe?

24 MR. BROWN: Right. We'll look at that --

25 MRS. SKILES: See, I still don't understand

1 how one section is so bad, and our section isn't.

2 MR. BROWN: A lot of it has to do with the
3 geological stresses and then over time and depending
4 on what the -- how the pipe was put in back then.
5 It's a lot of issues -- a lot of issues that some of
6 your engineers should be able to address.

7 MS. PARSE: So FERC hasn't completed their
8 review, but --

9 MRS. SKILES: It's what?

10 MS. PARSE: FERC has not completed the
11 review.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: But you've raised a question
13 for us to address that.

14 MR. BROWN: Right, so we'll look at that.

15 MR. HAMMELMAN: I don't think my question
16 about the safety -- and it's related directly to her
17 question -- about the safety of the existing 16-inch
18 line, that I think there is a great concern that that
19 old line is, as far as we know, planning to be
20 continuing to be used. And it makes me nervous
21 knowing that it's under the ground on my property, and
22 knowing that a section very short north has been
23 determined that it could no longer be used.

24 MR. BROWN: Did you want to take that?

25 MR. HAMMELMAN: What, sir?

1 MR. BROWN: I'm talking to you --

2 MR. AUBELE: Yeah.

3 MR. BROWN: -- Mr. Aubele.

4 MR. AUBELE: My name's Mike Aubele. I'm the
5 environmental lead for Northwest Pipeline on this
6 project. And I'm not -- I'm not a part of our
7 integrity group, so I can't really address your
8 specific questions. But what -- what Charlie asked,
9 whether that segment through your area has been
10 pigged -- and it hasn't yet. We're in the process
11 right now of putting in a facility -- or we're about
12 to start putting in facilities this year. And then we
13 will running tools through that segment of the
14 16-inch.

15 One thing I can add in terms of some of the
16 stuff that Al was saying and the existing 16 that
17 we're retiring, if you look, we've been investigating
18 that pipeline from -- let me grab the map -- from
19 Oregon City compressor station all the way down to our
20 Molalla meter station here (indicating). You can see
21 we're not abandoning this last couple of miles of
22 pipe, because based on this -- a lot of -- a lot of
23 survey work we've done and integrity assessment --
24 this piece of pipe's okay right now, where there's no
25 reason to abandon it in place.

1 So we're thinking most of the issues -- and
2 again, I want to just say on the record, I'm not an
3 integrity person. But most of the issues we've seen
4 are north of mile post 36, closer to the Oregon City
5 compressor station.

6 MS. HAMMELMAN: Have you actually done an
7 integrity run-through in our area on the 16?

8 MR. AUBELE: No. As I mentioned before,
9 we're putting in those facilities this year. We'll
10 probably be running a tool, I think, at the end of
11 this year, if not next year. I'm not sure what it is.

12 MS. HAMMELMAN: What's the likelihood of
13 that section being abandoned after this other one has
14 come through? And would that just be a replacement,
15 or would they, again, need to run another pipe
16 through?

17 MR. AUBELE: Again, being I'm a natural
18 resource person, I can't really speak to that.

19 MS. HAMMELMAN: Well, it's just a question
20 out there.

21 MR. AUBELE: Right. And we don't have an
22 integrity person here that could probably really
23 address that question. But as I said, we are
24 assessing that. It's part of our integrity management
25 plan, and we'll be looking at that 16-inch under your

1 property. But we don't --

2 MS. HAMMELMAN: And then the question
3 arises, why are we putting in new pipe in our area if
4 the pipeline existing hasn't been examined yet?

5 MR. HAMMELMAN: Why are you not putting a
6 new pipeline in next to the one that you're abandoning
7 rather than putting a new one in -- an extra pipeline
8 that you're continuing to use?

9 MR. AUBELE: I'll just say there's a number
10 of -- there's several reasons for that. But I
11 can't -- speaking here right now, I probably can't
12 address that well enough. But I think that's
13 something that's been requested of us at FERC at some
14 other agency meetings today. So it will be addressed
15 on the record, and it will be evaluated as part of
16 your document.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: In other words, the issues
18 you just raised has also occurred to the FERC staff,
19 and we've raised the exact same issues.

20 MR. HAMMELMAN: So as of now, you have no
21 way of guaranteeing the integrity of the pipe through
22 our property; it has not been assessed from the
23 inside?

24 MR. AUBELE: It has not been assessed from
25 the inside with a -- what we call smart pig. Our

1 operational group has -- continuously does assessment
2 work on that pipe. We just have not run an integrity
3 tool through it; that's correct.

4 MR. MICHINI: We've done various surface
5 assessments of pipeline on the surface of the ground.

6 MR. SKILES: The pig station that was put in
7 on Kropf Road was done last year in the middle of the
8 summer. You just did that as a preliminary move to
9 doing the insert or --

10 MR. AUBELE: That's on the 20-inch pipeline.

11 MR. SKILES: Oh, that's going back up the
12 other way.

13 MR. MICHINI: No. That -- that facility is
14 moving to the end of the 20-inch segment. So right
15 now it's at the end of the 20-inch loop line. It'll
16 be moved to the Marquam Road site to be placed at the
17 end of the 20-inch pipeline segment.

18 MR. FERGUSON: I'm Larry Ferguson. I'm a
19 senior operations engineer for the Eugene district.

20 There's a schedule out that we have to
21 adhere to for all of this pigging. Every inch of pipe
22 or as close to everything that we can possibly pig
23 will be pigged in the next -- what is it, Al, two
24 years, three years?

25 MR. MICHINI: I think the preliminary

1 assessment is by 2012.

2 MR. FERGUSON: Yeah. It will be -- all the
3 facilities will be in, and the pigging will occur for
4 all of the pipelines that we have in the ground and
5 that we're dealing with here.

6 You know, we can't -- we can't say something
7 if we don't have all the data yet. So it's really
8 hard for us to say, you know, yeah, everything appears
9 to be good. We do all of the tests that we're
10 supposed to be doing. We do all the cathodic; we have
11 that on, all the cathodic protection. Everything
12 indicates that it's okay. But that's as far as I can
13 say. It's -- it's all in the works to be done. It's
14 just a matter -- it can't all happen at once.

15 And so that's what we're doing. We're very
16 systematically pigging all of the lines. And that
17 meets the FERC requirements for the pigging of all the
18 lines. And that's the process that we're into.

19 MS. PARSE: And keep in mind, we are at the
20 beginning of the process. These are all great
21 questions. And I encourage you all to pick this up
22 here, this guidance (indicating). You can follow and
23 get emails from FERC for everything that's submitted,
24 your questions. You'll see the requests that we'll
25 have, as we mentioned, some of our data requests, what

1 we call them, where we ask Northwest specifically
2 about alternatives, integrity of the pipe, endangered
3 species.

4 Anything we don't have answers to, we
5 formally submit everything. It goes onto the record.
6 The public can see everything that goes onto the file.
7 And you can see anything they submit to us except for
8 any culturally-sensitive locations.

9 So I encourage you to follow this project
10 online. And everything we see, you will see. That
11 includes from any federal, local or state agencies.

12 MS. HAMMELMAN: That booklet has the
13 information --

14 MS. PARSE: Right here. It shows you how to
15 get on the FERC website.

16 MS. HAMMELMAN: Okay.

17 MS. PARSE: It's described.

18 Okay. Well, I appreciate your questions.
19 If you want to talk with Northwest one on one, I
20 believe we have some representatives here with line
21 sheets that would like to meet with all of you to look
22 at specific areas you were referring to. And we will
23 adjourn.

24 Let the record show that the Molalla
25 Capacity Replacement Project Scoping Meeting in

1 Mt. Angel, Oregon concluded at 7:35 p.m.

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