

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
26

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - -x
IN THE MATTER OF: : Docket Number
JORDAN COVE LIQUEFACTION PROJECT : PF12-7-000
PACIFIC CONNECTOR : PF12-17-000
- - - - -x

Malin Community Park Hall
2307 Front Street
Malin, OR 97632

Thursday, October 11, 2012

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting,
pursuant to notice, at 6:35 p.m., Paul Friedman,
FERC Moderator.

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

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
3 My name is Paul Friedman, and I work for the Federal Energy
4 Regulatory Commission. We sometimes abbreviate that as FERC
5 or the Commission, in Washington, D.C. Here with me tonight
6 is Holly Orr. She is with the U.S. Bureau of Land
7 Management of the Department of the Interior. We abbreviate
8 that as BLM. And Wes Yamamoto works for the U.S. Department
9 of Agriculture Forest Service, the Forest Service or the
10 USFS.

11 The FERC, the BLM and the Forest Service are
12 combined creating an Environmental Impact Statement to look
13 at proposals by two different companies. One proposal is by
14 Jordan Cove. They want to build a liquefied natural gas
15 liquefaction plant in Coos Bay. And the other company is
16 called Pacific Connector. They want to build a pipeline
17 from near here, near Malin, all the way to Coos Bay. So
18 theyve come to the FERC with their proposals during the
19 prefiling process.

20 Jordan Coves docket number is PF12-7. Pacific
21 Connectors docket number is PF12-17. So the BLM, the Forest
22 Service and the FERC are going to look at those
23 applications, and were going to generate an EIS.

24 The purpose of tonights meeting is to take public
25 comments that will shape the scope of our EIS. In other
26

1 words, your scoping comments will draw our attention to
2 issues that are important to the public.

3 As you can see, tonights meeting is being
4 transcribed by a court reporter. The FERC has a contract
5 with Ace Reporting, Inc. we call them Ace. Once they write
6 a transcript, theyre going to transmit it to FERC, and well
7 put it in our public record in the e-library system. Later
8 on, Ill talk about the e-library system. But if you want a
9 copy of that transcript prior to its being placed in the
10 FERC public record, you have to make personal, private
11 arrangements with Ace and pay their prices for the copies.
12 Once it gets into the FERC public record, you can access it
13 on the internet for free.

14 On behalf of the FERC, BLM and the Forest Service,
15 welcome to tonights public scoping meeting about the
16 environmental review process for the Jordan Cove-Pacific
17 Connector projects. The purpose of this meeting is to take
18 public comments about these projects so that we can
19 determine important issues to address during preparations of
20 our EIS. Let the record show that this meeting is starting
21 at Ive got 6:35 p.m. on Thursday, October 11, 2012. We are
22 at the Malin Park Community Center in Malin, Oregon.

23 The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission was created
24 in 1920. For most of its life it was called the Federal
25 Power Commission. Then under the Carter administration, we
26

1 changed our name to the FERC.

2 We are directed by five Commissioners who are
3 appointed by the President of the United States and approved
4 by Congress. Those five political appointees are the
5 decisionmakers, and people like myself are civil servants,
6 staff. What we do is, the staff does make recommendations
7 to the Commissioners prior to their making a decision.

8 Let me introduce other people on my team. We use a
9 multidisciplinary team of scientists to write our
10 environmental documents. Steve Busch, standing back there,
11 is a project engineer for FERC. Hes the assistant project
12 manager on this particular project, and hes an expert on LNG
13 engineering.

14 Way in the back is John Scott. At the sign-in table
15 is Rachel Katz. They work for a company called Tetra Tech.
16 Tetra Tech is our third-party environmental contractor, and
17 we treat our third-party contractor and our cooperating
18 agencies as if they were an extension of the FERC staff.
19 FERC is a very small agency. Were based in one building in
20 Washington, D.C. In order for us to handle large, complex
21 projects like that, we have to hire contractors to help us
22 out.

23 While the FERC is the lead federal agency for these
24 projects, we are not the only agency which must approve the
25 proposals or issue a license or a permit for their
26

1 construction and operation. For example, the BLM will issue
2 a right-of-way grant for the pipeline crossing of federal
3 land, and the Bureau of Reclamation I see them in the front
4 will have to concur with that right-of-way grant, as will
5 the Forest Service.

6 Another group of agencies are cooperating with us in
7 the production of the EIS. They include the aforementioned
8 BLM, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Forest Service.
9 Also the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Army Corps
10 of Engineers, the U.S. Department of Energy, the
11 Environmental Protection Agency, the Coast Guard, and the
12 Department of Transportation.

13 There was a rumor going around earlier that there
14 would be multiple environmental documents produced by
15 different agencies. Thats just not true. As you saw by the
16 list of cooperating agencies, were all in this together.
17 Were going to produce just one EIS for these projects.

18 The FERC, the BLM and the Forest Service are not
19 advocates for these projects. We are not proponents for
20 these projects. We are independent reviewers. The private
21 companies, Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector, theyre the
22 people who are proposing these projects. They came up with
23 the location of the facilities, and they came up with the
24 design for the facilities. The BLM, the Forest Service,
25 FERC and other cooperating agencies will independently
26

1 evaluate the proposals by Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector
2 during the preparation of our EIS.

3 This is the second go-round for both Jordan Cove and
4 Pacific Connector. Previously, Jordan Cove had asked to
5 import LNG, and Pacific Connector was going to take it in
6 the opposite direction: take natural gas from Coos Bay to
7 Malin, eventually to get to the California market.

8 The original Jordan Cove project was CP07-444, and
9 the original Pacific Connector project was FERC Docket No.
10 CP07-441. The Commission authorized those projects on
11 December 17, 2009. However, when the market changed and
12 Jordan Cove said, wait, we dont think theres a need for gas
13 in California any more, especially because of the Ruby
14 pipeline. Maybe well export gas to the Asian markets, and
15 well build an LNG export terminal.

16 So they came to FERC and they asked to enter into
17 our prefiling process. And the Commissioners said, well, if
18 youre not going to import that gas, were going to vacate
19 your orders. And so on April 16, 2012, the Commission
20 vacated the import terminal and the Pacific Connector
21 pipeline.

22 When they vacated that order, they also vacated the
23 administrative record that went with it. So if you have
24 previously submitted comments in Dockets Nos. CP07-441 or
25 CP07-444, those comments can no longer be taken into

26

1 consideration by us in the preparation of this new EIS.
2 However, the Commission in their order also stipulated that
3 the environmental document was not vacated, and in fact can
4 be used for the sections of it that are still applicable.
5 Of course, were going to ask the companies to update the
6 data for the new project.

7 The footprint for the new LNG terminal is basically
8 the same as the import terminal. Likewise, Pacific
9 Connectors pipeline route is basically the same now as it
10 was in the order that was authorized in 2009. Like I said,
11 we produced an EIS on the old project in 2009, and were
12 going to use parts of that that are applicable, plus were
13 going to update all that information in our new EIS.

14 Now Id like to summarize Jordan Cove and Pacific
15 Connectors proposals. These are proposals. They are not
16 authorized.

17 Jordan Cove wants to build a liquefied natural gas,
18 or LNG, export terminal on the North Spit of Coos Bay, Coos
19 County, Oregon. It will include a 7.3 mile-long waterway in
20 Coos Bay, a 0.3 mile mile-long access channel and marine
21 berth; three 16-inch loading arms and one vapor return arm;
22 a 2300-foot, 36-inch diameter cryogenic transfer pipeline
23 connecting the berth to the storage tanks; two 160,000
24 cubic-meter capacity full-containment LNG storage tanks;
25 four liquefaction trains with a capacity of 1.5 million
26

1 metric tons per year; a natural gas conditioning facility
2 consisting of two feed gas and dehydration trains with a
3 combined throughput of a billion cubic feet per day of
4 natural gas; and a 350-megawatt power plant which they call
5 the South Dune Power Plant. Not only will they need FERC
6 permission to build that facility, but they also need
7 permission from the Oregon Energy Facility Siting
8 Commission.

9 Pacific Connector wants to build a 230-mile-long,
10 36-inch diameter pipeline welded steel underground from near
11 Malin to Coos Bay; two meter stations at the interconnection
12 with GTN and Ruby, which are existing pipelines; a new,
13 23,000-horsepower compressor station right next to those
14 meter stations and a meter station at the intersection with
15 the existing Northwest Pipeline system near Myrtle Creek,
16 Douglas County, Oregon; and a meter station at Jordan Cove.

17 Pipeline construction consists of the following
18 activities: clearing and grading, trenching, pipe stringing
19 and welding, lowering in and backfilling, cleanup and
20 restoration. So here are some typical pictures. Thats
21 grading, thats pipestringing, thats welding, thats lowering
22 in, thats a stream crossing, and thats cleanup.

23 Lets talk about whats been done in the past so far
24 in these projects. On February 29, 2012, Jordan Cove
25 requested the initiation of the FERCs prefiling process, and
26

1 we accepted that on March 6. Pacific Connector requested to
2 enter pre-filing on June 4, 2012, and we approved that
3 request on June 8. The intent of our pre-filing process is
4 to encourage early involvement of stakeholders in
5 identifying issues to be resolved before the FERC receives
6 formal applications from the companies.

7 On April 4, 2012, Jordan Cove filed its first Draft
8 Resource Report One, which is a project description, and
9 summary of alternatives. Those resource reports were
10 revised on July 20. Pacific Connector filed its first Draft
11 Resource Report One and summary of alternatives on July 9.

12 The FERC has recently, in cooperation with the
13 Forest Service and the BLM, issued data requests for both
14 Pacific Connectors first two Resource Reports and also
15 Jordan Coves first two Resource Reports. Those reports are
16 in our e-library system, and if you have a computer and
17 internet access, you can see them electronically. And Ill
18 talk about our electronic system later on.

19 To date, Jordan Cove has held open houses in Coos
20 Bay on March 27, and we did an on-site inspection of the LNG
21 terminal, the site; theres nothing there now. From June 25
22 through the 28th, Pacific Connector held open houses in
23 Roseburg, Coos Bay, Klamath Falls and Medford. FERC staff
24 attended the open houses and were available to answer
25 questions from the public at that time. From August 27 to
26

1 the 30th, we held public scoping meetings in Coos Bay,
2 Roseburg, Klamath Falls and Medford, and this meeting is
3 identical to those meetings.

4 The reason were holding more meetings is because the
5 BLM and the Forest Service needed to produce a Notice of
6 Intent in the Federal Register. That came out on September
7 21st, and there are certain requirements about doing public
8 meetings within a certain time period after such a notice.

9 This is our prefiling environmental review process.
10 Some member of the public last night pointed out something
11 to me. At the very bottom, where it says FERC makes the
12 decision and authorizes construction, another option which
13 should have been on there is, of course, at that point, when
14 the Commission makes its decision, it could deny the
15 project. The graphic just doesnt show that.

16 This slide illustrates where we are in the prefiling
17 and review process. We are in the beginning at the scoping
18 process, toward the end of that. The scoping period will
19 end October 29, 2012. Even after scoping closes, we will
20 continue to take public comments on the record all the way
21 until we write the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

22 Other places in the process where the public has the
23 opportunity to comment is, one, when the companies file
24 their application when we issue a notice, and the public has
25 an opportunity to respond to those notices of applications;

26

1 and two, once we issue the Draft Environmental Impact
2 Statement, well be taking comments on that, In fact, well
3 do another round of public meetings, so I get to have the
4 opportunity to come back to Malin.

5 If you want to submit comments, I urge you to do so
6 through the proper channels. The FERC Notice of Intent had
7 a section on public participation that gave instructions on
8 how to file comments into the record. Please do not send
9 e-mails to staff. Those e-mails will not get in the public
10 record. Instead, although we have had complaints from the
11 public that some people find the FERC process difficult to
12 use, my own opinion is its as simple as writing a letter.
13 If you write a letter, address it to the Secretary of the
14 Commission at 888 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20426.
15 If youre really good with the computer and you have an
16 internet connection, you can go to our website at
17 www.ferc.gov, click on documents and filings, click on
18 e-filings, and you can do either an e-comment or e-filing.
19 There are different ways to do it, and if you have trouble
20 with that, you can call this number on the bottom, where it
21 says, call FERC support line. Theyll walk you through their
22 system.

23 Our process is open and transparent. All documents
24 that are in the public record are available through the
25 internet in our public record, which we call our e-library
26

1 system. Again, you go to www.ferc.gov, you click on
2 documents and filings, you click on e-library, you put in
3 the date range you want to look at, you put in the docket
4 numbers, and you can see everything in the public record.

5 In addition to that, you can be notified
6 electronically via e-mail of every filing ever made in this
7 docket. You can follow along electronically on your
8 computer. Simply go through the same process: www.ferc.gov,
9 click on documents and filings, go to e-subscription and
10 follow the instructions. If you have trouble, call our
11 information technology staff. Theyll be very helpful.

12 In all correspondence, whether electronic or
13 written, please make sure you get the docket numbers in
14 there. Again, Jordan Cove is PF12-7, Pacific Connector
15 PF12-17, although its misspelled on the slide.

16 Once we issue our draft EIS, were going to send it
17 out as a compact disc, a CD, and well be sending it to our
18 environmental mailing list, which includes elected
19 officials; federal, state and local government agencies,
20 landowners, environmental groups, non-environmental
21 organizations, interested Indian tribes, local libraries and
22 newspapers, and other interested parties.

23 During prefiling, our regulations say that within 60
24 days of the end of scoping remember that scoping ends
25 October 29 the companies must file individual Resource
26

1 Reports. Our regulations for what those resource reports
2 must contain are outlined in our regulations at 18 CFR 380.
3 The Resource Reports were going to get are: general project
4 description, water use and quality; fish, wildlife and
5 vegetation; cultural resources; socioeconomics; geological
6 resources; soils, land use; air and noise quality; safety
7 and reliability; number 12 we never see; and 13, LNG plant
8 design. Except for number 13, which usually has privileged
9 information not open to the public, all those other Resource
10 Reports are on e-library. They're available to the public,
11 and the public may comment on them.

12 Once the FERC believes that the data are complete
13 enough, we will allow Pacific Connector and Jordan Cove to
14 file their formal applications with us. At that time, the
15 FERC will issue a Notice of Application. The application
16 must include the final Resource Reports, and then FERC staff
17 and cooperating agencies will review those applications for
18 completeness and issue data requests as necessary to fill
19 data gaps.

20 In response to the Notice of Application,
21 individuals or organizations may file a request to be an
22 intervenor. An intervenor is a legal position. Intervenors
23 are allowed to seek rehearing on Commission decisions.
24 However, they also have the burden of having to provide
25 copies of all their filings to other parties in the
26

1 proceeding. However, you do not have to be an intervenor to
2 have your environmental comments considered in the
3 production of our EIS.

4 Also, we will not accept intervenors during
5 prefiling. You must wait till the applications are filed.

6 Based on the applications and our own research, the
7 FERC staff and cooperating agencies will produce an EIS in
8 accordance with the regulations of the Council of
9 Environmental Quality, CEQ, at Title 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508
10 to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental
11 Policy Act. The EIS will offer an independent analysis of
12 the potential environmental impacts of the proposals and
13 alternatives. Generally the EIS will discuss the current
14 environment, identify potential project-related impacts on
15 specific resources, and present proposed measures to avoid,
16 reduce or mitigate adverse effects.

17 In past public scoping meetings, members of the
18 public have brought up issues that are outside of the
19 jurisdiction of the Forest Service, the BLM or the FERC.
20 We call those out-of-scope comments. We do not have to
21 address issues that are not part of the undertaking. So,
22 issues that are not part of the actions of the BLM and the
23 FERC will not be addressed in the EIS,. We call these
24 out-of-scope comments, and some examples of those are people
25 talking about whether or not they like the idea of exporting
26

1 American natural gas as LNG, and they are concerned about
2 whether the export of LNG will affect domestic natural gas
3 prices.

4 The decision on whether or not to allow Jordan Cove
5 to export LNG is made by the U.S. Department of Energy, not
6 by the FERC, and our NOI clearly stated that. So if you'd
7 like to comment on the issue of LNG export, please do so in
8 a letter to the U.S. Department of Energy, not to the FERC,
9 the BLM or the Forest Service.

10 The other issue people get very excited about is
11 something they call fracking. Fracking is the hydraulic
12 fracturing during drilling of natural gas wells in certain
13 shale formations. The truth is that the FERC, nor BLM nor
14 the Forest Service, we do not regulate the production,
15 drilling or gathering of natural gas. Those are regulated
16 in most cases by the states. So therefore, since we don't
17 regulate that activity, it is out of scope and will not be
18 addressed in the EIS.

19 The BLM and the Forest Service can adopt our EIS
20 before they make the decision on whether or not to grant a
21 right-of-way to Pacific Connector. Now to talk about the
22 BLM and Forest Service process is Holly Orr.

23 MS. ORR: Hello, everyone. This may look funny, but
24 this was just for the court reporter.

25 My name is Holly Orr. I live in Burns, Oregon, and
26

1 I work for the Bureau of Land Management. Im the project
2 coordinator. Ive been working on the project since January.
3 Wes Yamamoto has been working on this project since 2006.
4 Hes my Forest Service counterpart, and is out of Tiller
5 Ranger District. And then up front, we have the Bureau of
6 Reclamation, the Klamath Project Office, and Sarah and
7 Elizabeth will be here following the meeting if you have
8 questions.

9 Plus, we have a contractor thats doing all of our
10 analysis and helping us with the EIS. Theyre called North
11 State Resources, and we have Paul Uncapher in the back. All
12 of the maps that youre going to see in my section here,
13 forward to just beyond here, are printed in the back. So
14 when were done, you can go back and take a look at the
15 things we have to do at the BLM and Forest Service for land
16 use planning amendments. Reclamation doesnt have a
17 land-use plan amendment, but they are involved in our
18 right-of-way grant, so Ill be going over that.

19 As Paul mentioned, the FERC is the agency that
20 decides whether or not to issue or approve, authorize the
21 pipeline. And because they are the lead federal agency,
22 theyre also the lead for the environmental analysis. But it
23 does also affect federal lands, and that federal land is the
24 BLM, Forest Service and Reclamation. So were what is called
25 the cooperating agencies.

26

1 The other reason why is, FERC doesnt have authority
2 to go out and issue a right-of-way grant to cross federal
3 lands. So the authority for that comes from whats called
4 the Mineral Leasing Act, and the Bureau of Land Management
5 has the lead to issue one right-of-way grant that covers
6 BLM, Forest Service and Reclamation projects.

7 So therell be one right-of-way grant. And that
8 right-of-way grant, then, we have to give the companies the
9 stipulations that theyll have to follow to be on federal
10 lands. In addition to that, Ill get into mitigation, and
11 Ill also get into our land-use planning.

12 There are essentially seven land-use management
13 plans between the BLM and the Forest Service that well have
14 to amend to come into compliance and be able to issue a
15 right-of-way grant if the pipeline is authorized by FERC.
16 And then FERC, under the 2005 Energy Policy Act, as the
17 lead, that policy requires us to follow FERC as the lead and
18 follow their schedule. FERC, BLM and the Forest Services
19 processes dont usually match up. So if youre used to
20 working with the BLM, Forest Service, Reclamation locally,
21 and you know the processes that go there, you may see a
22 different process under FERC. So if its kind of confusing,
23 you can ask your local BLM, Reclamation, Forest Service, and
24 well let you know where were at in our schedules.

25 So the BLM manage the private lands, the Forest
26

1 Service the National Forest Service lands, and Reclamation
2 has got the Klamath Project lands. We will be issuing the
3 right-of-way grant, only one, and then the Forest Service
4 and Reclamation will have to do what's called the Letter of
5 Concurrence; that everything that they need to cover their
6 lands is included in our document. These agencies have been
7 involved since 2006. The local plant contact here, Kristin
8 is the main lead for the office.

9 What we're doing is essentially responding to a
10 right-of-way application. It's no different than if a
11 person from the public came in and wanted a right-of-way for
12 a road to their house or a telephone line or a power line to
13 their place. Essentially it's the same process.

14 An application comes in, and with that application
15 we require a plan of development for federal lands that has
16 been submitted through the company. It involves 28 plans.
17 Those plans tell us all kinds of things: right-of-way
18 marking, right-of-way clearing, recreation, burning so that
19 is about how they will work and be authorized to work on
20 federal lands. It will become part of the Draft
21 Environmental Impact Statement, and you will have an
22 opportunity to look at that and make comments on it.

23 In addition to that, the other thing that has
24 happened is, when the right-of-way grant is issued, you will
25 see that any terms and conditions and stipulations that the
26

1 company has to do to comply with the regulations on federal
2 lands will have to be identified. In addition to that, its
3 called the mitigation package. Any time theres an effect to
4 landand the easy way to talk about it is, like wetlands,
5 there is a rule that says if youre going to lose wetlands,
6 you have to compensate with just as many wetlands. If you
7 lost five acres of wetlands, then you would have to
8 compensate by purchasing five acres of wetlands. So were
9 going to get into that, talk about the language, and then
10 how that applies to our lands.

11 One of the questions everybody asks is, why are you
12 amending your plans to allow a project? When we write a
13 resource management plan, for those of you who are familiar,
14 we usually have those in place for anywhere from 10 to 20,
15 sometimes up to 25 years. We cant consider when we first
16 write the resource management plan absolutely everything
17 that will come walking in our door. A good example is, like
18 in the Burns district, we had talked about energy, but we
19 had never talked about wind energy. So when the first wind
20 application came in, we had to look at wind when we were
21 reviewing the right-of-way application.

22 In this particular case, the BLM and the Forest
23 Service, Reclamation when they put out those resource
24 management plans, they had to consider a large pipeline
25 going through the forest or through the federal lands, the
26

1 BLM lands. So thats why we have to look at concurrence.
2 Thats what well be doing and analyzing as part of this DEIS.
3 So right now, the BLM as it stands cannot issue a
4 right-of-way grant to the company without doing land use
5 plan amendments.

6 One of the other things, and Ill follow up on this:
7 people that are not used to resource management plans on
8 federal lands may be also used to, like, county variances in
9 the zoning. A resource management plan is a lot like that.
10 Your county zoning order that says that its only established
11 for this, and somebody wants to do something different with
12 that plan, they go to the county and they apply to change
13 the county zoning. So thats a similar process to the
14 county, if youre familiar with that.

15 Again, the Reclamation doesnt have to look at the
16 land use plan amendment. They are already in compliance.

17 So the land use plan amendments that the BLM and the
18 Forest Service have to do, theres a couple that are common
19 to both of us. Reallocation of matrix lands to late
20 secessional reserves. So matrix lands on the west side are
21 called OCB, or Oregon-Coos Bay they are made specifically
22 for timber, for harvesting, and for those revenues that will
23 each go back into those counties.

24 Then we have late secessional reserves which thats
25 the oldgrowth, and thats the habitat for the spotted owl and
26

1 other species that require late secessional or oldgrowth
2 timber. Coos Bay, Roseburg districts, and the Umpqua and
3 Rogue River National Forests, were looking at places where
4 the pipeline comes through and they have to cut the timber.
5 And if it crosses across LSR or oldgrowth, how are we going
6 to compensate for that?

7 And so, in the past, one of the things that weve
8 done is, weve had companies go out and buy more oldgrowth.
9 As the years have gone on, the opportunity for us buying
10 private oldgrowth has reduced. And in addition to that,
11 when we look at our management plan, we have essentially a
12 lot of oldgrowth, and then right in the middle of the
13 oldgrowth may be some land that is considered harvestable or
14 matrix.

15 So one of the things that were looking at doing is
16 reallocating that harvest land thats in the middle of
17 oldgrowth to be oldgrowth, and make it a more complete bloc,
18 and then have the company go out and instead of buying
19 oldgrowth, theyll buy new harvest and timberlands that is
20 more readily available on the open market. So that
21 reallocation of matrix lands to oldgrowth or LSR is common
22 to both BLM and the Forest Service, and I will be showing
23 slides that try to identify those parcels.

24 Then there are specific waivers of management that
25 concerns what are called Survey and Manage EPs. On the BLM
26

1 side, that applies to all of our offices in Coos Bay,
2 Roseburg, Medford and our Klamath Falls resource area which
3 is managed by the Lakeview District. And the Forest, its
4 the Umpqua, the Rogue River and the Winema National Forest.
5 Ill show copies of maps.

6 So this one here and again, I know its hard to see,
7 but we have bigger maps in the back when you see the blue
8 land there, thats essentially BLM lands on Coos Bay that is
9 currently identified in our resource management plan as LSR
10 or oldgrowth and habitat. So the pipeline is the red, and
11 then the yellow are the matrix plans, and so somebody could
12 come in and harvest those yellow pieces.

13 What were talking about doing, as part of land use
14 plan amendments and analyzing, is the conversion of that
15 yellow to blue, and then having a backfill by going out and
16 buying more harvest land thats not connected with the
17 oldgrowth. So this is a map of where we would be proposing
18 that in the Coos Bay BLM district, and these are the pieces
19 that were looking at doing in the Roseburg BLM office.
20 Again, these maps are located in the back, and we will be
21 back there to answer questions following this.

22 In addition, this power point slide is available on
23 the FERC website. So you can always go to the FERC website
24 and get copies of this.

25 The Umpqua National Forest and their reallocation
26

1 they dont have the checkerboard lands. If you take a look
2 at the project as a whole in the back, youll see that a lot
3 of the BLM lands on the west side are checkerboard, whereas
4 the Forest Service is more old. And so in this location, we
5 have the Umpqua National Forest, and the blue lands are
6 lands that are currently managed LSR, and the yellow are
7 currently managed as harvestable. And theyd be looking at
8 converting that yellow piece, which is about 600 acres, into
9 LSR, and then having the company go back out and backfill
10 that, buying an additional 600 acres for harvestable timber.

11 This is a copy of the Rogue River National Forest,
12 which is not quite 600 acres. In this case, it is 512 acres
13 thats being proposed.

14 In addition to these commonalities, we also have
15 site-specific amendments to just BLM and to the Forest
16 Service. On the BLM side, we have a site exemption thats
17 requirements for the protection of Marbled Murrelet Habitat
18 in the Coos Bay and the Roseburg districts. And for the
19 Roseburg district, we also have a site-specific exemption to
20 the requirements to retain habitat in Known Owl Activity
21 Centers. So go over and look at the maps.

22 This is essentially the map that shows this. The
23 Coos Bay and the Roseburg districts, to waive the protection
24 of the existing or proposed MAMU Habitat within one-half
25 mile of any of the occupied sites. And those are our
26

1 beautiful the darker brown or checkerboard lands over on
2 the left side.

3 In the Roseburg district, the KOAC is Known Owl
4 Activity Centers. Those three locations that you see
5 identified better on the larger map would be those areas
6 that wed have to do an amendment for.

7 The Forest Service has several site-specific land
8 use plan amendments that they will have to do in all three
9 of their forests. Visual quality objectives: currently, the
10 land use plans are not compliant, and so there are three
11 locations on the Rogue River National Forest, which Ill show
12 you on a map, and three locations in the Winema National
13 Forest, where visual quality objectives will have to have
14 land use plan amendments.

15 And then, the threshold for soil disturbance within
16 the actual right-of-way grant area on all three of the units
17 Rogue River, Winema and Umpqua. I have a map which shows
18 the utility corridors in the Riparian Areas, the shaded
19 areas. In the Umpqua National Forest theres two
20 amendments, and one amendment in the Rogue River.

21 And the final one is the Rogue River National
22 Forest in their land use plan did not provide for energy
23 transmission. So therell be an amendment for that.

24 So when you look at this map, youll see the proposed
25 line, and the proposed line is in the red. And youll see
26

1 the aerial shot of the timber. There's also the blue lines,
2 and this is essentially where there will be a removal of
3 shade on those perennial streams and the corridors within
4 the Riparian Area. So we have to do an analysis of that
5 effect.

6 In this, you're looking at the Rogue River National
7 Forest, and these site-specific amendments. There'll be two
8 of them, on Highway 40, one at Big Elk Road, one at Middle
9 Butte Creek crossing. And the last one, we can see it on
10 the map, at PCT that's Pacific Crest Trail.

11 In the Winema National Forest, the site-specific
12 amendments, those are located along the utility corridor,
13 the Dead Mountain Memorial Highway and over at Silver Creek
14 Road. And these are the ones that are site-specific
15 amendments to the visual quality objectives.

16 When announcements first came out on August 13, only
17 by FERC, what happened was that we also needed to put a
18 notice out under the Federal Register Notice for BLM and for
19 the Forest Service. We did not get that published until
20 September 21, and what essentially that did was extend our
21 comment period for our study. And FERC matched that
22 extension in the new scoping period. The closing period is
23 October 29.

24 With that, I think I'll turn it back over to Paul to
25 talk about the remaining FERC part.

26

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Holly.

2 Once weve reviewed the applications, well determine
3 that we have enough information to fully understand the
4 environmental impacts of the projects, and well issue a
5 Notice of Schedule. What that letter of schedule does, in
6 accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005, it notifies
7 other federal agencies that they have to issue their permits
8 or approvals within 90 days after the FERC releases the
9 final EIS.

10 A draft EIS will be published for public review and
11 comment. There will be a 90-day comment period on the DEIS.
12 The FERC will hold public meetings here in Oregon to take
13 verbal comments on the DEIS. We will address comments on
14 the draft in our final EIS.

15 The EIS is not a decision document. It would be
16 prepared to advise the Commissioners and to disclose to the
17 public the environmental impacts associated with
18 constructing and operating these projects. The
19 Commissioners would consider our environmental analysis
20 together with other staffs material pertaining to
21 non-environmental issues before making an informed decision
22 about the projects.

23 The Commissioners have the option of accepting the
24 proposals in whole or in part, approving the proposals with
25 or without conditions, or denying the applications

26

1 altogether. The final decision by the Commission is issued
2 as an order.

3 If the Commission decides to authorize the projects,
4 the FERC staff will make certain that the environmental
5 conditions appended to the order are satisfied. Those
6 conditions usually include stipulations that the companies
7 obtain all other necessary federal and state permits and
8 authorizations prior to construction.

9 The companies must implement all of the measures
10 they committed to in their applications and mitigation
11 programs as proposed. FERC staff and our contractor will
12 monitor the projects through construction, restoration, and
13 the completion of the mitigation programs, and will perform
14 on-site inspections for compliance with the environmental
15 conditions of the order. The BLM and the Forest Service, of
16 course, will also monitor activities on lands that they
17 manage.

18 John, do you have the speakers list? Okay. Does
19 everyone who wants to speak tonight, have you all signed in
20 to the speakers list? All right.

21 (Recess.)

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Now is the time for public comments.

23 Let me emphasize at this time that our scoping
24 meeting tonight is not a hearing on the merits of the
25 proposals. Other Commission staff will consider the
26

1 economic need for these projects and the rates to be charged
2 for services.

3 As I said earlier, this meeting provides you, the
4 public, an opportunity to comment on the types of
5 environmental issues that you would like to see covered in
6 the EIS. The more specific your comments are about
7 potential environmental impacts, the more useful they will
8 be to the FERC staff to focus our attention to important
9 issues in the EIS.

10 This is not a question and answer session. I am
11 here to listen to your comments. We will address all
12 comments raised during the scoping in our EIS after we have
13 conducted the appropriate research.

14 I will call on the speakers one at a time in they
15 order they have signed up. I ask that each speaker come up
16 to the podium, which has this microphone. I ask you to
17 clearly speak your name and spell it for the court reporter.
18 And to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to speak,
19 I'd like you to keep your comments within a five-minute span.
20 If you have more extensive comments, please submit them in
21 writing or electronically to the FERC, as has been discussed
22 earlier, through our e-filing system.

23 If I can't pronounce your name or I can't read your
24 writing, you'll have to come to the desk. Is it

25 MR. EMERY: Richard Emery.

26

1 Hi. Im Richard Emery from Silver Lake, Oregon,
2 E-m-e-r-y. Im a resident of Lake County. Been in this
3 country all my life and on a lot of these pipelines and
4 construction jobs, I was previously on Ruby, and I notice
5 this pipeline crosses a huge amount of great agricultural
6 land, and Im just a little concerned about that.

7 I know that the pipeline has been real good in the
8 past about going above and beyond and taking care of private
9 land -- so thats what Im here concerned about, private land.
10 Thats all I have to say.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

12 Lillian Wata? If I mispronounce your name, please
13 correct me.

14 MS. WATA: Were wondering if -- the Klamath Tribe
15 is wondering if we would get some cooperation as far as
16 helping with our cultural sites. We had a lot of damage to
17 our cultural sites on the pipeline, and we wanted to know if
18 they would have or we could have on and off mitigation on
19 the right-of-way highway and agreement for monitors. Also
20 protecting our cultural sites.

21 Thats some of the questions that we have.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Thank you for your
23 comments.

24 Next is Penny Terry.

25 MS. TERRY: My name is Penny Terry, P-e-n-n-y

26

1 T-e-r-r-y. My husband and I have owned property at 33909
2 Malin Loop Road in Malin, Oregon since 1996. Our property
3 surrounds the existing Malin metering station. We have 60
4 acres of pasture thats not irrigated. We use the pasture to
5 winter cattle.

6 My understanding is that a large section of our
7 property is being considered as the site of a compressor
8 station. More of our property would be used for the
9 pipeline as the beginning of the Pacific Connector pipeline
10 starts about Coos Bay, Oregon to the LNG station. We
11 already have Ruby Pipeline, a TransCanada pipeline, on our
12 property.

13 My husband and I believe the existing pipeline has
14 caused a reduction in our property values. We worked hard
15 to make our old house a home, and have made improvements to
16 our property since we purchased it. We have concerns about
17 what would happen to our property value; concerning about
18 the Connector pipeline project and compressor station.

19 My feeling is that this project will probably be
20 approved. Therefore I would like to address some other
21 concerns I have about the project.

22 Weve had problems with the Malin metering station
23 and the extremely bright security lights they use to leave
24 on it. It was like living next door to a ball field, with
25 bright lights on at night. The lights were not only very
26

1 annoying, but the lights were like a very bright locator for
2 possible terrorists.

3 After speaking with the employees working at the
4 metering station during the day, they were kind enough to
5 cut back on the security lights. My husband and I
6 understand that there may be times when maintenance occurs
7 during the night hours and the lights would be necessary for
8 work crews.

9 I would like to suggest that the Pacific Connector
10 Pipeline project should explain what type of lighting would
11 be used at the site. I would hope they would consider the
12 bright security lights would not be appreciated, and that
13 some type of hooded or shielded lights should be considered,
14 and very few of those.

15 We are very concerned about the noise pollution, and
16 what type of tests will be conducted, with consideration for
17 neighbors. I believe theres been a suggestion for a natural
18 barrier to hide the view of the compressor station from
19 neighbors; that would mean some type of water source would
20 need to be considered.

21 I would suggest that the neighbors of the compressor
22 station are included in the decisions about what type of
23 trees or landscaping would be planned concerning their view.
24 Who would be in charge of making sure the natural barrier
25 would be cared for in years to come, or in the case of
26

1 another company buying out the compressor station and
2 pipeline?

3 I would also like to suggest that they leave as many
4 of the existing trees that are currently on the property.
5 Most of the trees on my property are juniper trees.

6 There's a short section of Moreluck Road which should
7 be paved by the pipeline company. The dust is very bad as
8 it is. I believe the road would be used heavily during the
9 construction of the pipeline, and oiling the road is simply
10 not enough. After construction is completed, the dust would
11 continue to be a problem if the road is not paved.

12 What type of fencing would be used around the
13 facility? If the area around the compressor station is
14 fenced with cyclone fencing, it should have something added
15 to the fencing to hide as much of the facility as possible.

16 Thank you very much for making the extra effort to
17 come to Malin in order to allow people of the community to
18 voice concerns about the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

20 Wanda Baker?

21 MS. BAKER: Wanda, W-a-n-d-a; Baker, B-a-k-e-r.

22 My main thing about this is that I'm around 79 or 78
23 I don't remember now in North Rural Route in Myrtle Creek,
24 Oregon. My impact is the washing away of the land with this
25 big drain that we have in that area. You from Tiller should
26

1 know what Im talking about, and from Vester. And that
2 vegetation, that could cause a lot of things to happen, such
3 as clogging our springs that people have their established
4 homes, streams, creeks and rivers. A lot of silt and debris
5 goes down.

6 I also am a little concerned about the creek and
7 river crossings, and I would like to know if theres going to
8 be a great chance of these washing, which I know happens, or
9 causing extensive washing on our banks. We cant just put
10 grass back on there. Some of these streams in this area
11 move exceedingly and move a lot of water, a great volume.

12 It would also cause the banks to be eroded for our
13 farmland, and also for our homes.

14 The compacting of the farm ground: with these people
15 working on there with the big machinery and so forth, its
16 going to cause a disruption with not only our top soil, and
17 for the future of our small farms. This to me, when youve
18 got a field and theres a chance that it might be a staging
19 area, it could cause a lot of problems in that sense.

20 The negative impact of the reduced property value,
21 of course, I think, is a possible wipeout of salability of
22 that future.

23 The safety concerns I have is the ability of any
24 kind of response that could be made in a timely manner.

25 That could also cause the forest to burn. It could cause
26

1 our homes to burn. Also, just being relatively close were
2 like 100 yards away from the proposed site, approximately
3 there; Im not real great on yardage, but somewhere like
4 that. And thats personal safety.

5 I think we do need natural gas in America, but I do
6 not feel that it needs to be the expense of our private
7 landowners. I would like to see it be more on public land
8 or BLM, federal land of that sort. I realize it cant all
9 be, but please try and keep it in there. Thank you.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

11 Clifton Smith?

12 MR. SMITH: Good evening. Clifton Smith,
13 C-l-i-f-t-o-n S-m-i-t-h. Im a resident of Klamath County
14 and a property owner in Douglas County.

15 I support this job, obviously, for the thousands of
16 good-paying jobs it will provide. But I also support this
17 project for the positive growth that it will provide for
18 decades to come.

19 The world is running out of crude oil. All the
20 experts predict there will be a global shortage some time in
21 the near future. We have to develop our natural gas
22 resources.

23 North America has a 100-year supply of natural gas
24 that we need to tap into. The Rogue Valley and Umpqua Basin
25 have a limited supply of natural gas right now. Theres no
26

1 room for expansion or growth. Businesses are being turned
2 away from that area because of the lack of supply.

3 The Pacific Connector could cure this problem in
4 supplying an unlimited supply of clean and cheap fuel. It
5 would open the door to growth for businesses and industry.
6 Everyone in Oregon cant make a living being a hobby farmer
7 or selling fishing tackle to tourists, as Ive heard. We
8 need living wage jobs. I believe this project would help
9 supply this.

10 I would rather have a natural gas pipeline in my
11 back yard than a windfarm or solar farm. Wind turbines are
12 being built in this state in some of the most scenic and
13 pristine areas, and they are a scar on the landscape
14 forever. So is solar, which is clean and a good energy
15 source, but it permanently scars the landscape. Like all
16 the solar farms theres one being finished in Christmas
17 Valley right now. This land cant be used for anything else
18 while these energy farms are there.

19 In this decade, we will see the majority of semi
20 trucks and railroad locomotives switch over to natural gas
21 from petroleum. This is the fuel of the future, and we need
22 to deviate from our use of petroleum products and start
23 building our infrastructure for natural gas.

24 I sympathize with the property owners that have
25 issues with this project, and their concerns do need to be
26

1 dealt with to their satisfaction. The environmental
2 concerns will be met on this project using state-of-the-art
3 construction methods, and the people who will build this
4 project are the experts in their field.

5 Id like to see Oregon lead the nation in converting
6 from petroleum to natural gas. We need to build this
7 project, and I believe it is good for Oregon and good for
8 this country.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

10 Dan Bailey?

11 MR. BAILEY: Im Dan Bailey, president of Southern
12 Oregon Building Trades; D-a-n B-a-i-l-e-y.

13 I guess a lot of questions were asked: why are the
14 unions so involved with this? What we have found is that a
15 lot of these projects like this have gone non-union in some
16 states that the states dont have the resources to build
17 those type of projects, and a lot of people come in from out
18 of state to build them. So all those wages are leaving that
19 state and going back to help their economy in their own
20 state.

21 By joining with these companies in the state of
22 Oregon to build this, were allowing more Oregonians to go to
23 work and do these projects, and keep that money in our
24 economy and not go somewhere else. We have an ageing work
25 force; this is going to help us train new trainees through
26

1 apprenticeship programs for these projects, and help
2 training the work force for later on as well.

3 I very much support this project. We understand the
4 concerns of everyone, and we hope theyre all addressed. If
5 this project is built, well be proud to build it for you.
6 Thank you.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

8 Dennis Coplin?

9 MR. COPLIN: Good evening. My name is Dennis
10 Coplin, D-e-n-n-i-s C-o-p-l-i-n. Im the director for
11 political and legislative affairs person for Local 290,
12 Plumbers and Pipefitters Division of the United Association.

13 The United Association has a membership containing
14 welders, pipefitters, people who do these pipelines. We
15 have over 340,000 members across the United States, Canada.

16 We have members. Now, some people brought up the
17 point that a lot of this work would be done by people out of
18 state. Thats because of a national agreement that we have
19 with the people whod be laying pipeline in Oklahoma. That
20 is a union that is also a United Association Union members.
21 We have this agreement. We will be providing people.

22 Nobody in the United States has a group capable of,
23 by themselves, a local, to put in a pipeline such as the one
24 thats being proposed. Theres just too many people that are
25 going to be working on it.

26

1 Now, bless her heart, I had a sweet little old lady
2 at two of these meetings actually get up and at the
3 following meeting got up and said that shed heard from
4 somebody that this was all going to be done by five or six
5 people. Now, if we could find a contractor that could do it
6 with five or six people, they would be very happy. This is
7 going to involve 800 or 1,000, just pipefitters, welders,
8 people like that.

9 Its going to involve people who are going to be in
10 the construction phase, operating engineers. Theyre going
11 to be operating the heavy equipment. Well have safety, well
12 have fire, well have people here that are going to be
13 supporting this economy, from this area. And albeit we will
14 have people coming into this state from out of state, the
15 wages that they earn will be taxed on Oregon income. They
16 will be contributing to this economy.

17 So were looking at creating a lot of jobs. We want
18 to see this come into this area. Were talking about a lot
19 of jobs just in the manufacturing or construction of the
20 facilities at Jordan Cove as well as the Cogen facility, the
21 pipeline. Were talking about mammoth hours. Were not
22 talking about 10,000 or 8,000 man-hours. Were talking 8,000
23 to 10,000 man-years in wages. A year is 2,000 hours. So 8-
24 to 10,000 man-years is a lot.

25 We are environmentalists. We enjoy the outdoors.

26

1 We hunt. We fish. We belong to clubs. We sympathize I
2 was raised on a dairy farm, so I understand the need to make
3 sure that we do this as safely and as efficiently as
4 possible, with the least amount of infrastructure.

5 In closing, our construction enters your life. Why?
6 Because its going to happen. It has to happen to be done.
7 There is no job that would ever be done in the United
8 States, or the world for that matter, if some form of
9 eminent domain was not used. You have to do it. You cant
10 think of a road, a bridge, a highway, an airport or any
11 other construction facility that wouldnt be done without
12 impacting somebodys life. You have to understand that, and
13 we understand it. We empathize with you. But understand
14 that it will be taken care of as best as we can truly do.
15 When were on these jobs, were not going to be out there
16 trying to ruin your environment for the sake of the
17 paycheck. Thats not what were about.

18 All I can say is, we want to see this project go
19 through, but we want to see that youre taken care of as
20 efficiently, as safely and with as least amount of impact as
21 possible. Its going to happen. If this project goes
22 through, it will have some impact on the environment. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

25 Rafael Hernandez?

26

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: My name is Rafael Hernandez,
2 R-a-f-a-e-l H-e-r-n-a-n-d-e-z. Im county assessor, and Im
3 here asking first of all, my sentiments go out to all the
4 private owners who may have cultural sites.

5 My statement, more like a question, is: depending
6 on what code areas this pipeline goes through, there might
7 not be a fire district that you will pay into as far as
8 property taxes. Will there be some type of an agreement
9 that with a global fire district or fire department that you
10 could work together? I know that with Ruby Pipeline, that
11 has been answered; that Ruby Pipeline doesnt pay any of the
12 fire districts. But I would imagine that if there was a
13 fire out there, they would be glad to respond. But theyre
14 not getting any of the tax dollars.

15 So thats, as I said, more of a question. Has that
16 topic been addressed; and also, what type of hazards do you
17 think Klamath County districts will be receiving? Thank
18 you.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

20 Like I said, Im not going to address questions now.
21 There were questions from the Klamath Tribe and questions
22 from the Klamath County Assessor. We will address those
23 comments in our EIS, so at that time youll be able to read
24 where it is in research, and to find out the answers to your
25 questions, and addressed in the EIS.

26

1 Thats the end of my speakers list. Is there anyone
2 who did not sign up who would like to speak at this time?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: If not, its time for us to close the
5 meeting. Let the record show that 7:45 is the conclusion of
6 this meeting. Thank you.

7 (Whereupon, at 7:45 p.m., the meeting was
8 adjourned.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25