BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -x

IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.

OREGON LNG & WASHINGTON : CP09-6-001 & CP09-7-001

EXPANSION PROJECT : CP13-507-000

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -x

Clatsop County Fairgrounds (Exhibit Hall)

92937 Walluski Loop

Astoria, Oregon 97103

Monday, September 21, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:00 p.m., Medha Kochhar, the moderator.

P R O C E E D I N G

MS. KOCHHAR: Good evening on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC I want to welcome all of you to the public comment meeting on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or Draft EIS for the Oregon LNG Terminal and Pipeline Project and Washington Expansion Project.

Let the record show that the Draft EIS comment meeting began at 6:01 p.m. on September 21, 2015 in Astoria, Oregon. My name is Medha Kochhar, I am the Environmental Project Manager with the Office of the Energy Projects. Which is a division of the FERC. Also with me today at the table is Robert Kopka and then to the right is Patricia Terhaar. Bob Kopka is with FERC he is the Deputy Project Manager and Pat Terhaar is with the HDR our third party contractor.

HDR is assisting FERC in our environmental analysis of the projects. In addition we have Elisa Lykens and Molly Brown outside of the table, of the sign-in table, they are also Elisa is with FERC and Molly is from HDR. We also have Doug Zenn who is here helping us with the tables, he is from HDR.

In addition we have Captain Dan Travers from the U.S. Coast Guard right up in front. In addition we have representatives from Oregon LNG Development Company LLC,

Oregon Pipeline Company LLC together referred to as Oregon LNG and we do not have anybody from Northwest today here. They were there last week.

They have maps and they will be around after the meeting to answer any specific questions on the project that you might have. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Environmental Protection Agency are participating cooperating agencies in the preparation of the EIS.

I would like to thank the cooperating agencies for their continued assistance with the NEPA review. Now I will request Captain Travers to come up front and make a presentation and tell you about their agency as a cooperating agency, Captain Travers?

CAPTAIN TRAVERS: Thanks a lot I appreciate it. I spoke earlier so I thought I would come back to consistency but any way good evening ladies and gentlemen as mentioned I'm Captain Danny Travers, I'm the Captain of the Fort here and the Federal Maritime Security Coordinator. My main responsibility is from Queets River up in Washington all the way to the California border and extends out to the Idaho/Utah border.

I'm here to discuss the Coast Guard's role of

necessity for the proposed Oregon LNG Project in Warrenton. With me tonight are my project officers for this proposal I have Mr. Ken Warrenson he has been with the project for a while and then this is Lieutenant Commander Warren Springer who is the Waterways Management Division Chief.

I exercise the regulatory authority excuse me -- my sense is that LNG can be divisive. The lead of the Coast Guard is neutral as to whether or not this is something that gets build. It is my job to manage the navigable waterways and secure our state and secure all recreational and commercial users. The Oregon LNG Project is one of two LNG projects located within my area of responsibility.

The other proposal is the Jordan Cove Project. The regulatory for waterfront LNG facilities and associated vessel traffic is under several long established statutes such as the Ports and Waterways Safety Act and the Magnuson Act, the Maritime Transportation Security Act and others. FERC is the sole siting authority for shore side LNG facilities.

The Coast Guard does not issue a permit for siting operations and LNG terminals. If a facility does become established and operational the Coast Guard will be used to produce a facilities operational manual, facility security plan and emergency response plan. For the purposes of FERC's permitting process the Coast Guard acts as a

cooperating agency. We provide FERC with information relative to navigation, waterway safety and security and vessel equipment.

The Coast Guard also requires the applicant to prepare and issue a waterways feasibility assessment. We evaluate this assessment with a sub-committee in the area of maritime security consisting of industry experts and other stakeholders including state and local emergency responders.

Pilots, industry representatives and members of the Harbor Safety Committee -- we submit all of our recommendations to FERC and the waterway for LNG marine traffic. The Coast Guard sent a letter of recognition and a letter of recognition analysis to FERC in April 2009. That letter found that the waterway remained suitable for LNG traffic with limitations and certain risk indication measures that are found in the letter of recognition and analysis of April 2009.

These documents remain the working documents for the Coast Guard in this project. Although the Coast Guard's recommendations were done over 6 years ago we are required to conduct annual reviews of the waterway feasibility assessment.

These reviews have determined that there are no significant changes to the waterways or risks associated with LNG shipments since those documents were created.

Although the project has changed from an import to a bi-directional terminal, the risks associated with the vessel and waterway has not changed.

I cannot stay for the meeting, but have members of my staff to be on hand to talk about the risk and they will be here. Please you know as far as the comments we have discussed those comments, we will provide response to all comments that are in there and give our final import in the Environmental Impact Statement that will be prepared by FERC.

I need to clarify a couple of things there have been some inaccurate reports and a few other things that indicate that the Coast Guard intends to shut down the recreational and commercial use of the Columbia River or the Skipanon Waterway during LNG tanker traffic. We have no intention of closing the waterway during the LNG tanker shipments.

The Coast Guard is highly experienced at managing similar existing safe and security zones on the Columbia River for cruise ships and shipments of other dangerous cargo such as ammonia, none of these need to result in closing the waterway. We take your comments seriously and the more specific and detailed your comments are the more thoroughly we can analyze and address them.

Please take the time and make them orally today

or send them in writing. Thank you for your time today and it is my pleasure to be able to serve each and every one of you and the safety and security of our maritime committee thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you Captain Travers. Now I will have a very short power point presentation to explain FERC process. The purpose of today's meeting is to give you an opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement EIS, specifically the proposed projects and Draft EIS. Explain the FERC review process -- FERC process is an independent regulatory agency. FERC is responsible for rates, for interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil. FERC is also responsible for siting of interstate natural gas and hydro-electric facilities and LNG import and export facilities.

DOE, Department of Energy approves the export of LNG. FERC is lead federal agency for NEPA review and EIS for the Commission. FERC is an advocate of the environmental review process not the project. FERC issued a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS issued on August 5th, 2015 that EIS comment period ends October 6, 2015. Comments will be addressed in the final EIS.

The EIS is not a decision-making document. FERC Commissioners determine that the project should be approved

based on review of environmental information in the EIS, public comments, engineering, market and rate information. What is the EIS? The EIS is an analytical document. The EIS takes a hard look at the environmental impacts of the projects and compares alternatives.

The EIS addresses environmental issues identified by the public and agencies during the scoping. That EIS, comment meetings, written comments, you can provide by U.S. mail, or comment form on the table which is outside, letters mailed to FERC directly, digital comments by e-library or click comments by e-library, these are different methods that you can provide your comments.

Written comments are given the same weight as spoken comments. I will give you a little information about the Oregon LNG Project. Oregon LNG consists of import and export LNG terminal in Warrenton, Oregon and 86.8 mile long 36 inch diameter bi-directional pipeline, 140 megawatt, 48,000 horsepower electrically driven gas compressor station.

The next slide shows the map of the project and I apologize that it is very difficult for you to read however, Oregon LNG folks have a map at the table you can look at that. Basically it begins on the top right corner it shows the triangle goes through Clatsop County, crosses the Columbia River and goes into Washington state at Woodland,

Washington it will connect with the Northwest Pipeline.

Washington Expansion Project which consists of 140.6 miles of 36 inch diameter pipe in ten non-contiguous segments between Sumas and Woodland, 96,000 horsepower of additional compression at five existing compressor stations. It also involves the betterment and removal of existing pipeline and above-ground facilities.

I know again this map is also very difficult but we have it posted in the back you can look at it if you see there are red segments those are the proposed segments for the pipeline development and replacement. And it begins from the bottom of Canada at Sumas and ends at Woodland in Washington.

Public concerns identified have been safety, geologic hazards, export of natural gas, impacts on aquatic resources, wildlife, listed species, water quality and cultural resources, forest clearing, cumulative impacts and alternatives, LNG carrier traffic impacts, air emissions, usual impacts.

Now I have something to tell you about the meeting decorum today. Please turn off your mobile phones, summarize the main points and submit additional information in writing, refrain from personal attacks, do not interrupt speakers. Any disruption will only restrict your fellow citizens' ability to speak. And I notice here that some of

you have posters, please leave them in the back and try not to use them to disturb the speakers or obstruct anything.

Speaker's procedures -- come up to the microphone when your number is called, state your name to the microphone, spell your name for the stenographer, adhere to the 3 minute time limit, yellow light will show up and shows when 30 seconds are left and red light means time is up.

Please do not interrupt the speakers. The last slide that we have it talks about the FERC review process. If you focus your attention to the three gray areas, those are the public opportunities for input and that arrow indicates excuse me --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't read that.

MS. KOCHHAR: I know I am going to tell you, there's a poster in the back that explains all of that, the same thing. It is so big it doesn't fit in. The arrow points are where we are in the process that means we have already mailed out the DEIS and we are conducting comment meetings like today.

The responses to comments would be used to why is the DEIS developed and Final EIS. The Commission will review the DEIS and will ask rates, engineering and market and other things before issuing any decision. If the Commission decides to approve the project parties can request FERC for re-hearing and if the project is approved

the applicants will submit all of the outstanding information to satisfy conditions of the Commission Order or Authorization.

Once they have obtained all the federal authorizations FERC will issue a Notice to Proceed with construction so anybody who is invested in looking into the FERC review process there is a poster outside at the table, you can look at it and read the explanation of the review.

You will note that we have arranged to have a court reporter to transcribe this meeting so that we have an accurate record of the public comment meeting. The transcripts for this meeting will be placed into the public record after a few weeks. If you would like a copy of the transcript before that you may make arrangements with the court reporter following this meeting.

Oregon LNG requests Authorizations under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, NGA, to site, construct and operate an import and export liquefied natural gas LNG terminal in Warrenton, Oregon. Oregon LNG also requests a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity which certificate is subject to Section 7C of the NGA to construct and operate a natural gas pipeline from the proposed LNG terminal to an interconnect with the interstate transportation system of Northwest near Woodland, Washington.

Northwest requests a Certificate pursuant to Section 7C of the NGA to expand the existing natural gas transmission system between Woodland and Sumas, Washington. The primary purpose of the project is to export an equivalent of about 456.3 billion cubic feet per year of natural gas to foreign markets.

The primary purpose of this meeting is to give you the opportunity to provide specific and valuable comments on the Draft EIS prepared by FERC staff on the projects. It will help us the most if your comments are as specific as possible regarding the proposed project and the Draft EIS.

I would like to again clarify that these projects are being proposed by Oregon LNG and Northwest and FERC is the federal agency responsible for evaluating applications to site and construct on-shore and near-shore LNG import or export facilities as the application to construct and operate interstate natural gas pipeline facilities.

The FERC therefore is not an advocate for the project, instead as mentioned throughout the process FERC is an advocate for the environmental review process. During our review of the project we assemble information from a variety of sources including Oregon LNG, Northwest, you the public, federal, state and local agencies as well as Indian tribes and our own independent analysis.

We analyze this information and prepare the Draft EIS that was distributed to the public for comment. A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was issued for the projects on August 5, 2015. We are near the end of the 60 day comment period of the Draft EIS, the comment period ends on October 6, 2015. All comments received, written or spoken will be addressed in the Final EIS.

I encourage you if you plan to submit comments and have not please do so here tonight either during the comment period portion of the meeting or in writing using one of the forms in the back of the room. You may also submit comments using the procedures outlined in the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS which includes instructions on how to submit your comments electronically. Your comments will be considered with equal weight regardless of whether they are spoken during the comment portion of the meeting or submitted in writing.

If you received a copy of the Draft EIS paper or CD, you will automatically receive a copy of the Final EIS. If you did not get a copy of the Draft EIS and would like to get a copy of this Final EIS please sign up for the mailing list at the table in the back. Provide your name and address we will make sure you get a copy of the Final EIS.

I would like to state that neither the Draft nor the Final EIS are decision-making documents. In other words

the EIS does not determine whether the projects are approved or not.

I also want to differentiate between two distinct FERC roles, the Commission and the environmental staff. Bob and Elisa outside and I are part of FERC's environmental staff which oversees the preparation of the EIS for these projects. We do not determine whether or not to approve the projects. Instead the Commission consists of five Presidentially-appointed Commissioners who are responsible for making a determination on whether to issue an Authorization to Oregon LNG and a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity or Certificate to Northwest.

As I mentioned earlier the EIS is not a decision-making document but it does assist the Commission in determining whether or not to approve the project. The Commissioners consider the environmental analysis in the EIS, public comments, as well as a host of known environmental information such as engineering, markets, and rates in making its decision to approve or deny Oregon LNG's and Northwest's request for an Authorization and Certificate respectively.

There is no review of FERC decisions by the President or Congress thus maintaining FERC's role as an independent regulatory agency and providing for fair and unbiased decisions. Only after considering the

environmental and non-environmental factors the Commission staff will make its final decision whether to approve or not approve the projects.

If the Commission votes to approve the projects, Oregon LNG will be required to meet certain conditions as outlined in its Authorization and Northwest will be required to meet the conditions outlined in the Certificate.

FERC environmental staff will monitor the project through construction and restoration to document the environmental compliance with applicable laws and regulations, Oregon LNG's and Northwest's plan and mitigation and the additional conditions required by the Authorization and Certificate.

So I give you a kind of short overview of what FERC's role is. Now we move into the part of the meeting that we will hear comments from audience members. If you would rather not speak tonight or do not get to say everything you wanted to in the allotted time, you may hand in written comments tonight using the comment form found at the table at the back of the room or send them in to the Secretary of the Commission by following the procedures outlined in the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS.

Either way your comments will be considered with equal weight. As I said before this meeting is being recorded by a court reporter so all of your comments will be

transcribed and put into the public record. We will be calling speakers in order according to the numbers given out during the sign-in.

Due to the length of the speaker's list we ask that you please limit your comments to three minutes or less. If we have additional time at the end we will allow more time for anyone that would like. I ask that each speaker first identify themselves or if a group or agency you are representing, please spell your name for the record and speak clearly into the microphone.

My number one rule is please show respect to anyone speaking. We are now ready to call our first speaker. Before I say that I would request you to hold your applause just one or two seconds, but don't continue because you will be losing your own time and we have a big list of speakers here and we may have to take a break at 8 o'clock so with that we will now call the speakers, so will speaker number 1 please come to the microphone and Pat will be calling.

MS. TERHAAR: Before we start I just want to -- as we mentioned before we will be using this timing light. At the end of 3 minutes there will be a noise for you so please finish the sentence that you are on at that time and the other thing that we want to mention is that if you could come, the first four speakers, come up and sit in these

chairs here and that way it will move the meeting along.

So if we could have speakers 1 through 4 come up, okay we have got speaker 1 up here so thank you, speaker number 1?

MR. HALVERSON: Members of FERC thank you for taking public comments tonight. For the record I am Brad Halverson, H-a-l-v-e-r-s-o-n and I reside in Hillsboro, Oregon. As a lifetime Oregon resident I am proud of the reputation of our state has achieved for clean air, clean water, relatively healthy fish levels from those that preceded you and I.

It is contrary to sound reasoning to argue this proposal will not have significant long-term environmental and ecological impacts to the most scenic parts of our state. But I am here this evening in my role as Vice President of Conservation and Association of Northwest Steelheaders, to express concern for this proposed activity in a sensitive habitat, vital to sustaining healthy runs of salmon, streelhead and sturgeon, many individual stocks of which are listed as endangered.

As I annually moor my sport fishing boat during July and August at Skipanon Landing on the Skipanon River, my access and that of all others who have moorages in Warrenton, will be undeniably and necessarily restricted due to increased marine traffic, and the imposed security and

recreationalists taking advantage of this renowned basin. Delays or restrictions during the return to port in the afternoons, when high winds often make navigation difficult and dangerous, could reasonably lead to a higher incidence of boating accidents.

In addition, the risks to sustaining a healthy Columbia River estuarine ecology compels denial of this proposal. The LNG tankers and terminal will adversely impact this fragile, natural balance by expelling hot water from tanker engines, and chemically treated water from the terminal. In addition, the ballast water expelled by the LNG tankers could reasonably contain invasive species, acquired in foreign waters.

The proposed deepening of the Columbia River will require removal of 1.2 M cubic yards of river bottom to dock LNG tankers, and necessitate maintenance dredging 300,000 cubic yards every three years directly in the bull's eye of sensitive marine life habitat and migratory routes. Anadromous salmonids travel this corridor at two critical junctures to their life cycles: once at outmigrating smolts, and once as in-migrating adults on their journey to their natal spawning grounds. During both phases, they must spend extended time in the estuary to transition from fresh water fish to a salt water species, and then back again.

It has been shown dredging and the removal of sediments can have adverse impacts on marine species and their habitat due to physical or chemical changes in their environment at or near the dredging and dispersal sites through increased turbidity and oxygen depletion. Resettlement of suspended sediment can smother these fish. Removing substrate means removing habitat and species alike. So, in the short fun, we risk suffocating them; and in the long run, we risk permanent removal of their habitat due to altered flow and sediment.

These negative impacts to wildlife stocks and Oregon citizens are eminent if the terminal and export operations transpire flawlessly. God forbid the consequences if we experience a catastrophic event at any time throughout this process. Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: I've been told by my court reporter to be careful when you are speaking into the microphone not to speak too closely.

MR. MESSING: Is that okay?

MS. TERHAAR: That's perfect thank you.

MR. MESSING: All right I'm Ted Messing, a 45 year resident of Clatsop County and the Columbia River Estuary. I have been fighting LNG proposals on the Columbia River since 2004, okay, but before I begin I want to ask everyone who is opposed to this project to please stand up.

Thank you. I don't understand why we are here today. Clatsop County Commissioners unanimously in 2013 voted unanimously in 2013 to deny permits for the gas pipeline so Oregon LNG has no feeder pipeline. The proposed terminal site is an Army Corp. of Engineers dredging dump site. This was recently upheld by two federal judges, so they have no pipeline and no terminal site.

In addition Clatsop County citizens voted no LNG by 67% in '08. We don't want this LNG export project and we don't need it but because you are known as the Federal Energy rubber stamp committee, we are pretty sure you are going to approve this matter going forward no matter what our community wants.

So I thought perhaps your rubber stamp was getting worn out so I made you a new one and you will see it says "Okay" on it so it needs to be used so I made this for you and it is all ready to go so this is yours, I am going to leave this with you thank you very much.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. DURHEIM: Lori Durheim, L-o-r-I D-u-r-h-e-i-m. The many regulatory requirements for permitting Oregon LNG's terminal and pipeline are stated with the DEIS. Their proposal clearly violates part if not all of the Clean Water Act, the River and Parks Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the

Golden Eagle Protection Act the, Fisher, Constellation and Management Act -- stop the clock please.

Should I start again? Okay, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act, the National Historic Preservation Act and most importantly the Coastal Zone Management Act. Why is FERC taking the word of the applicant that everything can be fixed by mitigation?

According to Oregon LNG in the DEIS and on their website they can take care of all possible problems and conditions. I don't believe them. The Skipanon Peninsula is made of dredge soils from the lower Columbia and Skipanon rivers. Exploratory drilling has been done to try and find bedrock. There was no bedrock found at a depth of 350 feet. How can a huge gas terminal be built on this kind of terrain?

Oregon LNG seems to have all the answers you want to hear. Would you move your family to a neighborhood which has LNG manufacturing and export facility close to your home, your children's school, your place of worship, where you go shopping or where your loved ones are buried? Well I don't think you would.

We who live and work here know what is at risk if this speculative project goes through. Do you? Is FERC going to give lip service to conditions to let this project

go forward? Your Draft Environmental Impact Statement is full of holes and won't hold water.

This isn't the first DEIS I have read. In the communities where these enterprises are proposed, the citizens say that FERC is a rubber stamp agency for energy companies. Exporting LNG would exploit our community and our state with huge environmental impacts, this is also true for the Jordan Cove LNG Project in Coo's Bay. Show us that FERC does not stand for "Forget Environmental Restrictions Commission". Don't green light these projects, the people of Oregon say no to LNG.

Washington said no to LNG, California said no to LNG and Tijuana, Mexico said no to LNG.

MS. TERHAAR: And can speakers 5, 6 and 7 come to the front?

MS. EADY: My name is Carolyn Eady, E-a-d-y. I'm here to speak. I will be submitting these comments in writing in an expanded version.

First there is a slip slide fall directly underneath this facility. It was identified by Thomas Horning who is a certified Oregon engineering geologist and he said it is probably public record, he did this study for the Board of Commission and he said it is significant, it's been known in the literature since the early 2000's. It can generate an earthquake in the 6's, it can come at the same

time as a seduction or it can come by itself, either way if it comes together it will increase shaking by 80%.

I can't think of anything worse so unless I missed it in all of those hundreds of pages you have to look at that. Second, these large carriers which are supposed to cause no problem have done simulation studies it is in your report, our pilots tried with the 40 foot draft with the ship loaded, their maximum operating was 2 knots in waves of 2 feet.

I don't know if you have got around here but that is quite unusual. To me it's a no-brainer you can't use those unless they get smaller ships or something so that needs to be recognized.

The third point well that's the earthquake potential -- I'm most concerned about hazardous substances. I think the people in this area have no idea of what they are going to be handling, how toxic, how flammable and explosive they are, they are going to be collecting other products, propane and butane and selling them, having trucks pick them up every week.

There are 3.7 tons per year of hazardous what do they call them, hazardous substances called hazardous airborne substances that will be released. They have 24 organic compounds in there including benzene, all kinds of toxic things so that cannot be ignored and finally the

modeling.

There are so many problems with that modeling I guess I am going to have to put it in writing, but they are not following good science here and you can't build it that way.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 5?

MS. QUINN: Thank you my name is Donna Quinn, Q-u-i-n-n. I'm the Marketing Director for the Canopy Hotel and Spa here in Astoria, Oregon. I'm also the executive member of the Oregon coast Visitor's Association Board working closely with Travel Oregon. My business is tourism. 27% of the jobs in Clatsop County are tourism related.

Travel dollars coming in to Clatsop County 2002 were $390.00 and in 2014 they were $516.79 dollars. Oregon LNG threatens our growing tourism economy and promises short-term jobs for long-term economic pain. These short-term jobs I went over could also result in our county having to put folks on unemployment. It is a fallacy that LNG will sustain jobs for levels. Oregon LNG will cost jobs and cost us the environment and character of a place unlike any other.

This place belongs to the world. Because of the richest renewables of Clark and the vision of John Jacob Astor, American's first Millionaire -- it is having an

important place on the state for over two centuries and has a vital and important place today.

Today the North Coast communities of Astoria and Warrenton are international tourism destinations because of this culture and its beauty. Having a dangerous industry would change its character forever and undermine our thriving economy which is booming now and will continue to grow provided we are considered a beautiful and safe destination.

We and you have the responsibility to observe our Lewis and Clark legacy, our important American history, our unique national story which exists here and only here in the kind geographical location. Oregon LNG would be critical and endanger salmon habitat in the Columbia River and it would negatively impact the healthy commercial and recreational fishing industry and threaten public safety.

The list of reasons to deny this is long. Why be approved, such a monstrous and bad idea in this place? Who will ultimately gain? Oregon LNG with their expensive lawyers and compromised scientists, smoke and mirrors PR campaigns and questionable findings should not deliver with promises they cannot keep.

Thank you for protecting what is in essence here, a growing site, because of its cultural and physical significance to world history, this is a special place,

actually defined as the western boundary of the United States. Thank you for exercising the visionary leadership function and big picture which we need now to deny this project in the irreplaceable Columbia River estuary.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you.

MR. HAGUE: Good evening, my name is George Hague, H-a-g-u-e. This past Friday the Daily Astorian ran five very good letters on the LNG Project. I will be submitting the page with those five letters. I will expect the Final EIS to include those five letters, I will expect the Final EIS to respond to all of the concerns and questions raised within those letters.

One of them I will read a short portion of is from a resident, a 78 year resident of the City of Warrenton. I am a native of the town, born across the street from Warrenton grade school, football field on 9th Street, I have lived here my entire life of 78 years. I wish to stay here but if this plant is built I will have to move elsewhere.

When I was in my teen years I used to duck hunt at the location of the proposed LNG construction site. I had to wear hip boots because of high tide, the water would rise from the Columbia River in Young's Bay, almost all the way to the Skipanon River dike. This site is not acceptable

for this project. Skip Hearling, the Planning Director. Who wants this project did not come from this area and knows nothing about the history of the area.

I'm going to stop at this point in his letter but it does show the concern that residents do have that live here. The Final EIS must analyze, it's a worst case scenario for this project. That means that you are going to have the worst case of a ship loading, operations going on and then we have the worst tsunami and earthquake along the edge and then the impacts of that on this rounding lands.

But the Final EIS really needs to show what that scenario would do to our area. With this project in the worst case scenario and also show what would happen if that project did not exist. So we can compare a loss of life, especially perhaps within the schools and that has to be in there for each of the schools in our area, we need to know what is going to happen to those students.

We need to know what facilities will be available to exit those students safely. We don't know what's going to happen to all of those children, they are not an acceptable risk, they are not.

The proposed facility is going to be around probably when that tsunami and earthquake or earthquake and tsunami takes place, during its lifetime.

Hopefully we will not see that anyway.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you sir.

MS. TERHAAR: I think we have 8, 9 and 10 come forward please.

MS. JOHNSON: Sure, Cheryl Johnson, 4493 Peterson Lane in Astoria. I am a grandmother, a retired school librarian and a 40 year resident of the Lower Columbia River. I have been fighting to keep LNG off of my beloved river and out of our community since 2004. I have attended FERC meetings, site visits and hearings on numerous occasions.

In over a decade of moving from a mild school librarian to an outspoken community activist I have learned two truths. Number one, FERC does not care a fig about communities nor the citizens in places where LNG terminals are proposed.

Number two, FERC has never had an LNG proposal or a new terminal that it did not like and certainly rushing to permit the Oregon LNG terminal and pipeline as fast as possible.

Therefore today I call on the Governor of my state, Kate Brown to use her authority to protect our safety, our environment and our economic future. Elected officials are supposed to protect communities from development which will introduce unacceptable levels of safety hazards for the residents. Governor Brown I have

four specific safety concerns I would like to share with you today.

Number one, Oregon LNG has not developed an emergency response plan and isn't required to until after the terminal is approved and prior to the start of construction -- the Warrenton County Fire Department consists of 3 full-time employees and 30 more volunteers and is located within the 2 mile hazard zone. The sole ambulance provider is Medics ambulance located across the bridge and is within the 2 mile hazard zone.

Columbia Memorial Hospital is the nearest hospital also located across that bridge and is not a designated burn center.

Governor Brown number two the Coast Guard has no available plans for dealing with vapor cloud fires, or pool fires on the Columbia River. In fact according to the enforcement division Chief of the Columbia River, the Coast Guard does not own or operate a fire boat in the lower Columbia River.

Number three Governor Brown, currently there is no signed agreement to meet these needs. If FERC plans to permit the Oregon LNG with only a promise of a future cost sharing plan and Clatsop County will have no authority to later deny the terminal.

Number four Governor Brown, Oregon LNG has not

provided an evacuation plan. Oregon elementary and high schools house over 900 students in grades 1 through 4, these local schools are within the 2 mile hazard zone. What is the evacuation plan with children if there is a vapor cloud fire?

Governor Brown we as citizens of Oregon cannot depend on FERC to advocate for what is safe for our community. Once the permits have been granted and Oregon LNG is pitching hard to begin construction.

Governor Brown please stand up for Oregon citizens and direct Oregon state agencies to deny the permits for Oregon LNG, thank you very much.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MR. HELLER: Mahlon Heller, M-a-h-l-o-n H-e-l-l-e-r, Astoria, Oregon. One -- export of LNG. It is unpatriotic to export our natural resources. They are needed in case of declared or undeclared war and consider that those like Oregon LNG are partly owned by foreign governments such as the Chinese.

If exported natural gas prices would increase as much as 10%. Furthermore, we really do not know how much natural gas using fracking is available. Moreover, production might be curtailed due to the inherent level of environmental problems like water pollution, earthquakes and sinkholes.

Hence the price of natural gas could sky-rocket. Does FERC understand the potential consequences stated above?

Two -- homes security. Home security has denoted LNG facilities as high value terrorist targets. FERC must require LNG, Oregon LNG, to fill out and submit to FERC and Oregon LEDC emergency plan and tell us are you willing to risk thousands of Oregonians, their homes and their livelihoods for an unnecessary LNG terminal and 100 to 135 long-term specialized jobs?

Three -- Oregon state requirements. How can you issue a license or two license when a: the Army leases an area that Oregon LNG needs? Not all Oregon state requirements have been met and c: Oregon LNG is in violation of some of Oregon's state and county decisions.

FERC obligation, number 4 -- government and FERC are formed by the people and for the people. FERC's first obligation under the Constitution is to determine if the proposed LNG terminal is good for the people and has value for the U.S.A.

Clearly because of all of the testimony today and items one through four listed above the proposed LNG terminal is not good for the people and may be detrimental to the U.S.A. hence the LNG terminal is unnecessary and the FERC license should not be issued.

If you issue a license do you really think you are a representative of the people?

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you speaker number 9?

MR. VANDENHEUVEL: Good evening, my name is Brett Vandenheuvel, I'm the Director of Columbia Riverkeeper. First off I want to thank some of our federal representatives up here tonight and representatives from Senator Merkley and Senator Ryden and others, thank you for coming.

And first of all I stand up here first proud and I want to thank all of the engaged, incredible, passionate community members that are here tonight that took their afternoon and evening to come talk to you about this project so thank you everybody.

This Oregon LNG terminal and pipeline is a reckless and dangerous project that you will hear many of the reasons why tonight. I don't need to go into those again. What I do want to tell you is that FERC today should have -- can and should have reject Oregon LNG. It is not necessary to wait, it is not necessary to continue to evaluate. This project should be denied today.

There is -- including the fact that Clatsop County rejected it, Save Oregon must reject it because it is inconsistent with the Oregon Coast Management Program that implements a Coastal Management Act. It is inconsistent

with local lives in Warrenton and as well as the gentleman spoke before the Army Corp. of Engineer's easement. The Corp. has an easement to deposit dredged soil on the very site where they want to build this project. FERC has known about this since at least 2009 when they received and entered into -- Oregon LNG has known for at least that long and during this whole time this process has marched forward.

The Corp. in a letter to FERC said that we will vigorously defend our easement. There could not be a more clear signal that the Corp. is not going to give this up, it is taken seriously, it is required to keep the Skipanon River open, to be able to dredge it and this project doesn't have the right to be built there.

The EIS says one out of hundreds of pages of subsets, one very small paragraph on the dredged soil and it deserves more than that, it deserves to take a hard look at that and reject it because they do not have access to the property. I don't think it can be any more simple than that. While it is dangerous and reckless and there are many, many reasons to reject this project, not being able to build it there by law is the reason FERC should stop it today, this is a colossal waste of time, it is a colossal waste of energy and it is embarrassing to the federal government, we need to do the right thing today.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 10, and if we can have 11, 12 and 13 come up.

MR. SHOBER: Madame Kochhar I have a favor to ask of you. May I just stand and address people with the microphone?

MS. KOCHHAR: We usually prefer that you face us.

MR. SHOBER: I can't hear you ma'am?

MS. KOCHHAR: We prefer --

MS. TERHAAR: We would like you to face us so that --

MR. SHOBER: Yes, okay, actually that's sort of my point. FERC is thoroughly corrupted. I have gone to FERC meetings as long ago as 2008. In 2008 you shared a stage with the company you are supposed to regulate in the matter of the Pelham More Pipeline in Northwest Natural. You shared the same stage, you shared a computer, a power point presentation, you were up there and telling us how it was going to be with that pipeline.

And the people in my position here were speaking to you and turned around to speak to the neighbors we were all told no we could only address FERC. You have heard the expression captive regulators. You folks have said very clearly that you promote the review process and not the industry, but your actions align to that.

You are a voter of industry as they say you have

never seen an LNG project you didn't like. You are immune to the what people want, you are immune to local input, you are selling what should not be sold and that is prostitution. You are prostituting the authority of the public and it is not what we want, you should take that home with you and shut this thing down before it begins.

There is no defense for what you are doing, thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 11 please.

MS. LEATHAN: I am supposed to address FERC but in fact I am hoping to affect what Kate Brown says about this project because I agree with her. My name is Ellen Leathan, L-e-a-t-h-a-n, I live at 4122 Southeast Pine Street in Portland, Oregon. I was invited to babysit my grandchildren today and I drove down here because I thought, what will I say to them in 18 years or 14 years?

I am going to be turning this in in writing too because I will probably run out of time. We have not talked yet about the noise that this plant will produce for anybody so foolish as to authorizing any common sense. I want to talk about the noise and I want to talk about the noise that wasn't made. This is a Trojan horse. In August, Steve Dean exposed in the Oregonian what was written in 1970 when the nuclear power plant was built on a fault in the

Columbia gorge.

That information was suppressed for 23 years and it took us that long to shut down Trojan, before there were just minor leaks and advanced powerful leaks and the increased subsidized pseudo-cleanup.

Things that have not been suppressed about how dangerous a little terminal or pipelines are. 2007, Ben Gerwin writes in the third edition of his book on the Oregon geology. The river bottom near Astoria is so unstable that the combined currents of the river entirely eroded the sea floor around it again as the Astoria Bridge was being constructed.

He writes further holisting sediments are notoriously unstable. Oregon Geology's Society's presentation, on May 9, 2014 to Kurt Peterson explained that the most significant finding in his study of Columbia River's topography is the unusual depth of the holisting sediment. They range and they are extremely unstable. Holisting sediments are avoided in the construction, you go down to the layer below and if they were by a bridge they were up to twelve hundred and ninety feet in depth and Astoria Bridge they are up to 400 feet deep, that's when you are going to get to bedrock.

How the hell can you run a pipeline across unstable sand and gravel? All day long and Maryann sipping

sand with toxic gas and stuff that's not real, good God, but I would like to suggest that we put warnings on it, or on a solar panel. Thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 10?

MS. RASMUSSON: Hello my name is Pearl Rasmussen, I grew up in Astoria.

MS. TERHAAR: Can you spell your name please?

MS. RASMUSSEN: Sure, P-e-a-r-l and my last name is Rasmusse n R-a-s-m-u-s-s-e-n. I'm from Astoria I grew up here. I attended the Sadie Hawkins dance in this building. I love this community more than anything and I think that committees such as yours should recognize our town's right to say no to this project as we have done over and over and over again.

I don't feel hopeless on you and I really hope that you guys could change your act and vote differently on this this time. My whole family lives here, I have nieces and nephews here and I hope to raise a family here someday too and I hope that the air is safe for them to breathe and that it's okay to swim in these rivers, at least as much as it is now. I know the Columbia is not perfect but please say no to this, thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 11 and would 14, 15, and 16 come forward?

MS. DELORENZO: Hi, Teresa Delorenzo. Okay, wonderful, Teresa Delorenzo, T-e-r-e-s-a Delorenzo, D-e-l-o-r-e-n-z-o. These projects are so wrong on so many levels it is hard to know where to begin. Please deny Oregon LNG's application for an import/export LNG facility and associated pipelines.

Approving the proposed LNG terminal violates your own regulations and is a monumental insult to Columbia River, Columbia Pacific region, surrounding environment, human and wildlife communities.

The last speaker has me choked up and will make a massive contribution to accelerating climate change. Approving the proposed LNG export terminal is a bad idea on all levels and would demonstrate a remarkable lack of imagination. There is no demonstrable need for the proposed Oregon LNG plant. Building a massive facility to import and/or export fossil fuel extracted at grave cost to the environment provides no local, regional or national benefit. It offers tremendous risk and serious consequences for no benefit.

MS. TERHAAR: 14?

MR. MARVIN: Dan Marvin, M-a-r-v-i-n, 1228 Elgreen Avenue in Astoria. If you look at that address you would see that it overlooks Young's Bay and I have got a nice house that I have spent probably 1,000 hours remodeling

and it has got a beautiful view of Young's Bay.

And the terminal site is just around the corner from me. But my background is fishing here. I've got about 35 years in the industry I have started out salmon trolling out of Newport, I have been with the city for about 25 years and then I came back and I'm playing around at Young's Bay, so I have a permit and I live right on the bay, a beautiful little house and I overlook it and it's you know -- a big part of this is this has recently been designated as a commercial fishing area by Oregon State Law.

And the sport fisherman are paying into it as speaker number 1 kind of testified here a little bit. This area I don't see how it is going to be able to exist with the terminal a mile outside and all the dredging that is going to be taking place. The smolton that are in there are very sensitive to dredging and it is just going to take one bad tide and it is -- so anyway you have a big problem right there.

So one of the Head for Salmon for All which is a local trade organization for commercial called me and he wanted to know what I thought about if the fish would survive and I say no way they won't survive if this gets built.

Anyway that's all I have to say so thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 15?

MR. HAYS: My name is Roger Kevin Hays, H-a-y-s. My wife and I live on Lewis and Clarke Road just outside of Astoria on 35 acres of land. We were advised a few years ago that the pipeline would pass through the back of our property across our forest land. We were also advised that the pipeline company had the power to seize our property, the easement by eminent domain if we chose not to sell voluntarily.

I believe that if a private entity has the power to seize somebody else's property by eminent domain that there should be a very high public purpose for that seizure and that very high public purpose should take into consideration not only the economic benefit of the person but the power to seize, but the health, safety and environmental concerns and economic concerns of the general public.

Since this will be literally passing through my back yard I feel that we have -- my family has a very strong stake in the issue of safety and I don't think safety has been a big concern by the developers of this project. If safety was a concern why won't the terminal be built along Puget Sound where the Washington Expansion Pipeline passes on its way south from Canada?

Certainly if safety was a concern the terminal

might be built in Woodland, Washington where there wouldn't be a necessity then to run this high-pressure pipeline under the Columbia River and then up and through impassable terrain of the coast range down through Clatsop County, including my back yard to the soggy Skipanon Peninsula which has been identified by the State of Oregon as a tsunami inundation zone, clearly marked on state maps.

Safety is not a high consideration by the developers of this project. I have testified before FERC before the County Commission, I have testified at the DEQ hearing, it was always overlooking at only land use, are we looking at only clean air or clean water standards. But we need somebody to look at the big picture and make the big decision. If it is not you then I hope it is Governor Brown. If you have that authority and you have the information of the danger this project represents it's a boon-daggle, it's a catastrophe waiting to happen and you know it, thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 16?

MS. ANDERSON: Hello my name is Catherine Anderson, Catherine with a "C" Anderson, s-o-n. I live about a quarter of mile from the proposed terminal. Every morning I take my morning coffee, go to my dining room window and look out at the Columbia River and the estuary, if this thing comes in I will be looking at storage tanks.

I'm not happy about this but I am going to talk about I know you hear all of these people and there is people's passion. I want to go to a study done by Sandia and National Laboratories, have you heard of them?

And there were scientists, I mean a whole realm of people who did this and they made a guidance on risk analysis and safety implications of an LNG spill over the water. We are talking about going from the terminal to the ship and what happens in that little bit between those two if a spill happens on the Columbia River.

We are in zone 1, ground zero as it is. By then there are three factors to be in zone 1. One is that there is a narrow channel for the LNG ship to come in, boy do we have narrow channels out there, we have sand bars, yeah so they have a narrow channel to pass.

The second one doesn't apply which means they have to go underneath the bridge, but the third one definitely applies and that is, are there people within five meters of this pipeline and/or terminal that has population that poses public safety and personal hazard and yes we do. We have people all over the place, we have schools, we have Fred Meyer, we have a Free Mart Center, I mean there are people there, they shouldn't be able to make a facility that close to the public. The risk management strategies for LNG operations should address both vapor description and fire

hazards, therefore the most rigorous current major such as vessel security zones, waterway traffic management and establishment of possible control over vessels are options to be considered as elements of this risk management process.

I know the Coast Guard is working on it but I hope they address all of those scenarios. There also needs to be a coordination among all court security stockholders that is essential. Incident management and emergency response measures should be carefully evaluated to ensure adequate resources, is that being done?

For example what about the firefighting, do we have those things? Not yet. What about salvage in case something goes wrong with the ship, do we have that yet? Not to my knowledge are available for the consequences and risk negation.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you.

MS. ANDERSON: This is -- oh, the first page of this, there is 161 pages you need to look at this. There are a lot of things in here.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 17 and can we have 18, 19, and 20 come to the front please.

MS. JOHNSON: My name is LaRee Johnson, that's L-a-R-e-e Johnson with an "o" and I have quite a bit of testimony here and I am not going to be able to cover it

all. I would like to start with this quote, "There is still very limited awareness of the nature of the threat. There is an area of specialists, it is also an area dominated by industry in which the right to make a dollar at whatever cost is seldom challenged. When the public protests, confronted with some obvious evidence of damaging results, it is fed little tranquilizing pills of half-truths. We urgently need an end to these false assurances, to the short coming of un-palpable affects.

It is the public that is being asked to assume the risk. The public must decide whether it wishes to continue on the present road and it can do so only when in full possession of the facts."

This quote is from Silent Spring by Rachel Carson. How many of you heard that? This still rings true today because of her research of 50 years ago it alerted us to the damage caused by DDT and other pesticides for their deadly effect on health on humans, plants and other animals.

This is part of the letter that I wrote on February 14, 2005. This was published I the paper and I have a sheet of letters that have been published and I regret that there are -- everyone in this room has a sheet of letters that they have written that they did send and I would suggest that you make copies of those letters and send them to our Governor Kate Brown because she may not have

then read since 2004 when this started.

So there are many questions we need to ask when you are writing the LNG proposal. I remember when Peter Hanson the Vice-President for business development of Calpine, then Acadia and now Oregon LNG asked us to have patience for their proposal, we are running out of patience.

I still have more questions for FERC. Is it wise to build a project of this magnitude in a tsunami, earthquake subjection zone? Are they listening, are you listening to the testimony that has been given by the citizens who have been saying no for 11 years? Have you read the work of Dr. Jerry Havens, distinguished professor of chemical engineering who studies the dangers of LNG and came here specifically to speak to a pack here by the Liberty Theater.

You can google his name Dr. Jerry Havens. Can a small local volunteer fire department handle an emergency with LNG explosions? Google LNG explosions, who will want to buy property in Warrenton with an LNG facility in their back yard? Why have we spent money rebuilding salmon habitat to have it destroyed by dredging, warming of the river and possible endangered species in the balance? Do you know that schools with children are within the blast zone of the proposed LNG.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, you can submit the

comments.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you very much and I will hand in the rest of this for it to be included in the testimony.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

MR. BATCHELDER: My name is Alan A-l-a-n Batchelder, you spell that Batch as in "cookies" elder as in "church". I want to acknowledge that this is an important part of the information presented to the environmental impact people.

The environmental impact people lack authority. They can advise and give information is that correct? So what I want to be sure to have considered if we have any influence today that we have been told that the LNG project is a done deal. If that is the case why are we here?

Does anybody know? Does anybody have an answer to that? Well I hope that somewhere, somehow the will and the concern of the people that are included in the environmental impact statement. However, I am quite confident that the proposal to open the river to traffic of petroleum products by trade must have been approved in the environmental impact way and we know already that the promises of safety have been rather hollow when it comes to rail transport of petroleum products.

The transport of liquefied natural gas makes the

crude oil in a railcar seem like a fake match. I want that to be somehow included in the thought processes of the Environmental Impact Statement. It is important to know that the local economy which is positively affected by cruise ships coming up the mouth of the Columbia River in Astoria, it is a huge difference and the people who are on those cruise ships get the benefits of Astoria as a welcoming safe and charming place.

And if those cruise ships have to compete with large vessels carrying liquefied and natural gas I wonder whether the companies that are responsible for these cruise ships are willing to share the river with such hazardous vessels. It is questions like that that concern me more than some of the others.

However the potential for disaster is possibly the greatest, we don't even have a clue I suspect as to how it will be the impact of an incident with the LNG project can be and that is why I am standing here -- I didn't come here because it was a pleasure, thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Thank you.

MS. PEPER: Hi, here I am again. Welcome to Clatsop County. My name is Josie Peper, J-o-s-i-e P-e-(one P)-e-r. Oregon LNG's proposal is a bad and ill-conceived idea. We know that Gillnet Fleet is being phased out from

the main stem of the Columbia River and the fishery will be the last best refuse of the Lower Columbia Gillnet Fleet. This only to be exacerbated by the fact that salmon smolts migrating through the area would be imperiled by the overheated water which OLNG plans to discharge into the Columbia River.

We know that OLNG disregarded reliable reports regarding the structural geology of the Lower Columbia River and the inherent risks associated with not one but several recently active geologically speaking, faults in the area. We know that SIGTTO, the Society for International Gas, Tanker and Terminal Operators has stated in their LNG terminal siting standards that there is no acceptable probability for a catastrophic LNG release, that LNG ports must be located where LNG vapors from the snow, that are released cannot effect the lands, and the risk of catastrophic LNG release is unacceptable.

That LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway uses, now and into the future. For example, commercial and sport fisheries as well as pleasure crafts and other ships that apply to the Columbia River and that also that human error potential always exists so it must be taken into consideration when selecting and designing an LNG port.

The SIGTTO standards cite the

government-sponsored Sandia Labs report, as previously mentioned, potential risks to LNG transport and terminals. If he finds 3 hazard zones surrounding LNG carriers, the largest on that is 2.2 miles or 3500 meters around the vessel indicating that LNG ports must be located at least that distance from civilians. Some of them recognize LNG hazardous groups, some world recognized LNG hazard experts, Dr. Jerry Havens has already been mentioned have indicated that 3 miles or more is a more realistic hazard zone distance.

We know that the largest hazard zones for the OLNG proposal takes in most of the city of Warrenton and three schools as well as a good part of the west side of Astoria, two schools and the Young's Bay Bridge. Further it is an insult that FERC hasn't required OLNG to supply a detailed and full emergency response plan. Is it because there are so many potential risks that cannot be mitigated? How do you mitigate public safety?

We know that the DEIS currently understates the hazards and potential impacts of Oregon LNG and we know it is not sustainable. Please don't rubber stamp this proposal, we need better from you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 20, and can we have 21, 22 and 23 down in front.

MR. FABER: Hi my name is Jan Faber, J-a-n

F-a-b-e-r. I'm an over 30 year resident of Astoria. As I recall the FERC was established during the time when the government wanted to secure energy independence for the energy security for the United States and the FERC was charged with moving that goal forward and also serving the public interest.

So in view of that let's take a look at the answer to this question should be rather simple. First of all what does the Oregon LNG plant do to provide energy security for the country? They are taking natural gas and sending it somewhere else. That just tells you right up front that it is not needed, we have no need for the natural gas that they are exporting. It does nothing to help the energy policy of the United States.

So let's turn to the other side the public interest. Was the public interest served by exporting Oregon LNG? Well first let's get beyond construction and jobs that are involved in that because that is temporary, you are looking if something is going to be operating in the future for countless numbers of years.

So what is the public interest served by getting the gas and sending it overseas? The only interest I can see is profits to the investors for the company. I don't think anybody has identified any other public interest local, state-wide or national served by selling LNG

overseas.

On the other hand what are some of the downsides of it? We have got over 600 pages of downsides in your environmental report, so there is extensive disruption of nature between logging the right-of-way, dredging, constant discharge of warm water into the Columbia, all of that has been well documented and what do you have to answer? Mitigation.

Well I think if you have looked at the history of mitigation for a disruption of nature nation-wide you can see that it doesn't work. We are spending billions and billions of dollars to try to put back into nature what we have destroyed. So if there is no public interest served by this, why go through that in the first place?

And with my apologies to the Coast Guard and I would like to stand corrected. I think they were a little disingenuous in saying that we are not "closing". Okay they are not closing anything but when I read their letter the 500 yards on either side of these ships as a security zone, so for that portion they may not be closed but you can't get closer than that.

Our shipping channel is not 1,000 yards wide. I wonder, especially with the State Representatives, why the Port of Portland isn't up in arms? There are so many shipping companies that are on the borderline of rejecting

coming up to the Port of Portland. If they have to wait all of that time for the passage of the ships, the Port of Portland is going to severely suffer.

MS. MARINCOVICH: I'm Georgia Marincovich, Georgia like the state, Marincovich, M-a-r-i-n-c-o-v-i-c-h and I have been fighting LNG since 2004 and I think I have spoken at FERC before for Bradwood Landing, your faces look familiar.

MS. KOCHHAR: I wasn't on Bradwood.

MS. MARINCOVICH: Anyway, so what I have to say is that my husband is a commercial fisherman, my family has been 139 years fishing or in fisheries in Astoria and on the Columbia River. My husband is head of the Columbia River Fisherman's Protective Union. We have had a lot of trouble getting fishing on the river, it's trying to put us off the river and that isn't working and I read the DEIS for Bradwood Landing and I found things that were wrong in that and I looked at Oregon LNG's -- accompanied the original DEIS, it left so many things out I couldn't believe it.

Don't they say they only work during fish runs. Fish runs year 'round, I mean the fish smelter and endangered species, they run in the winter. There is fish up and down the river all year long so you can't build a plant when there is no fish in the river because there is always something in the river.

So the dredging is going to ruin Young's Bay and it's not just Young's Bay, the fish run all the way to Canada and we have the most beautiful fish in the United States and we have the best salmon in the world. When the Queen of England came to Canada she had Columbia River Salmon from Astoria, on her plate and I just -- it's just crazy to think that you would allow that in Astoria.

The other thing that bothers me is where are all the people that were supposed to be for it? Where is Warrenton? Astoria says what is wrong with Warrenton, I said they are crazy and you are too if you allow this here.

MS. DEA: I'm Marilee Dea, my last name is spelled D-e-a. I'm a public health pediatric nurse practitioner in myCounty for 30 years and I coordinated prevention programs, alcohol prevention, blood prevention and vaccine prevention and communicable diseases and now in my retirement I am working on trying to save the children's future from climate change. I'm trying to prevent that.

I need my glasses on to read. What I am about to say, this summer the Northwest experience the beginning of what looks like climate change it was very hot air and caused forest fires. 50 million acres in Alaska burned, 300,000 acres in the Olympic National Forest burned, it is the wettest place in the entire continent. I have a small retreat in the north coast and I was so fearful all summer

that that was going to burn too and all the town forest burning like the -- burns.

I am very fearful that LNG is going to harm this even further. At one time there was a thought that LNG was the bridge to the future because when it was a little less current, but not we know that it is not the bridge to the future at all because the way they are getting it is fracking is we are wasting melting. Much more melting that we expected and methane is 83 times more potent than CO2 which is causing all of this climate change.

It's leaking 25% and it's leaking where its fracked, it is leaking at every transfer site, when it is goes into the pipeline, when it comes out, when it goes into the ship and the methane is going up as a pollution blanket over our earth. This was just found out by a study by Colorado State University. It has now found that LNG is even more dangerous than coal or oil for our habitat.

The real solution to climate change is to leave fossil fuel in the ground. Let Astoria be a bridge of the future in wave energy, do you have any waves here, or wind? You guys are really stuck for the future and just use that. Even exporting, if you want to export something solar panels, these are a good place for jobs and they will be renewable for our future, thank you very much.

MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 23 and can we have 24 and 25 and 26 come to the front also?

MS. HOLMES: Hi my name is Nancy Holmes, H-o-l-m-e-s and I live in a quiet little corner of Seaside, about 19 miles south of here -- I really hate this thing barking at me, I'm going to bark back -- 23 miles away from the proposed terminal in Warrenton.

Thank you for coming to this beautiful corner of the world. A corner, a region that will be considerably less beautiful if the LNG terminal is sited here with those invasive pipelines creeping across the land. You will hear and hopefully listen to the geological and biological and safety issues and other valid reasons that this proposed project does not belong here. But really think of it this way, it is as if I received a notice, someone was going to put a gas station on my front lawn, this is my genetic position I'm a little crooked -- it does not belong here, it is awful, the cars that drive up my driveway to get gas for the gas pump all night long -- but that is what will happen the notice tells me.

The notice also says I have to be open 24 hours a day, all day all night, when will I sleep? How can my neighbors sleep with all the lights flooding into their homes, 24/7? Oh yeah, no one is going to sleep with that awful generator noise coming from the pumps, right there on

my front lawn. I must tell the city, or do they know about this? They know I am in a tsunami zone.

I have one of those barrels that drive through food or something in my garage that will feed two or three people for two days when the big one hits. My garage door is splitting because the house is settling in two different directions. I can't get my front door open. This is no place to put a gas station.

Do the people in Salem know about this? Does our Governor realize what is going on? She must have read something about it or is she really listening? Is she deciding or ducking -- and how about the other politicians who represent me in Salem and in Washington --Washington, D.C.?

The ones whose signs I put out on that front lawn every election time. That gas station will take care of that. Where are they know when I needed to listen about this awful gas station on my front lawn? Or when my corner of the world is being made considerably less beautiful and less safe by the money the oil and gas people's destructive and irreversible constructive project named Oregon LNG?

Please do not site this Oregon LNG terminal in Warrenton on the base of the beautiful Columbia River, it simply doesn't belong here.

MS. TERHAAR: Number 24?

MS. HUNT: Hi, thanks for coming and for listening to us, this beautiful corner of the world. I'm Joyce Hunt, H-u-n-t and I live in Seaside, -- Nancy does another great place. And I have had 11 years to think about having an LNG terminal where we could probably see if it we stood on the roof from here.

I went out on my surfboard, I'm trying to relax, enjoy you know -- could I see the terminals from the Cove in Seaside or if it exploded what would be the light pollution at night? Then I drove up here today, I have always loved driving across the bridge, that's really going to affect my view.

I'm thinking my personal stuff here now, two weeks ago I was up on the top of Saddle Mountain, I don't know if you guys saw it when you drove in, it is one of the highest spots here on the north coast because it has a 360 degree view and that would be highlighted in the view and to me totally destroying it, but again that's personal.

As a career I was an x-ray technologist my whole life and one of my basic tenants is working with something that is potentially hazardous, but does the benefit outweigh the risk. So I tried to look at LNG that way and there is no way I could figure out any benefit. I mean some people talk about a few jobs but does that -- when the risks are a terminal in a major tsunami zone that is going to destroy

the views, potentially hamper all the works that we have been doing for the salmon?

I'm on the Watershed Council a local Watershed Council and I know that millions of dollars have been spent trying to keep the salmon going and keeping us a sustainable river and this isn't compatible, the benefits aren't there, they do not outweigh the risk and I want to -- there are so many risks involved with this I don't see how they could ever benefit.

MS. CAPLAN: My name is Laurie Caplan, L-a-u-r-i-e C-a-p-l-a-n. I have to wonder why you bothered to arrange this hearing. This DEIS is incomplete and inaccurate and misleading. People who don't review terminal applications for a living have found numerous errors and omissions and some of that misinformation would be laughable if we weren't talking about such a massive threat to Warrenton and our region.

You already know that this project is dangerously irresponsible for the reasons you have heard for years. This proposal does not even make sense of the 8 basic site selection standards set by the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators, SIGTTO so I have to ask does it concern FERC that Oregon LNG's proposal ignores three orders of the SIGTTO guidelines?

If you believe these industry standards don't

matter which apparently you do, why does FERC even pretend to care about the health and safety of the area residents? On previous site visits to the Skipanon Peninsula, FERC didn't even bring a geologist and you have to turn to company representatives to answer our questions because you knew so little about the project.

At one public hearing in Warrenton you hired armed guards to intimidate us with blocks and you had a microphone and sound system that didn't work. Yes we can tell how much you care about what happens to us. It is we here who would bear the destruction, dangers and costs of this project while FERC denies any responsibility for the consequences of your decisions.

It is way past time for FERC to start using your power over Americans more responsibly. I would like to think that at least a few FERC staffers know you could and should do better. You call this a public hearing but we know FERC isn't listening. Governor Brown are you listening? Thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: 27, 28 and 29.

MS. MCDONALD: Hello and thank you so much for coming. My name is Pamela Mattson McDonald, that ends with "s-o-n", two "t's" and McDonald just like hamburgers. I am vetting myself. I have been in the merchant marines for 7 years working for an oil transport company called Crowley

Maritime and a member of the Inland Boatman's Union.

For 7 years I worked as a merchant mariner on tugboats hauling petroleum products for Crowley Maritime. I have been to Nakisky on Keynine and I have been to Vancouver BC. Our petroleum depots were right next to the LNG depots there. I saw incidents and items which would put the fear of explosion in anybody's heart. I have pictures here that are totally incriminating that I took while I was working.

True examples -- our engineer smoking on deck as we passed the docking area in Vancouver BC for petroleum and liquefied natural gas and chemical piles -- crew members barbequing on the back deck of the tug boat holding 8 million gallons of gasoline while we were motoring along on calm seas.

Lazy attitudes about the dangers of petroleum products -- gallows humor abounded on the boat and on the barge. I know the close calls I have witnessed and the dangerous job of hauling gas and petroleum, I participated in them. They are occasional and not recorded. Often near misses are only shared between parties involved to avoid being put on the crewman's record for the company.

The LNG plant is inappropriate to the geology on which it is going to be sited and safety is not guaranteed because I know up close and personal the crews that work in this thing and please all crew members please excuse me, but

Lanny you should never had smoked on that barge while you were doing that stuff and we were going up the channel in Vancouver, thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 27?

MR. ADEE: My name is Ken Adee, A-d-e-e and I am a resident of Astoria. Astoria is the oldest town west of the Rockies, it is a historic treasure. There are 847 properties including the downtown historic district on the National Registry of Historic Places. We are proud of our heritage. The historic character of the town, the awesome scenery, the fisheries and natural resources are the reason I moved here and the reason we all love Astoria.

It is the reason we have a burgeoning tourist industry. The Draft EIS should provide -- it identifies many of the risks to our natural resources in the community posed by the construction of the pipeline and the export terminal. It fails, however, to respond to those risks affectively.

It claims that Oregon LNG will mitigate the drastic impacts of construction and operation of the terminal and pipeline but it provides no signs or explanation of how the proposed actions will actually mitigate the impacts. Your assurances that mitigation measures are adequate are simply empty promises.

They have no basis in fact. We know that FERC

will approve Oregon LNG's proposed project. We must rely on Governor Brown and the state agencies to stand up to the fed's and corporate greed to protect our environment and communities. If the Governor and state agencies do not refuse permits and these projects are implemented they will devastate the historic character of our community and the natural resources that are the pride and the life-blood of our community, we are not an acceptable risk.

So that's all I have to say but my wife asked me to note that nobody has brought up that we have recently learned that 1,298 heavy and light-duty trucks would be traveling from Tongue Point at the east end of Astoria, through Astoria to Young's Bay and farther per day, this is unacceptable.

I mean God that road is way too trafficky now, putting another 1,200 trucks going up and down that road especially in the summer is just ludicrous. All right that's all I have to say, thank you.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 28?

MS. SULLIVAN: Hi, my name is Kathleen Sullivan, I live in Astoria. I have been so busy at my job that I haven't been able to write anything down. I work at the Canopy Pier Hotel and every day we have a view of where the site is going to be and every day we check in people from all over the country and from overseas.

And they come to Oregon because it is such a beautiful state. One of the things that I am really proud of is Governor Tom McCall wasn't here at that time but made the shorelines public. So we have a resource that is attractive to people from all over the world to come and see wild shoreline that's not built up, it's really a miraculous thing.

One of the things that in addition is that I have been involved with local politics since I have been in the community which is almost 9 years and I have also been a public school teacher and so how do you rule communities, how do you get people to act, to make us think things is a very difficult thing to do and that's what makes it so amazing, they have been here for over a decade.

And you know from sitting in other FERC hearings how unusual this is and I personally have been knocking on doors and making phone calls, I have worked on campaigns for city council, for Warrenton City Council, for County Commissioner, I mean years of meetings, yada, yada, yada, yada, because I want to keep the hope alive that a democracy is valuable.

I had some young nephews, well they are teen-agers now they lived most of their lives in the area and they say why do I get involved? It's getting harder, it's getting harder but my God don't we have a voice still?

The other thing that I know everybody is here today, did you even recognize our flag, but I personally am grateful that we have the FERC here and again I know there are countries where Shell Oil and
Enron and all these other big companies come in and just plow over and the people don't even have the right to speak up and we do. We should be thankful for that.

And we will help stop this, we dismissed one and we will ultimately dismiss another one and it is quite a feat and it is because of regulations -- it is because of people like you who take a job as you do, the business of government is long and hard and I appreciate you being here and I hope you will listen to us.

The miracle of democracy needs to stay alive, thank you.

MS. TERHHAR: Can I have 30, 31 and 32 come to the front please.

MR. RODMAN: Hi, I'm Marc Rodman, M-a-r-c R-o-d-m-a-n, I live in Astoria. I have spent quite a few years in Alaska and have been around their LNG terminal in Nikiski quite a bit. If you go by their terminal you would notice that downwind from it all of the vegetation is either dead or mutated for a good mile.

They have had at least two tankers break loose from the flowing ice, which I know we don't have that

problem here, but I also know that it is rated that 6 kilotons of explosives -- the idea of putting a bomb of that size into a community it's just unbelievable, I can't imagine why anybody would do this.

If you are going to put a terminal like this, put it somewhere where there isn't any people at least. I mean don't worry about the environmental hazards then, worry about the human hazards. This is just not the right place to be putting bombs of that size and I'm sorry if the Coast Guard thinks they can protect us from this.

We know better than that. Thank you that's all I have to say.

MS. TERHAAR: 30?

MR. THOMAS: My name is Ted Thomas, that's Ted as in one day I will be dead and Thomas is Thomas, T-h-o-m-a-s. I promised my friends I would speak about the incomplete, inaccurate, misleading, Draft Environmental Statement and the inadequacy of the description and the real impacts and so on but the absurdity of profunctory theater, of counterfeit public involvement where the outcome is pre-determined and our testimony only lends credibility to the sham process and places us in the role of supplicant become so odious and it makes you so sick at heart that you can't take part, you can no longer take part, you can't even passively take part.

We will confine that testimony to my written -- my written testimony and the eloquence of my colleagues here. The proposal to me is fundamentally a question of our sovereignty. Of whether our national founded in bloody revolution that overthrew the control of foreign owners shall now succumb to the interest of billionaires and the central committee of the Communist party of the People's Republic of China at the Battle of Plassey in the 18th Century the inferior British expeditionary force prevailed over a superior Indian force.

They did this because of the treason of a prince who for a price withdrew his supporting troops at a crucial point in the battle. That treachery delivered the entire Indian sub-continent into the hands of the British occupiers for a subsequent 200 years. The British rewarded that trader with palaces, jewels, harems, and more pomp and ceremony that would make the European regions blush with modesty.

But he was only a puppet like the CEO's and energy holding companies here in the United States. The British plundered India, their people starved by the millions. We will only see unemployment and destitution by reducing our country into the role of the colony like the British in India.

Are we to participate in such treachery? Ask the

people of Central America if United Fruit benefited them. Ask the people of Africa if Rio Tinto held their mines in their own interests. You have within your power in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to rule in the interest of the American people, do so.

MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 31?

MR. SEAMONS: Hi my name is Paul Seamons, P-a-u-l S-e-a-m-o-n-s. And I just wanted to say something, earlier somebody asked all of the folks opposed to the terminal to stand and they did but I wanted to note for the record because it wasn't recorded but I think virtually everybody stood but I guess I would like to ask everybody who is in favor of the terminal to stand.

So for the record no one stood up. Pardon me -- one person stood. Now why do you think that is? Why do you think that we have a public hearing here and only one person out of 50 or 75 is in favor of this terminal? I don't know. Is it because there is hardly anybody in favor in this community or this area?

Could that be? It just seems curious to me. But anyway I just wanted to say that you know the smartest scientists in the world -- the folks most acquainted with climate, science, geology, oceanography have assured us -- assured us that we are in a race against time. We are in a race between can we transform our energy economy from a

carbon-based economy to a renewable-based economy before global warming and ocean acidification transform the atmosphere and the oceans in almost irrevocably into something we don't recognize and probably can't deal with.

We have got to change our energy economy away from carbon. Invest in additional investment in carbon-based infrastructure does exactly the opposite and it makes it that much harder to accomplish the transformation that we know we must have. You folks made clear you are not the decision-makers, but you are citizens and you are all intelligent and I suspect that you all know that we have got to make this transformation.

This project does not make that transformation this project makes that transformation much more difficult, it creates greater vested interest and greater infrastructure and greater momentum in the wrong direction. So aside from the small scale environmental impacts the large scale environmental impact that we have got to consider is the contribution that this makes to additional acidification and climate change and on that basis alone the committee, the FERC should deny the application.

MS. NEWMAN: So I'm Carol Newman. I'm a 41 year resident of Clatsop County and I have been standing against LNG since October 2004, it's 11 years. And I am asking you right out to deny LNG's permit for an export/import

terminal. A couple of concerns I have -- I did just mention slightly so I won't dwell on them but the traffic.

I live in Brownsmead and it took me over the summer it took me an hour and three-quarters on a Friday afternoon to get from my house to Astoria, 23 miles and that was because it was over 100 degrees in Portland. Now, just imagine the main part of the stoppage was between Tongue Point and inside the city. So adding to that all of the information that you have.

A colleague just mentioned that they should put the LNG terminal where there are no people. Well guess what, those of us who have been involved from the beginning know how it got here to begin with. California said "no way" and these folks came up here, the Swiss Calpine which is now OLNG that was the predecessor before they went bankrupt. They came here because they said exactly that we are an acceptable risk. There are few enough people in this rural area and as you have seen from our t-shirts, we don't agree with that.

We consider ourselves to not be an acceptable risk. So I don't know where there aren't no people but this doesn't work either for LNG as far as I am concerned. I work with the cruise ships, I am one of the docents at the Liberty and I work in the town as well. They come in in the spring and they come in in the fall, there are more and more

of them because they love it here, because of the volunteerism, the passion with which the people here appreciate our environments.

That's another thing you have heard it several times that will stop. They don't need us, they love us but they don't need us. We need them. The Army Corp., I may be wrong on this, but my understanding is the Army Corp. of Engineers is a federal agency. I also understand that FERC is a federal agency. Could you two please talk to each other and figure out what the hell is going on because something is very wrong when these two agencies are completely at odds with one another.

Lastly in my culture "sins" of omission are as relevant and detrimental as "sins" of commission. Oregon LNG is mightily guilty of both transgressions. This is a very important time of the year, we are all thinking about our transgressions. I hope you will make sure not to make yours and thank you to all of the audience who came on their own time and expense, including the representatives of our senators and representatives, I hope they will listen and do the right thing along with the Governor.

MR. ZENN: 33?

MS. TERHAAR: 33? And can we have 34 and 35 come up?

MS. MCKINLAY: Hi, my name is Bonnie McKinlay,

M-c-K-i-n-l-a-y. I live at 7112 Southwest 53rd, Portland, Oregon. For those of you in this room that heard this testimony outside the building please forgive the repetition. I applaud the eloquence, the wisdom and persistence of the noble people of this breathtakingly beautiful place. Thank you so much for your continued work.

We stand with science, science. Remember science? Science tells us about the flow of the tides, the cause and cure of illness, the interdependence of life forms. Science. When science gets in the way of financial gain for the fossil fuel industry it is ignored. Industry has its way forging ahead with unsustainable and dangerous projects.

Science is real. Real is acknowledging our planet problem. Real is using renewable alternatives and employing millions in its development. Real is not found in this outdated industry plan for more and more fossil fuel extraction and exportation when despite science and safety and economic realities FERC approves LNG facilities we take our energy, our testimonies, our numbers elsewhere.

The growing opposition to the two LNG terminals and connecting pipelines is not going away. We will not dishonor our state by accepting proposed LNG projects on the north coast or on the south coast. We will not dishonor our state by bending to the will of Oregon LNG, Williams

Pipeline or Progressive Industries.

We expect Oregon Governor Kay Brown to stand with science, her responsibilities and stand with us in opposing LNG and Oregon.

MR. DUGGAN: Good evening --

MS. KOCHHAR: Excuse me just a second. After this speaker we will have to take a 10 minute break, okay, thank you.

MR. DUGGAN: Good evening my name is Forrest Duggan, F-o-r-r-e-s-t D-u-g-g-a-n and my family and I live at 82 Southwest Elm Avenue in Warrenton and I opposed this building of the LNG plant for obvious reasons. For one my family and I live a mile away from the proposed area facility.

Our home sits within the blast radius of the proposed area. Now why would I want a ticking bomb, one we can stop before it happens in our city? Is my family supposed to live in fear of another catastrophe? I do not want to raise a family knowing that there is an LNG plant down the road.

Second I am a commercial crabber who departs from the Skipanon River. Crabbing is my livelihood and the 500 yard exclusion zone would directly interfere with my family's stability. The traffic the LNG plant would bring to the area would hinder the delivery of crab.

Commercial fisherman will be put in jeopardy which is the basis of safety in the ocean when you want a timely departure or return. Like the Salmon, Warrenton is my nursery for my family and the proposed LNG plant will threaten both. We cannot gamble with our future, LNG plants in Mexico, Algeria or even right up the Columbia River have proven that they are not safe.

When you propose building any hazardous material within the densely populated area you run the risk of killing people. We cannot allow these corporate ventures to outweigh the safety of our city, of our people and I beg you Brown, to oppose the building of the LNG plant in Warrenton, thank you very much.

MS. TERHAAR: We will take a 10 minute break now, so at 8:20.

(Break at 8:08 P.M.)

MS. KOCHHAR: Hello I request that everyone take their seats, we will resume, thank you.

MR. ZENN: Number 35 if we can 36 and 37, 38 up. It's all yours.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay I am Roble Anderson, R-o-b-l-e Anderson A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n and I live at 22 Northwest 13th Street which is about a quarter of a mile across the water from this LNG facility. I am a Warrenton resident for the last 65 years. I have been working on the

family homestead for the last 61 years. I have dedicated my life to developing this property.

Okay first off my first question is for 11 years I have been hearing all about this facility is going to create 50 or less jobs. Suddenly two weeks ago they are saying they are going to create 150 jobs. Where did these extra 100 jobs come from? Okay, moving on -- jet engines, as I have been told in order to power these compressors they are going to have to be running jet engines, the series of engines, not just one but a bunch of engines, 24/7 in order to provide the power, in order to power this thing.

I wear hearing aids because I worked in a flight line listening to engines. I can't imagine what it is going to be like to be a quarter of a mile away from those things, I could hear jets taking off at the airport 3 miles away. This is a serious noise pollution problem.

Then there is the lights, they are going to have lights on in this place all night long. The place is going to be lit up like a whole city and every window of my house except for two face directly toward that. There is not going to be anything that is going to resemble darkness in my house ever.

Light pollution as you are well aware is considered an environmental pollution hazard. Two years ago or not two years -- last summer I decided that this was

becoming too bad of a situation for me to continue to live there. I decided to put my house on the market. I was asking two-thirds of what it was valued at. I did not get any offers at all because nobody wanted to be that close to that facility.

This is a real thing that is ruining property values, even now. Back in the cold war they were worried about what they were going to do to the President and his cabinet, all the big-wigs at the top as they wanted a safe place to put him. They built a bunker down about 50 miles south of here up in the hills. That bunker was there because that was the cleanest air in the world. You could go anywhere in the United States and that was considered the safest place.

I have one last thing -- in your beginning thing here on the screen you said that FERC was responsible for interstate handling of energy, there were types -- this is an international thing, it is not an interstate thing, this is way over your heads. This is Canada tried to export LNG to China --

MS. TEHAAR: Thank you for your comments. Speaker number 36?

MS. MERRITT: My name is Kathleen Merritt, M-e-r-r-i-t-t. I'm a 39 year resident of Warrenton well within the blast zone. You have heard all of the great

things tonight, mine are a little more specific dealing with environment. At the meeting last -- whenever in Warrenton, when OLNG was there and their consultants, they all gave various little scenarios talking about how wonderful everything was and I asked them a series of questions which they did not answer.

Number one they talked about at the terminal here they would be removing sulfur and mercury from the incoming gas but they would not tell us where they went. Air pollution -- they talked about the temperature of the discharge water to the city but they could not give us a temperature that it currently is.

Air exhaust -- it would have been really nice if you would have had this meeting oh maybe August 1st and have you drive from the airport down as Ms. Newman pointed out, you wouldn't have gotten here let alone thousands of trucks, with their exhaust day in and day out plus their cars.

I also asked about noise, noise pollution is a big one in the environment. They talked about driving piles, I don't know if you have been around a pile-driver, they go constantly, I live within that blast zone. You know they talked about caring for the marine animals and fish and the wildlife and the environment what about us and our hearing. They didn't mention -- I asked how many hours a day they would be driving piles, they never answered that.

They mentioned buffering for the fish and marine animals, they didn't talk about us. They talked about environmental monitoring but they didn't say who is paying for it or how often so I just want you as everybody has said, we don't want this here, we don't need this here, there is no do over, you can't hit delete once everything has been destroyed, thank you.

MR. ZENN: 37? You might as well get 38 and 39 up here as well.

MR. MCKINLAY: Donald McKinlay, M-c-K-i-n-l-a-y, Bass Lake. I want to explain the moral responsible for us, for the people of Oregon and Washington is to stop the expansions of fossil fuels that will prevent a future for a living earth, to stop the destruction of lands and communities by gas pipelines and terminals, to stop the gas extraction process that poisons and threatens the earth and to stop all harmful export projects initiated by a desire for profit alone.

And we ask and we expect all democratic institutions to support us such as yourself. We cannot and we will not tolerate the destruction and social corruption caused by proposed liquid gas export facilities because we want a healthy and abundant future and a better world.

MS. WRIGHT: Karen Doris Wright, W-r-i-g-h-t and my 90 year old mother have lived at 94 Southeast 3rd Street

on the Skipanon River in Warrenton for about 20 years and purchased the home and to avoid future cancers, illnesses from airborne pollution. We believe the Oregon LNG export proposed for the peninsula at the mouth of the Skipanon River, essentially at the mouth of the Columbia River is an unconscionable project which is in the middle of the city of Warrenton, is an unconscionable project for the local Warrenton area, the regional area along the Columbia River, western half of the United States and the people for the entire United States for hundreds of significant reasons, many of which were mentioned during today's hearing by those speaking against the approval of Oregon LNG.

And I incorporate all of their comments and questions and written submissions as part of my comments by reference. An LNG expert at Stanford told me no LNG facility should be built in the middle of a town or a city and that California banned LNG exports due to the extensely horrendous, negative and toxic environmental impacts. So if it is not okay there and in Mexico and in Washington, how is it that people here or Washington think it is okay to poison us?

Greed and politics is pushing the Oregon LNG proposal forward. It needs to stop now. I was shocked back in about 2005 at the Warrenton Council when they said it was okay to import and export LNG since LNG proponents told them

it was no different than off-loading boxes. It was ridiculous then and remains so today. Stop it now.

Basically there is only two reasons given for the Oregon LNG. One -- so Oregon LNG can use up limited United States LNG for a for-profit and allegedly to provide jobs, mostly temporary. Well that is smoke and mirrors. It is unconscionable that the U.S. allows our scarce resources to be sold off. As China and other countries can afford to pay about ten times what the citizens paid for natural gas now. Prices of LNG will -- to U.S. citizens and business will shoot up significantly, perhaps as much as ten times. This price increase will not just be at the mouth of the Columbia community but will likely be over half of the nation and the result will be citizens losing jobs while not being able to afford to buy LNG gas they need.

So the net effect of this will be a tremendous on-going loss of jobs. The net effect will harm our balance of trade by increasing costs of products produced in America and thereby reduce the sale which in turn will result in a loss of jobs. --What I didn't hear a noise?

MS. TEHAAR: Thank you.

MS. WRIGHT: I forgot to mention that noise will keep us up too.

MS. TEHAAR: Number 40 and can we have 41, 42 and 43 down here at the front please?

MS. FRITZ: Good evening, my name is Anna Fritz, A-n- n-a F-r-i-t-z. My understanding is that you are looking for public comment about the Environmental Impact Statement and to be honest it really doesn't even matter what the specific environmental impacts of this particular project are, it's really very simple. Climate change is already happening. New fossil fuel infrastructure means burning more fossil fuels.

If we want life to continue on earth, we have to leave fossil fuels in the ground. We cannot continue down this path as a nation or as a species. If you have any loyalty to the human race, to the plants and animals that we share this place with, to the creator of all life, you will do everything in your power to stop this project, thank you.

MS. TEHAAR: Number 40?

MR. ZENN: Number 40?

MR. MOORE: Hello my name is Larry Moore, with two "o's" and I'm from Brownsmede and I've been just participating in the meetings when Northern Star was proposing their site, Bradwood and as I was talking to one of the representatives there, I think I kind of mentioned I said it seems to me as though you forgot your context map. We were on the Oregon side of the river and I didn't see anything about the other side of the river which was the island of Cathlamet, a Pugent Island and we joined then with

some people from Puget Island and we made friends and we have had pot-lucks and Northern Star got cold feet or their investors got cold feet and somehow went away.

We have all felt better those of us who were against it. Most of what I had to say if I can cover that, I'm not going to get redundant here but I will suggest partly the thing that I'm somewhat qualified -- I have a degree of landscape architecture and this is my pull up number five here, this project will ask to mitigate the destruction to the river bottom and wetlands on the peninsula where I find most mitigation falls a little bit short of its intended benefits.

Somebody here just asked me what is mitigation? I go, well mitigation, that's an attempt to replace the habitat or somehow you know compensate for the destruction or like say the change of a place. Often times that is disconnected from the place, in other words, the company will be allowed to build a wetland in Seaside after they change the environment say for instance, it would have been Bradwood, and an example of that might be these little ponds over there by Fred Myer -- that was one that didn't work so well.

There are some that do work better than others and I would say that this is probably not a success formula, thank you very much.

MS. TEHAAR: 41?

MR. CORBETT: Del Corbett, C-o-r-b-e-t-t, thank you very much for being here and allowing us to have some say. I want to put aside public opinion for a moment and bring your attention to scientific solid evidence. I believe there is overwhelming evidence for you to deny this application.

With the public opinion and people's wishes back to it and there is nothing but overwhelming reason to deny this application. This is about the fourth public meeting I have been to with public opinion being overwhelmingly in one direction. I hope this will not be the next public meeting where that Commission or body has acted against the people's wishes.

I believe I hope we still live in a democracy and that the people's say has some effect. I believe you have all the evidence -- more than enough evidence necessary, scientific and public input to deny this. Should FERC approve this application I believe you are not committing an act of prostitution, just an act of prostitution. I believe you are committing treason, thank you.

MS. TEHAAR: Thank you. Speaker 42?

MR. DUNCAN: Thomas Duncan, D-u-n-c-a-n. I'm speaking to the absurd and deliberately deceptive notion of bi-directionality. The Skipanon Peninsula has stirred

controversy since the mid 1990's when it was zoned for use as a golf course and hotel development that started our re-imagining and revisioning of the Port of Astoria.

In 2004 the land was abruptly removed from consideration to the gulf development and leased by the Port of Astoria to the Calpont Corporation without publicly consulting the City of Warrenton for the purpose of siting a LNG import facility.

This was of course a violation of the comprehensive plan and didn't meet the requirements of the then current zoning however, within the next year the City of Warrenton rezoned the peninsula to water dependent industrial shore lands, I2. I was at that meeting and remember it well the discussion which was just recently lived through here. Under the I2 zone the following are permitted outright: industrial docks, piers and mooring facilities, green cargo transfer facilities, seafood receiving and processing, that's still the zone.

LNG unloading and re-gasification is considered an outright permitted activity because in the words of the Commissioners, I'm paraphrasing here, it was very much similar to unloading and processing fish. Although that was something of imaginative overreach it similarly carried the day and the zone was changed.

This is now the basis for Oregon LNG's claim that

bi-directional LNG facility is already permitted under the current zone. Oregon LNG is claiming that manufacturing of LNG from raw natural gas is the same as re-gasifying LNG that has been prepared elsewhere and shipped to a Warrenton dock.

In other words, to create it similarly in the spirit of Warrenton's city Commission -- bi-directional natural gas is like a bi-sexual person. One can go either way but it is still a human being. This notion emboldened Mr. Conners to stand up at the Warrenton meeting a few weeks ago and assert the BNG facility had already been approved and that the zone could not be changed and that he was wasting his valuable time and taxpayer's valuable money and arguing the point. That claim in fact, was an outright deception and is a bullying tactic.

Manufacture of LNG is a very different matter from re-gasifying already made LNG and this BNG is an entirely new proposal. To slide this in under the radar as Mr. Conners would do is a very devious and evil bait and switch.

First the natural gas coming to the proposed facility is not pure methane but has numerous components, such as mercury, Sulphur, other toxic elements and there are hydro methane such as ethane, propane and butane which need to be separated safely and stored in some manner which is to

be mitigated.

None of that is present in the pure liquid methane in the original proposal and it is a major change in the project. Secondly the process of liquefaction is intensely energy consuming requiring as much as is currently used in all of Clatsop County. In addition there is an open gas -- clearly there are pictures of similar projects, the project needs to go back to the drawing board and the City of Warrenton needs to take another look at their code and what they mean by industrial benefit.

MS. TEHAAR: Number 43 and 44 come down to the front.

MS. BIRKENFELD: Carey Birkenfeld, C-a-r-e-y B-i-r-k-e-n-f-e-l-d. I have lived in Clatsop County for 43 years. My great-grandfather immigrated here in Homestead with my grandfather and father we are all loggers in the area. They lived close to the land and raised families here. They are all gone but I think you would agree with me that it is ludicrous to build in an area where earthquakes and tsunamis are certain to occur.

I have great concern about the health consequences to those living in the area and I am also concerned about the environmental impact as well as the impact on our lifestyle and traffic in the area. A number of years ago long before 2004 when this all started I saw a

re-enactment on TV of a woman who survived a huge explosion of an LNG plant in which a huge gas fireball was moving through the sky. She was clever enough to duck underwater in her swimming pool and held her breath for as long as possible and waited for the huge gas ball to pass over her house and pool. She was lucky she survived but how many of us have swimming pools in the area that are literally available for us to dive into. Most of us would perish, people much come first.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this.

MS. TEHAAR: Number 44.

MS.WEIDMAN: My name is Janet Weidman, W-e-i-d-m-a-n. I am a business owner and mother of five. Thank you very much for being here to hear us. We are all human and we have a lot in common. I imagine that you have families and you care about them deeply. I too have a family and I care about them deeply. My family would be put in harm's way by this project.

The environmental impact must include air pollution risks. This is one of many examples of one of those risks. Benzene is a known carcinogen linked to childhood leukemia, Benzene is an organic compound which would be released at LNG sites -- Benzene would then be exposing all of our children to childhood leukemia.

I don't know if any of you know anyone who has

that. I do and I have seen her grow up struggling three times with recurrence. I think you need to do that right thing and deny this project. I has been surmised that some FERC Commissioners work in the energy corporation in the past and they may even return to work for the energy corporation after working for FERC.

Please show us that you are not part of a revolving door. I am hoping that you have a conscience and you will do the right thing, just like Martin Luther King said, do the right thing and deny this hazardous, unsafe, unnecessary project. You will sleep better at night, thank you.

MS. TEHAAR: 45 and I believe we don't have 46 but if there is 46 I will ask them to come down to the front and 47 and 48.

MS. KLECZEK: Thank you for coming. My name is Kathy Kleczek, K-a-t-h-y K-l-e-c-z-e-k and I come here to talk to you about many of the things that have already been mentioned and I am not going to go into detail about the fact that this project is unsafe and unsound to be planned on unsound ground in the Cascadia subduction zone that it is contrary to the global mandate to step away from fossil fuels, that it is contrary to our economy here.

I personally own two businesses here in the local area and have an opportunity every day to welcome people

from outside of this region to our area and they come and I am told every day why they come. For the beauty and the environment that we have here that we hold important, that we protect.

We may be a rural community here, we may not have big fat wallets to support us and not bring in big city lawyers, but we speak from the heart and we come here from our own time and out of our own dollar to speak to you about what is important to us.

You have been presented with ideas if this will create jobs. You have been told over and over again how many jobs it will take away. The balance is on the side of the jobs it will take away by creating this facility here in the area.

I am asking for you to look at the information that is provided to you with a balanced opinion without taking into account the information that you are given by the company that pays environmental engineers to come up with the test results that they personally desire. I can give you an example five years ago I was traveling out of the country and had the pleasure of meeting some environmental engineers. After a little bit further on in the conversation I discovered when they told me that they worked for LNG companies and their job was to go to a site and come up with test results that they would present which

supported approval of the sites, regardless of what the evidence actually showed.

Their job was to write test results that supported approving LNG plants. They told me if an LNG company had decided to open a plant in my area in my county it was a done deal. We have also heard this evening that this is smoke and mirrors, but we are here and we are testifying but the decision has already been made. I would like to invite you on my own behalf and I'm certain I speak for many people in the room, to make us an example, make us the example that you are not a rubber stamp committee, that you can speak out and you can make the decision to recommend against siting LNG. We volunteer to be that example that this is the LNG plant that was an LNG plant that you liked.

MR. ZENN: Do we have 46? I don't think we do, 47?

MR. WEDELL: Good evening my name is Steve Wedell, W-e-d (as in Delta) e-l-l. I have been a resident of Clatsop County for 25 years --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear him too well.

MR. WEDELL: I have been a resident of Clatsop County for 25 years and currently reside in the City of Warrenton. We believe that the City of Warrenton's decision

to designate the LNG project's terminal and pipeline does not determine that this facility is an appropriate, highest and best use of the land and surrounding area of our beloved community.

There are many concerns that have been raised this evening that will dramatically affect our lives here forever. The regions character and placement of this facility so close to a known earthquake zone, the impact on cruise ships embarking and disembarking on the Columbia River, the flow of traffic, concern for safety and the ability of public entities to serve the needs created by this proposed facility of this magnitude are of serious concern.

The supporters of Oregon LNG continue to state that this facility will bring jobs. Attached here is a list stating that the current employment opportunities with the EPCC contractor and Pacific Northwest LNG they state, "Currently all of our positions have been filled. Job opportunities for construction-related work will be available through our EPCC contractor. Interested applicants may continue to submit their resumes and pending a positive and vested -- and vested now decision, we will be seeking qualified candidates in the following job areas. Listen number one -- construction management, two -- commissioning, three -- health and safety, four -- quality

assurance and quality control, five -- project control, six -- LNG plant integration, seven -- human resources, eight -- finance and accounting."

Each of these jobs requires a higher level of education other than just a high school degree. Training and strengths -- these are specialized employees that are being recruited. Warren Goldberg, the staff attorney for Columbia River Keeper quoted the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as stating this project will not provide the kind of economic benefit that this applicant and local government anticipated instead the project will continue to further denigrate the Columbia River estuary while changing or eliminating wildlife habitats.

Our beloved community isn't complete though unless we include the natural world, the natural beauty of our region includes national and state parks as well as local, well-restored downtown areas as is in this community of Astoria, several museums and is what Lewis and Clark founded in their epic journey to the west. Please continue the legacy to preserve and sustain this beauty and irreplaceable treasure of those before you have done, thank you.

MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, 48?

MR. PLUNKETT: I'm Jim Plunkett, P-l-u-n-k-e-t-t. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. Big projects like

pipelines and gas compressors bring up questions and doubts that might make us decide not to build them but over time we have developed ways to quantify risks. We have insurance and bond pricing to help us determine what might be the costs. There's compensation for risk.

Now another risk that can be quantified is the sustainability. There are hundreds of software programs now that can rate sustainability. An assessment of -- an assessment of quality of life, resource allocation and effect on the natural world and climate, public works agencies often use this software in their presentations.

I'm sure CH2M, uses these programs and I don't know why they haven't discussed this. The reason there is opposition to this project with so many red shirts is we are taking risk without compensation. Risks to our economy and environment, we take the risk without a reward.

Underwriters, yes bond holders yes, community gas company yes, salmon no, asthma no, fisherman no, kids no. I saw a video last week of a FERC hearing in Washington. A woman from Oregon had come there and disrupted the meeting. The video showed the audience looking straight ahead and slightly down and you might think that they were all embarrassed at the disruption and the decorum and protocol but I think they were embarrassed because they were colluding in wrecking the future and then perhaps their

children might see them there.

Here's what you could do. You could deny these projects, you could like we do as a citizen, call our Governor, you could say I'm on this slow-motion train wreck and I'm compelled by statute or something, would you deny it on our behalf and you could take courage from all of the people who have come to speak and you could tell your boss I can't do my job without an energy policy. I can't do my job without carbon pricing, I can't do my job without transparency.

MS. TEHAAR: 49?

MR. SERRES: My name is Dan Serres, I'm the Conservation Director for Columbia Riverkeeper. By my tally it's 49 to 0 this evening, that's a blowout, 7 touchdowns following Jim Plunkett so the famous Jim Plunkett who speaks very eloquently about why you should say no to LNG.

Many people will be submitting detailed comments in writing as one to request an extension of your comment deadline because there are significant omissions in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and in fact FERC goes out of its way to point out studies that should have been included that must be included during this comment period that haven't been submitted yet, meaning the public hasn't had an opportunity to review those.

Those include but are not limited to studies that

look at the final land -- the toxic disbursement analysis of the terminal itself. Those toxic vapors coming out of the terminal that would be a nice piece of information for people in Warrenton to have when they come to testify at a Draft Environmental Impact Statement hearing -- so Section 5 of the EIS basically lists almost 100 separate different items, most of which should have been resolved before the publishing of the Draft EIS.

An EIS is supposed to be a near-complete document under NEPA and this document falls far short of that. I also want to address the Army Corp. easement issue as Brett already alluded to and others have. It simply doesn't make sense for FERC to proceed with reviewing projects for which the applicant doesn't have control of the property and doesn't have the right to use the land for the purpose laid out.

The Army Corp. has a valid property right to dispose and dredge disposed material or dredged material on the Skipanon Peninsula that directly conflicts with what the terminal is trying to do put simply the proposal is unacceptable to the Corp. that's a pun. I had to point out that that's a pun.

I also want to point out to our friends in the Coast Guard who are here, the letter of recommendation that was issued in 2009 clearly stated it would be a 500 yard

security zone and talking with them in between these hearings there is some confusion about the size of the security zone. It is 500 yards all the way around the ship that is moving, that is with the written letter of recommendation. That means that the marinas in the Skipanon River itself will be shut off while the tanker is in transit.

So you can say that you are not shutting down the river but the letter of recommendation which is a signed document from the Coast Guard shows that it is a lot of direct negative impact on marine traffic. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has already pointed out that that would be a problem.

Lastly I just want to say that the list of things that are missing in this document is so extensive that I think you should withdraw and resubmit this Draft Environmental Impact Statement for public review. You can save yourself the work however but just denying Oregon LNG outright.

If you know you should do and you know you should do because the Army Corp. has a right to dump sand on the entire area. With that I look forward to seeing you tomorrow night in Vernonia.

MR. ZENN: Can we have 50, 51 and 52? Is anyone 50?

MS. BLACKMAR: Hello thank you very much for your presence here at this hearing thank you. My name is Susie McLerie Blackmar, that is my full maiden name. I have lived here since '71.

MS. TEHAAR: Can you please spell it?

MS. BLACKMAR: Oh, McLerie, M-c-L-e-r-i-e Blackmar B-l-a-c-k-m-a-r. Those are my parents' names and no I am not married. I have raised three children in this community, I have lived here for 44 years, all of my children stand behind me in opposing anything as horrible as this plan for Oregon LNG here in our community. It's a bad fit for our community it's a bad fit for the environment. I agree with all of the other testimony especially I would like you to review what Paul Seamons said, he came here from Ranier he is an engineer all of his life out of Wayerhaeuser, he knows his stuff. He was talking about science, he was talking about carbon emissions and we are not going anywhere if we add to the problem that we have already caused. We cannot have more acid rain and acid seas.

We are losing our fisheries we are losing everything we came here to live for. I moved here because this was a clean environment, a healthy place to raise children and basically we are all here for the same reason and for you guys or whoever it is OLNG people think they can

take that away from us, they cannot. We are stubborn, we are proud of our heritage and we want to keep our beautiful land and river the way it is.

The Native American people were given the gift of the salmon. We have no right to take away their habitat. If you want to impose upon lives of humans and fish and the sea it is absolutely ungodly to do that, I oppose it in all ways, thank you.

MS. TEHAAR: 51?

MS. FORSTER: Hello my name is Faith Forster, F-o-r-s-t-e-r. I live on 325 North Main Avenue in Warrenton. I am an Astoria resident, I was born well -- I was born in Astoria, I am from his area, born and raised. I went away to college, I traveled the world, I never thought I would end up back here. Growing up I was like you know get me out of here but the more places that I saw about 30 other countries and I have actually lived abroad as well, the more I appreciated it here for what everybody has said.

You know when you think Oregon what do you think -- green, trees, water, salmon, everything beautiful that's why Oregon is what it is and if I was being a really good student right now I would have a copy of that Environment Impact Statement and I would be reading, commenting on bits of it just like you requested like we are supposed to be doing here.

But I didn't feel like that was necessary. I couldn't take time away from my busy life to do that because I thought why are we even discussing this? If California said no why can't we say no in Oregon? We don't need it in our country. As people have commented before we are supposed to be moving away from this type of fuel, this type of energy, even as Obama has proposed. Why are we moving backwards when we should be moving forward?

And to talk about the specific proposal at this location, it is on dredged soils, in a tsunami zone, in an earthquake-risky area. I personally bought property in Warrenton because I was newly out of college, newly married, low income and it was the only place I could really afford in this area.

I instantly regretted it especially after the tsunami in Japan and -- the earthquake in Japan and the tsunami risk here in this area. And that makes it even more risky to have such a dangerous place built on such unsolid ground in such a zone. I also enjoy recreating in this area and depend on the salmon and depend on the local beauty and I have a new baby girl that I'm thinking I don't want her to grow up in that, I don't want to live in this.

So for those reasons I am asking you to please deny this. Please do not proceed. Why do we have to keep coming and fighting this over and over? Our state doesn't

want it, we don't need it lets move forward not backwards, thank you.

MS. TEHAAR: 52?

MR. ZENN: Might as well bring 53 up here as well.

MR. THOMPSON: Good evening, welcome to Clatsop County, Oregon. My name is Doug Thompson, P.O. Box 411, Astoria. Last name is spelled T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n.

MS. TEHAAR: We can't hear you Doug.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm not going to attempt to duplicate or saying the many, many fine detailed, legitimate valid objections to this proposed volatile fuel pipeline and plant. Rather I want to speak to the proponent Oregon LNG's publicly stated contention that local and state land use laws and finance, in particular the Coastal Management Act are trumped if you will pardon that unfortunate word, by your agency by FERC.

In other words the Oregon CZNA is irrelevant according to Oregon LNG. I don't believe that. Rather I think that the CZNA is very relevant and it is actually your agency that is irrelevant to this process. I say that in a political sense. I'm far too young to be cynical but I have no illusions as to your agency's ultimate decision in this matter.

After all your track record of yet to find an

energy project that you don't like or approve is legendary. I confess to having no clue as to how to go about holding your agency more accountable to the public in the long-term. Your agency frankly makes the Army Corp. of Engineers Portland District look like a bunch of tree-hugging earth muppets.

But I do know how and why we locals intend to hold Oregon Senior Senator and our First Congressional District Representative accountable for their waffling indecision and back-room maneuverings over this in the Jordan Cove LNG proposals.

Over the next 13 months leading up to November of 2016 as the saying goes, "They've got some 'splaining to do." In attempting to slip the LNG baby into its Warrenton and Jordon Cove paths is being politically too cute by at least half. As for your agency I submit the acronym should stand for Federal Evidence of Regulatory Capture, good night.

MS. TEHAAR: 53?

MR. SMOKEY: Thank you for having me my name is Joseph Smokey. That is Joseph like the guy in the Bible and Smokey just like the bear. I see that the three of you are taking notes and I want to make it easy for you. I just want you to write down this one sentence and that sentence the only thing you have to write down and otherwise just

listen to me for the next three minutes.

The Draft EIS is scientifically flawed. Write that down on paper. That is my comment for you to take and talk to the rest of the people that you are involved with. It is scientifically wrong. Many people have said that and that is a fact. The project is going to go through you guys are going to have a lawsuit on your hands in 20 years whatever it is going to happen.

I want to tell a quick story. You guys are probably familiar with the Snake River and you are probably familiar with the Environmental Impact Statement that was led and basically managed by Army Corp. of Engineer employee Jim Waddle. He collected about 30 some million dollars-worth of research to compile an EIS to basically analyze these dams, four of them and determine what the best course of action is, take them out, leaving them running, do something different.

The scientific evidence was overwhelming. Take the dams down, that said. FERC is involved in the EIS, you guys are not the decision-makers, Jim Waddle was not a decision-maker. You guys are compiling evidence to give to decision-makers. Jim Waddle's decision-makers did not follow through with his recommendation to tear down the dams. These dams stand today. Why? Because these decision-makers did not want to stand up to the political

backlash they would face.

Please FERC as the organization that you are, you are not involved in the decision-making, but you are involved in the EIS, please stand up to special interests. Stand up to money and greed. Have the balls to tell the LNG decision-makers that they should not proceed that they should listen to science, to the environment and to public health, thank you.

MS. KOCHHAR: Are there any more speakers? Anyone else want to comment or say something, so let him go first.

MS. SHANDLIN: Hi my name is Patricia Shandlin, 231 -- Astoria, Oregon. I love it here it is a wonderful place. And I was thinking about the trucks, the 1200 trucks through every day. Did you know how city is built on pylons? How much weight can it take? 1,000 trucks every day on those pylons -- I'm real concerned along with everybody else and I feel it is wrong. And I know you are going to make the right decision.

MS. TEHAAR: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to come up and speak?

MR. TAYLOR: My name is Tom Taylor, hello my name is Tom Taylor and I'm going to put my two cents in here and say that I have seen a little bit of a pattern that this is not a good idea. It's a bad idea and the evidence seems to

be overwhelming and if it is true that you will rubber stamp this there is something the matter with the process and I would like to say that as it gets closer to the end it it is becoming obvious that it is an energy trust problem that we are trying to change and that this kind of project will invest 6 billion dollars and something we don't want where that kind of money should be spent on stuff they do want which is to change the way our energy system works.

It goes on and on. I was at the Astoria column today and I looked down at the Skipanon Peninsula and it's a little strange to build a project on that peninsula with earthquake damage and so that's my two cents, I'll leave it there. You really should not do this.

MS. KOCHHAR: I'll take one more speaker, unless something has something special to say. Is there anybody else who has something to add to this hearing?

MR. CLARK: My name is Robert Clark, C-l-a-r-k. I'm looking at this lovely brochure of yours and I can't really see where in this bottom panel here where this restored right-of-way is anything more than a permanent path swath of destruction and a clear cut. It is not allowed to ever return to its natural state and it's a denial of the proper you know, recovery of the land that has the right for this purpose.

Now how that is protecting the environment I am

really unsure.

MS. KOCHHAR: We will accept any comment whether it's said or submitted, so please submit your comments and we will use it in our Final EIS, and if it something else -- and I can't speak anymore on that.

MS. WRIGHT: I don't think I've heard this but maybe I was right when they said it and we live on the Skipanon River and what I have learned is anybody who lives along the river, whatever building you have it sinks. The sand shifts and even if you put earth in there it will shift.

What are you going to do when those huge towers shift? Our house has shifted and we are going to have to lift it up 8 or 12 inches on the river side, that's a fact. Anything that's along the river especially at that sand will shift.

MS. KOCHHAR: Excuse me could you please state your name?

MS. WRIGHT: Karen Doris Wright, W-r-i-g-h-t.

MS. KOCHHAR: Anybody else? All right, since we have no more speakers for these topics that you are giving us here, this concludes the commenter time for those signed up to speak, if not the formal part of this meeting is closed. At the FERC website there is a link e-library you can type in the docket number for Oregon LNG, and for the

extension project, you can use the e-library to put comments on the record concerning this project as all the projects and information submitted by Oregon LNG and Northwest. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission I want to thank you all for coming here tonight. Let the record show that the comment meeting concluded at 9:30 p.m. Thank you for coming again.

(Where upon the meeting, was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.)