FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
COMMISSIONS'S OFFICE OF ENERGY PROJECTS
AND
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
* * *
OREGON LNG EXPORT PROJECT
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

The above public scoping meeting came on at the Woodland High School/Middle School Commons, 755 Park Street, Woodland, Washington, on October 16, 2012, at 6:06 p.m.

Cheryl L. Vorhees, CSR, RPR
Court Reporter

APPEARANCES:
Medha Kochhar
Environmental Project Manager
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC
888 First Street, D.C. 20426

Also Present:
Pat Terhaar
Tom Finch, DOT
Heather Ferree - Sign-In Table
Amy Dammarell
Matt Hutchinson
Peter Hansen - Oregon LNG

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:
Jose Perry
Carl Kisaberth
Joanna Connolly
Tim Maddox
Dale Clark
Rudy Martinez
Harold Gaskin
Varonica Koon
Steve Lawhorn
Kevin Weller
Hank Mroczkowski
Robert Crane
Anthony Harbison
Jason Sweeney
Ben Embree
Steve Dragich
SPEAKER LIST (Continued)
Dan Serres
Juan Sanchez
Carlos Martinez
Gayle Kiser
Larry Lovelady
Mike Karnofski
Dale Boon

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2012, WOODLAND, WASHINGTON

6:06 P.M.

PROCEEDINGS

MS. KOCHHAR: Good evening. Welcome to our scoping meeting for Oregon LNG Export Project. On behalf of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the FERC, I would like to welcome all of you here tonight. This is an environmental scoping meeting for the Oregon LNG Export Project proposed by Oregon LNG Development Company, LLC, and Oregon Pipeline Company. We will call them collectively as Oregon LNG.

Let the record reflect that the public scoping meeting in Woodland, Washington began at 6:06 p.m. on October 16, 2012. The primary purpose of this meeting is to provide you an opportunity to comment on the project or on the scope of the environmental analysis being prepared for the Oregon LNG Export Project.

My name is Medha Kochhar, and I'm an environmental project manager with the Commission's Office of Energy Projects. With me at the table tonight is Pat Terhaar. She's from HDR, a third-party contractor. Next to her is Joe Subsits. He is with DOT Washington state. And then we have Tom Finch from DOT, USDOT.

And at the sign-in table today we Danette, and Matt Hutchinson. Both of them are from HDR.

The FERC is an independent agency that regulates interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and oil. FERC reviews proposals and authorizes construction of interstate natural gas pipelines, storage facilities, liquified natural gas LNG terminals, as well as licensing and inspection of hydroelectric projects. As a federal licensing agency, the FERC has the responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, to consider the potential environmental impact associated with a project which is under its consideration. I don't see Russ Berg, otherwise I would have introduced him also today. It looks like he didn't make it here.

Anyway, with regard to the Oregon LNG Export Project, the FERC is the lead federal agency for the NEPA review and preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. We call it EIS, the Environmental Impact Statement. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have agreed to participate as cooperative agencies in the preparation of the EIS. These agencies plan to use our EIS to meet their respective NEPA responsibilities

associated with issuing their permits, approvals, and reviews.

As I said earlier, the primary purpose of this meeting tonight is to give you an opportunity to comment on the project or on the environmental issues that you would like to see covered in the EIS. It will help us the most if your comments are as specific as possible regarding the potential environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives of the proposed Oregon LNG Export Project. These issues generally focus on the potential for environmental effects, but may also address construction issues, mitigation, and environmental review process.

In addition, this meeting is designed to provide you with an opportunity to meet with the Oregon LNG's representatives, to ask them questions, and to get more detailed information about their proposed facility locations and construction plans. The company representatives will be available here and they will be available to you to answer questions after the meeting, and some of them I know were asking them questions before the meeting, too, which is very good.

Keep in mind, the project is still in its developmental stage. So the project can change. This

is only pre-filing right now. It's the intent of Oregon LNG that it may accommodate any comments that it receives, so it may refine this project.

So tonight's agenda is very simple. I'm going to describe what the FERC process is and then we will have Tom Finch from DOT to speak a little bit and tell us what DOT's role is in this project. And then we will maybe a word or two from Joe Subsits to explain how DOT with Washington state is affiliated with this project.

After we are done with this presentation, you can ask them questions but after the meeting is completed, not during their talk or right after their talk.

And at the end, we will hear from all of you who have signed the speakers' list to make a presentation and express your comments. Now, I'm going to describe the environmental review process. I have this poster here. I know it may not be easy for you all to read it. And the NOI that was sent out that had this same review process, and I'm sure you're aware of it.

Like I said, this project is in pre-filing phase, forecast, pre-filing phase and also certificate phase. Pre-filing phase is mandatory for all energy

projects. It is not required for pipeline projects, however, as it is LNG pipeline, it's the pre-filing phase. During this process we have no formal application from the project sponsor. They come in and ask for an approval to enter into pre-file review phase. They formally request that, we formally approve or whatever. We approved this project for pre-filing phase on July 16, 2012. This chart here explains the entire step-by-step process right from the beginning of the pre-filing phase to the end of the certificate issuance of the authorization.

The three gray areas here that you see are the areas where we officially involve the public to give their -- to receive their input and comments in this area. That does not restrict you from giving us comment during any other time of the analysis. This is just to highlight for the NEPA requirements that these are the pre-filing phases that we need your input. And we give you a time period for that.

So, where we are today? We are at this stage, we are the holding scoping meetings. The applicant work-up, assess the market, request the use of pre-filing process. We receive the applicant's request, we formally approved the pre-filing request on July 16th, I believe, and now we are in this phase

here.

The applicant did not hold any open houses during the pre-filing phase. Opened houses were in June, which we were not part of at that time. We issued a Notice of Intent, that is what I just showed you, and it was mailed out to everybody that was on our mailing list. That included folks that were there on the mailing list on the previous project, CP 09-6 and 09-7. Those people are still on the list and they were sent the Notice of Intent. The new people, new stakeholders, public officials, anybody else on the federal, state agencies, local agencies, everybody, we sent something like 6,880 NOIs, and some of them came back with wrong address, and I'll explain to you what we need from you for that.

Anyway, issuance of the Notice of Intent was done. That officially opens a scoping period for us. And in that you have a date given, November 8, that is is the close of the comment period. So, therefore, your comments on the NOI should come to us by November 8th. How to send those comments is given in the NOI. If you look at pages seven and eight, you will get enough information on that. Your comments should be sent to the secretary of the division. Not to me, not to just anybody. That is the way the formal comments

come in. You can also e-subscribe and send your comments through e-subscription that we will also get. You can sign in and there's no charge for that.

Then we are holding public scoping meetings which were the locations were notified by Notice of Intent. We have a total of eight meetings, and I'll explain to you why we have eight. There are three in Oregon -- let's see, one, two -- two in Oregon and then the rest are all in Washington state. The project is from Astoria to Woodland for the export part of the project, but it is associated with the pipeline that is being constructed -- that will be constructed by Northwest, and they will provide gas to Oregon energy in Woodland, Washington. So we are here for that meeting today.

After this comment period is over, we will analyze all the comments, look at what your concerns are, what will we need to do, where else we need to get more data from the company, whereas we need to do something else, what are the other problems that are missing or anything, and we will get that. And then we work on that and request by date of request of the company and get the information.

Once we have all of those NOIs collected and we feel we are satisfied with that information that we

need to develop an Environmental Impact Statement, which it will be the draft form at that time, NEPA requires us to produce a draft of Environmental Impact Statement. And that statement we can only develop once we have enough data for it. And that is where we will stop the pre-filing process at that time because we will know the resource reports are now almost complete.

At that point we will submit a formal application, which will be a CP docket. It will be given a new docket number. It will begin with CP instead the PF. At this time the docket number is PF12- 18 for Oregon LNG, and PF12-20 for Washington Expansion Project. I'll mention that later, too, so we get it on the record.

So once an application is filed, formal application is filed, there will be a Notice of Application. Notice of Application is out and within ten days people who want to file for a grievance status, they need to submit their request for that. And that officially begins our formal analysis session and then we begin to analyze the data, developing the draft EIS. The draft EIS is mailed out to everybody who is on the mailing list, including interveners, including the state, federal and local agencies, or

anybody who is interested -- or any citizen who is interested, not just the landowner. That gives you an idea as to where we are, what we are thinking of the project, and how we are analyzing and what the company is going to do to minimize impact. And you will get a chance to comment on that.

Based on your comments, again, we will see, do we need to do any further study? Do we need to look for any other route alternatives? Do we need to get some more information which we do not know? Or do we need to clarify some of the things. So that will be another comment period. We will hold public comment meetings on the draft EIS. And I think the minimum time we are given is 45 days for the comment period. And your comments will be analyzed and we will respond to your comments in our next document, which we will call Final EIS.

We do not respond to individual comments. We respond to issues that are expressed, and those will be described all in the Final EIS. Once the Final EIS is to be developed, we send a Notice of Schedule that will tell you when our document is going to come out. Those dates can change because if we find more comments and we find that some more information is needed, we need more time to do it. So sometimes we

may have to send more than one Notice of Schedule. We try not to do that, we try to do it once so people get one information at that time.

Once the Final EIS is issued, that Final EIS is used by the Commission to develop their decision. We do not make the determination. They make the determination. We only do our analysis, independent analysis. We may make some recommendations and the Commission may adopt them, may not adopt them, modify them, or whatever. They become condition to our authorization.

And that also opens a 30-day pre-hearing period. People who like to have re-hearing for one reason or the other, they will file a letter for requesting re-hearing status.

And then we issue Notice to Proceed with Construction, but that is done after the applicant has accepted the authorization and applicant will tell us in its implementation plan as to how they will implement all the recommendations that we have mentioned in our document.

We will review that. It is a 60-day period for that until and unless we are pleased or have all the information from them. We will not give them construction go ahead. So that is how our process

works. So this chart tells you pre-filing as well as a little bit of the formal filing status. And I'll go ahead and read some of the information to give you more specific information.

Okay. Just to give you very quick and a short information of what the proposed project is, I will review that and then later on we'll have Peter give a presentation to explain how this -- what is proposed for this project.

The Oregon LNG Export Project will be comprised of liquefaction facilities to be located at the proposed import terminal site in Warrenton, Oregon, and about 39 miles of new 36-inch-diameter pipeline.

The new pipeline segment will traverse Columbia County, Oregon and end in Cowlitz County, Washington to interconnect with the interstate gas transmission system of Northwest Pipeline GP. After completion of FERC's first pre-filing review process for the Export Project, Oregon LNG plans to amend its pending application for an LNG Import terminal and send-out pipeline. So the pending project that we have, would be CP09-6 or CP9-7, both of those will be merged into this and it will be an amended application.

The total miles of the pipeline will be reduced from 121 miles to 86.5 miles. As I mentioned, Northwest is proposing the pipeline from where the Oregon LNG will receive the gas. So at this point Northwest is also proposing to expand the pipeline between Sumas and Woodland, Washington to provide natural gas to the proposed Oregon LNG Export terminal, and also to the growing migrates in the state of Washington. Washington Expansion Project is also in pre-filing at this time. The number for that is PF12-20.

The two projects are interconnected and will be analyzed in one single Environmental Impact Statement. Washington Expansion Project is intended to supply natural gas to Oregon LNG. In our discussion here tonight, we will focus more on the Oregon LNG project, but you can give comments on the other one also if you'd like to.

Once scoping is finished, our next step will be to begin analyzing companies' proposals and issues that have been identified during the scoping period. This will include an examination of the proposed facility locations as well as alternative sites. We will assess the projects' effects on waterbodies, wetlands, vegetation, wildlife, endangered species,

natural resources, soils, land use, air quality, and safety, and also humans.

When complete, our analysis of the potential impacts will be published as a Draft EIS and presented to the public for a comment period that will be a minimum of 45 days long. This Draft EIS will be mailed to all interested parties. During the comment period of the Draft EIS, we will hold more public meetings to gather feedback on our analysis and findings. After making any necessary changes or additions to the Draft EIS, a Final EIS will be mailed to all interested parties.

Please note that because of the size of the mailing list, the mailed version of the EIS will be on a CD. That means, unless you tell us otherwise, you will find a CD in your mailbox. If you prefer to have a hard copy mailed to you, you must indicate that choice on the return mailer which is attached to the NOI. The back of the NOI is a return mailer. You can give us your choice if you want a hard copy. You can also indicate that on the attendance sheet tonight at the sign-in table.

As I mentioned earlier, our issuance of the NOI opened a formal comment period that will close on November 8, 2012. The NOI encourages you to submit

your comments as soon as possible in order to give us time to analyze and research the issues. If you received the NOI in the mail, you are on our mailing list and will remain on the mailing list to receive the EIS and any other supplemental notices we may issue about this project unless you return the mailer attached to the back of the NOI and indicate you wish to be removed from the mailing list. I have received a few mailers already that say remove my name. If you did not receive the NOI and you should have, I apologize for that. And I would like to tell you this thing: When I get comments sometimes it's very difficult to read the names and the addresses. Sometimes the stamp from the post office come in where we cannot read it. So make sure you write your name and complete address. Include the zip code. Sometimes the zip code is missing. So some of these come back. Actually I have a big thick stack that has already come back. So make sure that you give us your address correctly if you want to remain on the mailing list.

The mailing list for this project is large and undergoing constant revision. You can be added to our mailing list by signing up at the sign-in table in the back of this room by submitting your comments on

the project. I would like to add that the FERC encourages electronic filing of all comments and other documents. The NOI explains the process.

In addition, there's a small brochure that explains FERC's e-filing system at the sign-in table. It's a small brochure. There is this one and there's one more there. So you can look at the sign-in table for information how to do e-filing.

Also instructions for this can be located on our website, www.ferc.gov, under the e-filing link. If you want to submit written comments, please follow the directions in the NOI. It's very important that any comments you send either electronically or by traditional mail, include our internal docket number for the project. The docket number is on the cover of the NOI and is available at the sign-in table.

If you decide to send us a comment letter, please put the number on it, that will ensure that members of the staff evaluating the project will get your comments as soon as possible. The docket number for the Oregon LNG Export Project is PF12-18.

Now, I want to explain the role of the FERC Commission and of the FERC environmental staff. The five-member Commission is responsible for making a determination on whether to issue an authorization to

Oregon LNG Development Company and a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Oregon LNG Pipeline Company. The EIS prepared by the FERC environmental staff, which I am part of, describes the project facilities and associated environmental impacts; alternatives to the project; mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts; and our conclusions and recommendations. These recommendations become conditions to the certificate. The EIS is not a decision-making document. Again, the NEPA document is not a decision-making document. And no decision has been made. No formal filing has been made. So don't think that we have already reached our conclusion so far.

It is being prepared to disclose to the public, and to the Commission, the environmental impact of constructing and operating the proposed project. When it is completed, the Commission will consider the environmental information from the EIS along with the non-environmental issues such as engineering, markets and rates, in making its decision to approve or deny Oregon LNG's request for a certificate. The Commission does not make a decision simply based on the Environmental Impact Statement. We have other don't requirements to evaluate; market,

rates, and comments from you folks.

There is no review of FERC's decision by the President or Congress, maintaining FERC's independence as a regulatory agency, and providing for a fair and unbiased decisions.

So, now, at this point I will request Peter Hansen of Oregon Energy to make a short presentation about the proposed project. Peter?

MR. HANSEN: Good evening. My name is Peter Hansen. I'm the CEO of Oregon LNG and Oregon Pipeline Company. I have a brief presentation for you here that we'll go through in about ten or fifteen minutes, and then I'll be in the room the rest of the evening. I can take your questions individually when you come up.

In the interest of time, we should not take questions during this section here. Just come up to me individually when you have something.

What we have here is a view of the project as seen from the Northwest. The project consists of a dock for tankers out here, about a 2,000-foot concrete pier. Two tanks. They're 160,000 cubic meters each, which is the same at 42 billion gallons each. They're best described as a stainless steel tank, insulated stainless steel tanks surrounded by concrete bumpers.

The other comment features you see here are cooling towers. This facility is water cooled, and there will be two long cooling towers, one on each side of the equipment.

Another view from the southeast, again, the dock, the pier, the tanks, and the cooling towers. The facility will be designed to make about 9 million tons of liquid natural gas every year. That's about one-and-a-quarter billion cubic feet per day turned into liquids.

It will also have the capability to send gas back into the regional grid in case of emergencies, supply emergencies. We don't expect to use that much but that capacity will be there. And we expect to get between 100 and 125 ships per year, depending on the size of the ship, and we hope to be in service by 2018. We're located here in Warrenton, which is a couple miles downstream of Astoria and the Astoria Bridge. The tankers will come in across the Columbia River bar here and meet up with the bar pilings.

At the first turn here, they will meet up with the tugboats and slow down and the tugboats will escort them up to the facility where the bar pilings with dock the ship. There will be two bar pilings on every ship, and what we're seeing here a little

turning base, and it's basically a wide spot in the ship channel so we can turn the tankers around. That will require about 1.2 million cubic yards of dredging.

Looking at the general arrangements, the gas will come in down here in the southeast corner and go through a metering station and then there will a pre-treatment facility where we'll take out impurities in the gas, including any kind of acids, sulphur, water, any hydrocarbons, and a trace of mercury. There is a trace of mercury in all natural gas.

From there the natural gas goes into the liquefaction facility. That's the electrically-driven facility that will turn the gas into liquid, and from there the liquid goes into the tanks and then when the ship shows up, out the pier and can be re-loaded onto the ship. A few features here are three towers that will cool down the liquefaction process and the water treatment for that is here.

What you see here is a ground flare in case of process upsets, how hard it is and stuff like that, we would need to relieve pressure in various ways to save the facility, and that pressure will be burned off in this ground flare arrangement.

A Google Earth picture of the same thing.

This is the east bank of the Skipanon Peninsula and of course over here you have Warrenton, over here is Astoria, and this is the Young's Bay Bridge and the Astoria Airport. This is the pipeline that will come out of the facility and go down to Woodland.

Again, the dock and pier arrangement will require about 1.2 cubic yards of dredging, 2000-foot long concrete pier with deep foundations, a dock with loading arms and mooring dolphins for 100,000 ton ships. That will require three to four tugs depending on the size of the ship, with an 80-ton Bollard pull each, and that's all determined by the U.S. Coast Guard what the other requirements will be.

As far as seismic and tsunami issues are concerned, the project will be designed as per the federal guidelines, which continue to be updated and have been updated since the Japanese earthquake. There will be a lot of deep soil improvements and deep soil mixing. All structures will be on pile foundations, deep piles, and the tanks will also be built on seismic isolators which will allow the tanks to stay stationary if the ground is holding underneath the tanks. And then the facility will be surrounded by a tsunami berm.

We will use quite a bit of water, and we have

three water sources. The primary water source is drainage sewage water from the City of Warrenton, which we'll be buying from the City. The second source is surplus water. They have surplus water at certain times of the year, which we'll buy from them and use in cooling towers. And, finally, the backup supply is brackish water from the Columbia River, which we will take through a reverse osmosis system and dredge into fresh water.

Waste water will be discharged through the existing City of Warrenton outfall, where we will be paying them to take out sewage water. And the sewage water basically contains concentrated, made-up water, whatever minerals are in the water, and when you put it into the cooling tower those minerals will be concentrated up. You can evaporate water but you can't evaporate minerals. And of course the discharge water will meet all DEQ standards, including the temperature standards.

The pipeline route starts, again, in Warrenton, goes down to Clatsop County. That's the blue line. And then previously, when it was designed as an import project, the pipeline would continue down through the Yamhill and Willamette Valleys and next to the Williams pipeline down here in Mollala. As an

export project, that does not work, primarily because there's no capacity to get from here to here. But, instead, the gas will be coming down from Canada in the Williams pipeline, and come down into Woodland where we will take the gas out of the Williams pipeline and run it through a new pipeline route that goes under the Columbia River through Columbia County and over to the Four Corners area where it will connect with the original island.

Before we had landowners 220 impacted in Oregon. Now we'll have 31 and approximately 16 in Washington. Again, I want to emphasize, this piece of pipeline will not be developed. That line has been abandoned. And in all pipelines projects, landowners will be compensated appropriately. It will be in negotiations with each landowner.

So why the West Coast? Well, in Canada an awful lot of gas had been found. There has been gas developed in this area for a long, long time. But since the capability to extract sale gas has been developed, there's now a huge quantity of gas in this area and there no longer is a market. The U.S. market on the west coast, and especially over in the Midwest, no longer need Canadian gas, and consequently that gas needs to go somewhere else. And it will be exported

to Asia through the West Coast either down through Oregon or directly out through the Canadian coast.

Asia is the biggest market and of course the West Coast has a huge competitive advantage supplying that market. Gas could come out of the Gulf Coast, but it takes 34 days for a tanker to get from the Gulf Coast to Tokyo. From here it takes nine days.

The Canadian government or the government in British Columbia obviously has plans to export gas directly out of BC. They're planning to have three projects online by 2010, and I'll openly talk about five projects like this one. However, we believe there's a competitive advantage down here for a number of reasons. The terrain is very difficult in British Columbia. It's a harsh winter, it's actually violent obviously parts of the year. There's the issue of unresolved native land claims, and there's a shortage of labor. Must be a nice problem to have. We don't have that here. And that's one or the reasons why we'd like to bring the projects down this way.

We believe there's great opportunity to move some of those jobs to Oregon and to the Southwest Washington region as well. Kitimat is sort of the center for LNG developments on the BC Coast. Of course Kitimat means being in the snow. And one of

the problems in that area is that getting a pipeline across the bay rock is estimated at anywhere from 2 to 8 billion, depending on which route we're looking at. And, of course, all proposed pipelines is about $500 million from Warrenton down to Woodland. In other words, we can be very competitive there and that would allow us to move some jobs down this way.

We have made certain commitments as far as work is concerned. We have an agreement in place with the Northwest Construction Alliance. That's the carpenters union and the operators and also in Columbia Pacific Building and Construction Trades, which is a group of trades, different trades. This agreement includes a carve-out for a lot of small group of contractors in the Warrenton area. It also includes a commitment to support apprentice programs and a commitment to women and minority-owned businesses.

There's also agreement in place with the Oregon Department of Energy. We will fund, or we have been funding for a while, emergency planning on behalf of the State of Oregon. We will also fund whatever emergency response requirements this project will create. For example, there will be more fire trucks and other issues that have to be addressed at the

facility. The ODOE will get to specify what we have to pay and what we get to pay for.

As far as we know as far as standards and mitigation, we have also agree to ODOE's standards there. They are still being developed for the Export Facility. We would also be posting a retirement bond for the facility so that we don't end up with the hook if the world should change or if in 30 years the project becomes obsolete and needs to be removed. There will be a bond in place by us to do so. That is the FERC requirement but it's a Department of Energy requirement in Oregon.

Finally, we've had an analysis done of the impact of these projects. It was done by EcoNorthwest, the same company that's done the CRC, the Columbia River Crossing, and a number of other projects in this region.

I was done with IMPLAN model, which was developed and issued by the U.S. Forest Service in 1972.

When you look at the construction costs, it's 5.8 billion for the terminal, 0.5 million for the pipeline, for a total of 6.3 billion. The associated Williams Expansion, which is the project that Williams is undertaking to expand the pipeline from Sumas on

the Canadian border down to Woodland is another .82 billion dollars, for a total of $7.1 billion worth of construction as a result of this project.

When you look at the jobs that are created by this project -- and by the way, this does not include the Williams Expansion -- you get an average of 2600 Oregon and Washington residents four for a five-year period, and it's hard to see the number on, but it's 3,011, an approximate 3,011 total jobs for a five-year period, it peaks out in the 16 time frame with about 3400 jobs on the site.

That of course creates a bunch of other jobs because these are the direct employment jobs at the site and associated facilities. Then there are the business transactions resulting from these jobs. And then in addition to that we have the consumer spending. If you add it all up you get about 2500 indirect business-to-business jobs created by the 3,000 jobs and another 4800 jobs created by these two groups, for a total of 10,400 jobs created in Oregon primarily but also some in Southwest Washington as a function of this project. I think it's fair to say that that's a pretty important piece, 10,000 jobs for five years. That's exactly what we need right now. And you see here the distribution over time and peaks

in the 16 time frame.

As far as permanent jobs created by this, you see here that's 149 approximate jobs at the site. It's hard to see down here, 145 at the terminal and another four for the pipeline. That leads to indirect jobs of about 782 caused by the spending associated with the $6.2 billion through-put of the facility, and another 660 jobs induced, in other words from the consumer spending related jobs as a function of the direct and indirect jobs. That's adds up to 1591 permanent jobs primarily in Oregon, some in Southwest Washington.

Tax receipts not so interesting in this area, but if you look at Salem, Oregon income tax receipts during construction, 220 million and after that about 60 million a year. Property taxes during construction, 120 million. Annual property taxes, 57 million in Clatsop County. That will pretty much double Clatsop County's tax revenues. They're right around 60 million dollars a year right now. That will make the watermill the second largest taxpayer in Clatsop County at 3.4, and we will be right at 57 in a year.

Finally, we believe that this project will have benign environmental impacts. It may change the

Warrenton skyline. It certainly will because the tanks are large, you can't hide $6 million worth of economic activity, but we do not believe that it will change the character of the community. There will be an influx of newcomers. Obviously there will be a lot of newcomers during construction with 3,000 people on site, but this is not a facility with a lot of traffic associated with it, and the public services required by this project are obviously minimal because we'll have to provide most of our own.

It will be a massive long-term boost to Oregon's economy and to some extent this region as well, and of course it will a massive boost for Clatsop County more than anywhere. That's all I have. Thank you very much.

MS. KOCHHAR: Now I would like Tom Finch of US DOT to make a short presentation and tell us what your role will play in this project.

MR. FINCH: Okay. Thank you very much. Can you all hear me if I just talk loud enough? At any rate, we are US DOT PHMSA, which is Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration. And we don't get involved in the actual siting of this or approval, but if this LNG got approved we would be expecting from the beginning for design, for

construction insulation, and inspecting the current LNG plant that UTC inspects, is inspected at least annually. And that's basically our role. I didn't know if you all knew that basically pipelines, there's 2.5 million miles of pipelines, that's including your distribution pipelines. But they do provide two-thirds of your energy in this country in one form or another.

So that's about, you know, trying to make it short and simple. I had a little PowerPoint or whatever. We are the western region. I'm out of Lakewood Colorado. We would handle anything in Oregon. And the reason I brought Joe Subsits with the Washington Utilities Transportation Division to talk a little bit is any pipelines or any facilities in Washington state, they do because they're an interstate agent, which means they act as us. The only thing they don't do is write the enforcement cases. Which I've had the pleasure of writing some of them for them. Maybe not fast enough for them.

On that line, we have had our enforcement double basically by Congress. We were just reauthorized, the president signed our reauthorization January 5th of this year, so now we're up to $2 million per occurrence and stuff like that. The

largest fine I think we've had I think is like 3.8 million. But that's where we're at if they don't play by the rules.

So I will introduce Joe Subsits. He's the pipeline safety supervisor with Washington Utilities Transportation Division. I've worked with him since, what 1999? Or 2000, yeah, on something in Bellingham, Washington.

MR. SUBSITS: Thanks Tom. My name is Joe Subsits. I'm the chief pipeline safety engineer with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Division. We're housed by the Utility and Transportation Division, which is the agency which is responsible for consumer protection for utilities and transportation services in Washington state.

Our role is specifically pipeline safety. There's numerous ways to pipeline safety. We do inspections, we do investigations, we handle citizen complaints. We'll go ahead and we will do technical assistance with some of our pipeline operators, we do public awareness programs, keep the public apprized of pipeline safety issues.

One thing we do not is we do not site pipelines. You'll determine where pipelines go, but once we're built then we're very active and work with

pipelines. And that activity starts with the construction work. We're normally very involved in construction work, which takes place in the pipelines throughout the state of Washington.

We directly visit our facilities two to three times a year. Our higher risk operators, we tend to see them at least twice a year. We see them at least every two years, excuse me. Lower risk we feel is so important and that will give you an indication of how often we will inspect them. Because we inspect pipelines in Washington state, we see the same facilities over and over again, we become very familiar with them, and we feel this gives us an advantage of dealing with these pipeline operators.

If you're interested in pipeline safety issues, we have a pretty good web page, utc.wa.gov, and on that web page you can see all our actual inspection reports for all the pipeline inspections we've done in Washington state. So the results of those inspections can be found for your viewing on the web page. So after the meeting tonight, I'd be happy to answer your questions. I can give you business cards, if you have any questions any time, not just today, but I look forward to answering those questions. Thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: Now we're going to begin with the most important and that is to hear from you all what your comments are. We will first take comments from those who signed on the speakers' list, which was at the table in the back. And if you prefer you may hand us your written comments or present it orally tonight, or you can mail it to our office. All of these comments will be given equal -- they will be considered equally.

And Pat is going to announce the names of the speakers one at a time. You have also noticed we have a court reporter here who is transcribing -- which is being recorded by a transcript service. So make sure you come up to the front, speak into the microphone, give your name first, spell it out, give your affiliation so that everything is recorded correctly. So Pat, I will give you the opportunity to call people. And we will also limit the presentations to three minutes at a time, because there are quite a few. If we have more time, you are welcome to come back and say more. So we'll start with the first speaker.

MS. TERHAAR: Okay. I'd like to start with a couple of ground rules. Audience, we ask that you to be respectful of the speakers, and, speakers, we ask

you to refrain from making any personal attacks. As Medha said, your written comments will be treated the same as oral comments. And we're going to limit each speaker's time the first time you come up to three minutes, and after three minutes I'm going to hold up this red card as a gentle reminder for you to just kind of wrap things up, summarize what you're going to say. Again, you can turn in your written comments.

And if there's time at the end, after the speakers who have signed up have had a chance, then we'll open it up to other people who might want to come up and say something. And then after that, people who have spoken before may come up again if there's time.

With that, we'll start with our first speaker, who is Jose Perry.

MR. PERRY: Good evening, everybody. My name is Jose Perry. I'm with Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters. I'm a carpenter by trade. And for this project, because it's going to produce jobs and a media forum for construction, and it will give us jobs in the long term, stimulating our economy, and helping these different areas to bring in income that has been very much needed in this slow economy.

As a carpenter by trade, I say that we build

it safe, we build it clean, and we build it professionally, but I'm for building. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Carl Kisaberth.

MR. KISABERTH: Hello. I've been a union carpenter for Oregon and Washington for 33 years, and projects like this, it's a great boost.

MS. KOCHHAR: Could you please say your name and spell it for the court reporter?

MR. KISABERTH: Sure. It's Carl Kisaberth, K-i-s-a-b-e-r-t-h. And these projects are a great living wage income for the families of these men, and also a great tax base from our weekly paychecks to Oregon and Washington, and I'm gunning for this project. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Our next speaker is Joanna Connolly.

MS. CONNOLLY: Hi. My name is Joanna, J-o-a-n-n-a, Malandruccollo, M-a-l-a-n-d-r-u-c-c-o-l-l-o, dash, C-o-n-n-o-l-l-y. The Oregon LNG project will not only provide hundreds of jobs during its construction, the operations of the plant will provide over 150 permanent high-wage careers to the county. I'm a carpenter, my husband is a carpenter, my son and my grandson are carpenters.

Both my son and my grandson have had to leave the area to find jobs to support their families.

My husband was out of work for almost two years. This will bring jobs back and hopefully families back together. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Our next speaker is Tim Maddox.

MR. MADDOX: Hello. My name is Tim Maddox. I'd just like to say I'm supporting this LNG project.

MS. TERHAAR: Our next speaker is Dale Clark.

MR. CLARK: Yes. My name is Dale Clark. D-a-l-e, C-l-a-r-k. I'm in support of the project. I came here as a carpenter in Local 156, and I support this project. We need jobs, jobs, jobs. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Our next speaker is Al Rudy Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ: Good evening. Rudy Martinez, M-a-r-t-i-n-e-z, and I'd like to speak on behalf of the families affected by these jobs that are going to be created by this project. I think it's a good project, and any time you put carpenters, operators, and construction workers to work, you affect families in the area and I'm in favor of this project. Thanks.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you. Our next speaker is Harold Gaston.

MR. GASKIN: Hello. My name is Harold,

H-a-r-o-l-d, Gaskin, G-a-s-k-i-n. I'm a member of the Carpenters Local 156. I'm in favor of the LNG project. If it will create hundreds of new jobs it can't help but stimulate the economy in Oregon and Washington. I support the LNG project. Thank you very much.

MS. TERHAAR: Varonica Koon.

MS. KOON: Hi. It's Varonica, V-a-r-o-n-i-c-a, Koon, K-o-o-n. And I'm here to voice my support for the LNG project to create more jobs. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Steve Lawhorn.

MR. LAWHORN: My name is Steve Lawhorn, and it's S-t-e-v-e, L-a-w-h-o-r-n. And I'm a member of the Carpenters 156. I support the Oregon LNG project. It's formulary seems sounds. I trust the geotechnical aspect will be in good hand of the best scientists and engineers. I think it offers a good deal for Warrenton and the surrounding communities, the jobs of construction, and the long-term job base.

It places Oregon as a leader in exports. I believe that the LNG monetary benefits outweigh the unnecessary an overblown concerns, so I support the project. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you. Kevin Weller.

MR. WELLER: My name is Kevin Weller, and I'm Carpenters District Council Carpenters, Portland Oregon 156. K-e-v-i-n, W-e-l-l-e-r. I'm still learning about all the aspects of this 7.1 million dollars and the carpenters locals. I've been a carpenter for 30 years. I've lived in Kelso, Cougar, Vancouver, Portland, Scappoose, within 50 miles of here all my life. And I understand that someone here's going to spend some money, and this gas has got to go somewhere. And they need to replace all the gas lines from Canada to Oregon. And I support the LNG project, and I think we have the technology, the know how, and the capability, and the men on reserve to build it. And I support union labor and the operating engineers and the carpenters, and everyone that's looking for work in this area needs to go back to work. So that's about all I need to say. Thanks. Have I nice day.

MS. TERHAAR: Hank Mroczkowski.

MR. MROCZKOWSKI: Good evening. Hank Mroczkowski, M-r-o-c-z-k-o-w-s-k-i. I'm a lead representative for the carpenters union for the Pacific Northwest Pacific Regional Council of Carpenters. We have approximately 6,000 members in Oregon and Southwest Washington, and in western

Washington another 15,000. Many of our members have had to travel across the country in order to work over these last several years. Since '07/'08, the economy has dropped away and our workers have had to go anywhere there was work in order to survive.

This project, putting 3,000 workers to work for five years, brings that money and those people back home to their own communities to put that money back into the tax structure of their homes and areas they live in. This is a project that has been looked at and will be sited with all the safety concerns taken care of. I believe this project is good for the community, for the state of Oregon, and for the state of Washington. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Robert Crane.

MR. CRANE: My name is Robert Crane, C-r-a-n-e. I'm a member of Local 701 Operating Engineers. I'm a third generation union member but more importantly I'm a fourth generation Oregonian, I'm a father to a fifth generation and I'm a grandfather to a sixth generation. If the numbers I've gotten are accurate, the construction period will last around four years on the pipeline and the LNG facility, with peak numbers running around 3,000 on both projects. After construction close to 150

full-time family wage paying jobs.

In the construction trade, a three to four year project is almost unheard of so all the trades are very excited at this prospect. The union brothers and sisters that will be on this project are all highly skilled, trained, safety-minded professionals. We're excited at the prospect of being able to work in our own home state. Most of us travel extensively in order to raise our families here in the state we love. I myself, in the last nine years, have worked in ten different states and two different countries.

Tonight, what I would really like to do is I'd like to thank everyone here to be given this unique opportunity to express my opinion. Since I started on these rounds of meetings I've met politicians, tribal members, doctors, lawyers, union brothers and sisters, moms, dads, retirees, environmentalists and landowners. We all have a commonality. And that is, we believe passionately enough to bend and break our schedules, show up and speak to strangers about something we have a passion for. This is an American right and this process is a gift of freedom that was given to us by our forefathers. It's been an honor to have met so many passionate, gifted, and intelligent individuals.

Whether this project is a go or not, I wish to thank everybody here for showing me that the unique, independent spirit of our founding father still lives on, that a determination to have our voices heard is never circumvented by policy or greed or the removal of our civil liberties. I'd like to thank the audience and the FERC panel for the time and the honor to express my opinion. And I am 100 percent for this project. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Anthony Harbison.

MR. HARBISON: My name is Anthony Harbison, H-a-r-b, as in beautiful, i-s-o-n. I'm a carpenter out of Local 156. I've lived in Calama, which is right over the bridge there for ten years. But in those ten years I've had to go to Wyoming and work in Montana, two different states. With this job, with this LNG, it will bring more work here not only for us older guys but for our youth that live in this neighborhood. This will feed the families that are here, the carpenters who are struggling for work in the area who have to travel outside the area, who are not working, who have to go to other places, by taking on side jobs doing other things besides what we are trained for.

We're trained to be carpenters, skilled

carpenters. With this work we'll be able to show what our brothers and our forefathers have taught us and has taught the ones before us the skills that keep us going. There's an old saying, if you build it, they will come. Let's build it.

MS. TERHAAR: Jason Sweeney.

MR. SWEENEY: Hi. My name is Jason Sweeney, J-a-s-o-n, S-w-e-e-n-e-y. I'm a member of Local 146, I'm a carpenter, and I believe that this project will bring jobs in a big way and help our community. Thank you for your time.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you. Ben Embree.

MR. EMBREE: Ben Embree, E-m-b-r-e-e. I'm a representative for the Northwest Carpenters Union. And one thing we haven't talked about are the training opportunities that this job will give us. Because when we have hundreds of carpenters on the job, one in five will be an apprentice. They'll get their star and a lot of these apprentices will be women and minorities on this project. And some of them may be able to turn out as journeymen on this project if they stay there long enough. It's a four-year project, usually they're in an apprenticeship. And we need to train for the future and this is another aspect of this job that will help us out. Thank you very much.

MS. TERHAAR: Steve Dragich.

MR. DRAGICH: I'd like to welcome FERC to Washington and Cowlitz County. You're in my house tonight. I was born and raised here. So was my father and my grandfather. I'm going to switch gears. Last night you heard me talk about CEII, and the audience behind me probably doesn't know that that means but I'm sure all four panel members understand that. And I talk about that Foya. Before I was a firefighter and EMT I started life at Oregon State in engineering. Spent three years there. Forester engineering is similar to civil engineering. They offer you a dual degree. I changed gears and graduated Portland State Class of '86, emergency management, police and fire.

I'm going to talk simply about geology tonight. Specifically, I have in my hand a FERC environmental assessment on another pipeline not more than 30 miles from where we stand tonight. It's called the KB Pipeline. I'm going to read you staff a FERC staff report on a similar pipeline which you're proposing to construct here in South Cowlitz County, specifically on geology.

Let me read you a FERC staff assessment. "In reference to geology in extensive areas of slope

instability, areas with landslide or soil liquefaction, potential or fault areas are not known to exist along the proposed route."

The KB Pipeline was constructed in the summer and fall of 1991. Specifically the FERC staff, through their contractor at the time, Environmental Contractor, was known as a Basco out of Houston, Texas, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Enron. And I'm everybody in Portland and Oregon knows about Enron.

Your assessment, FERC's assessment of the geology of this pipeline, you found no faults, geologic faults.

Let me read you, "Geologic and mineral resources, Cowlitz County in Washington state under Governor Dan Evans 1966.

Fortunately, I know you probably can run my DVD and this shows you the construction and the fault which FERC said was not there. And here you have a map that's been in existence since 1966 put together by taking core samples in 1966 and going back to 1940. And right here, 262 feet, right on the fault line, right next to the KB Pipeline, guess who's there? Why, it's Steve Dragich's residence, right on the Harmony Creek Fault.

So when you're doing an assessment, an EIS,

or an Environmental Impact Statement, which is a little more involved, make sure you look at all the scientific information. This report has been sent to Washington UTC and to PHMSA.us.DOT September 23, 2012. And I'm going to submit this report and my DVD of an actual construction of a pipeline in Cowlitz County to you today as part of the record.

MS. TERHAAR: Okay. Thank you. Our next speaker is Dan Serres.

MR. SERRES: Thanks for your patience. Dan Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper, 823 Southeast Main Street, number 126, 97214, Portland, Oregon. Again, I want to reiterate our request for a 45-day extension beyond November 8th. I think this is a very complex set of projects and it's important that the public have a chance to weigh in. There are probably people in the room who are landowners on the new proposed Oregon LNG Pipeline through Woodland and there are probably in the room who are affected by the Washington Expansion Project.

Riverkeeper strongly opposes both projects for pretty simple reasons. The first is that it will damage the environment. If you look at the resource reports that are on file, you know, there's a stale information about the impact of the environment,

including stale information about the impacts to waterbodies. Resource Report 1 refers everyone back to the previous set of dockets, CP9-06 and CP9-07, and it tells you where to look there for waterbody crossing methods. They'll be site-specific.

Well, we're dealing with two new pipelines in fact, and it's not adequate to punt people back to previous review. This poses big safety risks. It poses a risk to every rate payer in the Northwest. When energy prices go up, that means America's competitive advantage is diminished in the global economy. It will harm the economy for that reason, and ultimately it's going to condemn land. And that affects families. It affects family farmers, family foresters, all kinds of businesses throughout the region.

There are two projects being scoped tonight, but really it's one project. It's one big project. And it's really important for everyone in the room to realize that. There is no Washington Expansion Project without the Oregon LNG Project; there is no Oregon LNG Pipeline without the Oregon LNG terminal. All three aspects are interconnected and interdependent. No terminal, no pipeline. This is dragged Bradwood dragged down Palomar. This is why

Oregon currently from of LNG terminals is because when the projects failed in Oregon, the Bradwood Project, it took out the Palomar Pipeline with it, which was no longer viable.

But for the terminals going forward, the pipelines cannot proceed. And I commend FERC for doing a joint review of all these projects and I urge FERC to issue no license for any one of these projects without the others. You need to look at the whole picture together and not to piecemeal this out. And you're doing this correctly with the environmental review by looking at them all together, and that's the right approach. I hope that that when you make a decision in the end you don't piecemeal it out and say license for one is a license for the other so we can start building a pipeline to nowhere, that we want to avoid.

In you're a landowner or pubic assistant who wants to stop the pipelines, you can achieve this goal by doing one simple thing, by stopping the terminal. There are a lot of reasons why a terminal doesn't make sense. If you'd been in Warrenton last night, you would have heard literally dozens of people standing up and talking about the impact to the city of Warrenton, the stupidity and arrogance of putting a

project like this in a highly unstable geologic area right in the middle of the city of Warrenton basically, right next to a major mooring base for fishing boats, for recreational boats. It just doesn't make sense.

So a few other issues I want to point out. The construction of highly erosive landslide slopes in Clatsop and Columbia and Cowlitz Counties with this project in particular is real troubling. If you look at the Columbia County route, it comes down some very steep routes. I know they said they wanted to skirt and on the ridge lines, well, where they drop down is very steep erosive country.

Cowlitz County itself is no stranger to pipelines being damaged by earth movement. Several in past 15 years have led to fires and pipeline failures that have interrupted service for natural gas pipelines.

At the site itself in the terminal, the water uses and discharge are enormous. Absolutely massive. The cooling water for the terminal alone would be 6.7 million gallons per day, and that's from Resource Report 1 from Oregon LNG. The balance from the water tankers would be 12.8 billion gallons per tanker, which is interesting. And I get that figure from

Table 1.3-4 in the Resource Report 1, which estimates 1600 million gallons per year. If you divide that by the number of tankers per year, 125, you get 12.8 million gallons per tanker. That seems like a lot. Except for the fact that the estimate for Bradwood was 20 to 50 billion gallons per tanker, coming out very high, coming out 17 degrees Fahrenheit above the ambient temperature. In the Columbia, in an area where trying to restore salmon, where a lot of jobs depend on fishing, and all the boating that goes around the salmon industry, a pool of water that's 17 degrees higher than all the water around it stresses out salmon and essentially kills them. It's unacceptable.

So it's something you need to look at very closely and explain the discrepancy between the numbers that came out in a final Environmental Impact Statement for Bradwood and what Oregon LNG is putting forward in Resource Report 1.

And I want to kind of close by getting down to the pipeline. There's an excessive amount of space between the main line block valves. If you live in Clatsop County, there's a huge stretch across really rugged country at 19.3 between block valves. And I know that basically the block valve spacing is

determined by more or population density.

I think you need to factor something else in, which is the fact that these landslides are moving, some of them are ancient and difficult to detect. But these are very erosive areas, they're areas where rivers move all over the place. The Lewis & Clark drainage coming up through Clatsop County is known for landslides. Those highways get knocked out every winter by landslides. And the idea that they're going to build this pipeline in 36 inches over a 1000 psi on a gauge, non-odorized, and have over 19 miles between block valves? That's a lot of gas to burn off of this property. Even imagining that the block valves engaged immediately, that the system worked perfectly, you still have a major, major risk to the people who live in this area. And it's not just the homes nearby, it's the entire Clatsop State Forest, and that risk pertains to the entire region. So we're very concerned about those aspects. And, frankly, we don't understand why the pipeline wouldn't be attached, and it should be.

The environmental impacts of this program are not done. The dredging at the terminal, the horizontal directional drills that are Oregon LNG is treating as if they have no environmental impacts will

have major environmental impacts, particularly if they fail. If you look at either side of those directional drills, you have huge pull back and laid-down areas for the pipe. And that's an impact, all that land, you know, Woodland block land, all that land on the other side of the river, and it doesn't go right.

A frack out basically would pop all that drilling fluid right in the middle the Columbia River or all the other streams they're trying to use directional drills for.

Finally, the price impact of this is really important to consider. Each tanker that would leave the Oregon LNG site would carry eight percent of the United States' use of natural gas. So this project is enormous in scope, and everyone in this room is going to pay more for energy if it goes forward. We're talking about taking our one -- in the world of the Cisero, a director of the Industrial Energy Consumers of America, this is our one competitive advantage and we're talking about exporting it. And that's just plain stupid. We need to do better than this. So thank you for your time.

If you're concerned, please come and talk to me. I've got a sign-up sheet, I've got a lot of information, a scoping guide. I'll be in the back

near the door. And I do encourage anyone who does have issues and is concerned about, please come and talk to me. Thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: I want to make one point clear for all of you. The resource reports that have within submitted, those are the very set of resource reports. Like I said, we are review it, this is pre-filing, and we always send two data requests to LNG to answer some of those questions. And of these questions we have brought up today and some were brought up yesterday. So don't think that we're blind to we are reading. We know. We have experienced that. We also have experience on track to specifically to assess tsunami and earthquake. We are looking into geology very, very seriously.

I don't know the old projects, I was not on it, I did not do that, I was not part of it, I can't speak to it. But you can see what will come up in the next projects. Okay? So we can't talk about the past, what we want to do is what we're doing right now doing. So be aware that this is only pre-filing and we are reviewing even that to help understand what more information we need. Okay? Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Our next speaker is Juan Sanchez.

MR. SANCHEZ: Good evening. Can you hear me? J-u-a-n, S-a-n-c-h-e-z. I am a carpenter. Not just a union carpenter, a union carpenter. Quick question before I start: Do I get three minutes or ten minutes? I'm not sure.

MS. TERHAAR: Three minutes.

MR. SANCHEZ: Three minutes. Thank you. So, you see, with any construction project if you don't billed it, what happens? Nothing. Nothing at all. If you build this project you will have construction jobs, you will have people working, you will have training for the future generations. I love this project and I support it 110 percent. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Next is Carlos Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ: My name is Carlos Martinez, C-a-r-l-o-s, M-a-r-t-i-n-e-z. I was working for the union. I can tell you (unintelligible) because right now I'm making 35 dollars an hour. I have five kids. What can I do? (Unintelligible).

MS. TERHAAR: Next is Gayle Kiser.

MS. KISER: My name is Gayle Kiser, G-a-y-l-e, K-i-s-e-r. I'm from Kelso, Washington. I'm sure there's nothing new or redevelop that anyone speaking tonight can bring forth. We've been testifying before you for seven years. You've heard

all of our concerns a multitude of times. What's it going to take to lift the scales to the eyes of our regulatory commissions so that they can recognize what we have known all this time?

This is a fool's era. We're getting hoarse from shouting that the emperor has to clothes. The original intent of the Oregon LNG was to import because, quote, "We're running out of gas here in the Northwest." We knew this to false and testified that this would turn into an export facility. All one had to do was look at the map in the proposed pipeline plans. The proponents of Oregon LNG poo-poo'd us and told the media that we didn't know what we were talking about, all the time knowing that we were right. Calling it pipeline bi-directional changes nothing. We know which way the gas will be flowing. We find ourselves here again, speaking in voices which are never plan for foreign national country who wants to exploit our energy resources to ship them overseas where they can make an obscene profit. But who pays the price?

Every resident of the United States faces higher prices here because the cost of gas will rise as the overseas market demands rise. We need a national energy policy that takes into consideration

the future needs of the U.S. market and the effects on our national security as we continue to allow energy companies to dictate the terms.

Right now I'm taking the debate between two individuals who wish to become the most powerful men in this nation. Neither one has addressed this program and neither one will as well as Washington D.C. is owned lock, stock and barrel by energy companies empowered by the two 2005 Energy Policy Act, written by our then vice-president Dick Cheney.

Closer to home, our neighbors are once again finding their property listed as an alternative route just when they thought they could resume a normal life, free to use their land as they see fit, not as dictated by having a high pressure pipeline running through the middle of it. And you can add to them the farmers in the Woodland bottoms. Surely the most productive farmland in the county. They face the same restrictions on their land if the project is approved. There's to feasible way that one can look on this project as being in the public interest, and as much the use of emanant domain should be disallowed.

The only ones who will profit from this are the investors who have been hoodwinked into believing that such a project is possible. The company rides in

her on their jobs platform knowing full well that we have a huge employment problem in the Northwest. But they're merely trying to pit us one against another, union member against independent farmer and landowner.

Their tactics are the same wherever one of these projects are proposed. We see the same thing happening with the proposed coal export facilities. Open your eyes, folks. Again, these are foreign companies trying to divide and conquer so that they can take not only our manufacturing jobs overseas but also the energy needed to power them. The only jobs are to the lawyers and the psychopaths who do the public relations for those projects. They have no concerns regarding our Columbia River. This project will endanger every citizen in Astoria and Warrenton.

Our federal enlisted salmon will be further stressed in an area where the number of fish are available is already pitting commercial fishermen against sport fishermen.

The proposed site for the export facility is a sandy peninsula. What would happen when, not if, we have our next Cascadia earthquake. We're told we're over due for the big one now. And how would it withstand the tsunami that's sure to follow.

To summarize, we here in the Northwest will

pay the price for this foreign operating company to make profits while we enjoy none of the wealth. Quoting Nancy Reagan, "Just say no." Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you. That is the end of our speaker list. Is there anybody who would like to speak who has not spoken yet? Larry Lovelady?

MR. LOVELADY: Larry Lovelady, L-o-v-e-l-a-d-y. I'm a rep for the operating engineers. I've been on numerous pipeline projects and they've always been able to work something out with landowners to make everybody happy. Maybe not exactly the way they wanted it, but they come to some kind of conclusion for them. What I've seen is these really work out pretty well. The ones I've been on are nowhere near the size of this one. So this one is going to take some work.

I hope that we can make everybody believe that this is going be a good thing for us instead of saying it's going to tear up the fish, it's going to tear up the land. There's always a way to fix it or make it just as good or better than it was at the beginning. So we are obviously behind this project because it is going to put people to work and it is going to help our economy. I'm for it. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Anyone else?

MR. KARNOFSKI: I'M Mike Karnofski, and I'm a Cowlitz County Commission for this district, and it's spelled K-a-r-n-o-f-s-k-i. Certainly the two key things for the citizens of Cowlitz County are jobs, but also safety. In your discussion you talked about some subsidies for Clatsop County and safety and if this goes forward I'd also like you to consider Cowlitz County and the needs the safety for that. Thank you.

MR. BOON: Dale Boon, D-a-l-e, B-o-o-n. I wasn't going to speak but I think there's a couple of key issues that you've got to consider. One is the terrain that the pipeline will follow on the east side of the freeway coming down just before intersection two where it's going to intersect with 2 and go across. Also, the farm ground that you'd be disturbing and restrictions that are put on it, and also what the fellow was saying about the river, the fish, the temperature of the water, these things are great impacts that would negatively affect a lot of people in industries in the area. Thanks.

MS. TERHAAR: Is there anyone else or someone who spoke before that would like to speak some more?

MS. KOCHHAR: Well, if we have no more comments or commenters, we officially adjourn the

meeting, and it's 7:35. The meeting is officially adjourned. Again, I would like to thank you for coming here tonight and I appreciate you all giving us your comments. Thank you.

(Meeting concluded at 7:35 p.m.)