

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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 1:00 p.m., Medha Kochhar, the moderator.

1 P R O C E E D I N G

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

8 Let the record show that the Draft EIS comment
9 meeting began at 3 past 1 on September 31st, 2015 in
10 Astoria, Oregon. My name is Medha Kochhar, I am the
11 Environmental Project Manager with the Office of Energy
12 Projects which is a division of the FERC.

13 Also tonight with me at the table is Pat Tehaar,
14 she is on my far right. That is HDR, she is from HDR and a
15 third party contractor. HDR is assisting FERC staff in our
16 environmental analysis of the projects. Also sitting next
17 to me on my right is Robert Kopka he is a deputy on the
18 project here.

19 Outside the hall we have Elisa Lykens and Elisa
20 Lykens is from FERC and then there are two more people Doug
21 Zenn is right here, he's from HDR and Molly Brown she is
22 outside at the assignment table. Also today we have Captain
23 Dan Travers from the U.S. Coast Guard. In addition we have
24 representatives from Oregon LNG Development Company LLC,
25 Oregon Pipeline Company LLC together with FERC as Oregon

1 LNG.

2 We don't have anybody from Northwest here, they
3 are in Washington. They have maps and maybe after the
4 meeting will answer any specific questions you might have.

5 The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army
6 Corp of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Department of
7 Energy, U.S. Department of Transportation and U.S.
8 Department of Environmental Protection Agency are
9 participating as cooperating agencies in the preparation of
10 the EIS.

11 I would like to thank the cooperating agencies
12 for their continued assistance with the NEPA review. Now I
13 would like to give time to Captain Travers an opportunity to
14 say a few words about his agency and as a cooperating
15 agency, Captain Travers?

16 CAPTAIN TRAVERS: Thanks a lot Medha, I
17 appreciate it. Again good afternoon everybody my name is
18 Captain Dan Travers, I'm the Captain of the port here and
19 the Federal Maritime Security Coordinator and I just had a
20 few comments and unfortunately aren't going to be able to
21 stay with my staff, but anyhow -- my primary responsibility
22 reaches from the Duwamish River near the entrance of the
23 Puget Sound in Washington to the California border and
24 inland to the southern Idaho and to the Idaho and Utah
25 border.

1 I am here to discuss the Coast Guard's role of
2 necessity for the proposed Oregon LNG Project in Warrenton.
3 With me tonight are my project officers for this proposal.
4 I have Mr. Ken Morrison he has been with the project for a
5 while and then this is Lieutenant Commander Warren Springer
6 who is the Waterways Management Division Chief.

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

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

22 The Coast Guard does not issue a permit for siting for
23 operation of an LNG terminal.

24 If a facility does become established and
25 operational the Coast Guard reviews and approves facility

1 operations manual, the facility's security plan and the
2 emergency response plan. In the FERC's permitting process,
3 the Coast Guard acts as a cooperating agency. We provide
4 FERC the information relative to navigation, waterways
5 safety and security and vessel equipment.

6 The Coast Guard does not issue a permit for
7 siting operations and LNG terminals. If a facility does
8 become established and operational the Coast Guard will be
9 used to produce a facilities operational manual, facility
10 security plan and emergency response plan. For the purposes
11 of FERC's permitting process the Coast Guard acts as a
12 cooperating agency. We provide FERC with information
13 relative to navigation, waterway safety and security and
14 vessel equipment.

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

20 This review culminates in a recommendation to
21 FERC of the suitability of the waterway for LNG maritime
22 traffic. The Coast Guard sent a letter of recommendation
23 and a letter of recommendation analysis to FERC in April of
24 2009, that letter found the waterway to be suitable for LNG
25 traffic with limitations and certain risk indication

1 measures that are found in the letter of recommendation and
2 analysis of April of 2009.

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

8 Through these reviews we determined there are no
9 significant changes to the waterways or risks associated
10 with LNG shipments since those documents were created.

11 Although the project has changed from import to a
12 bi-directional terminal, the risks associated with the
13 vessel and the waterway remains unchanged. I cannot stay as
14 we talked about earlier in the meeting but my staff will be
15 here to take comments from you and we will take those
16 comments and we will submit that. All comments in our file
17 will be input to the environmental impact statement that we
18 will be prepared by FERC.

19 One thing that I wanted to do is that I wanted to
20 set the record on a couple of things. First there have been
21 several inaccurate reports in the press which indicate that
22 the Coast Guard intends to shut down recreational and
23 commercial uses in the Columbia River and the Skipanon
24 Waterway during LNG tanker traffic. We have no intention
25 of closing the waterway during LNG tanker shipments.

1 The Coast Guard is highly experienced in
2 managing similar existing safe and security zones on the
3 Columbia River for cruise ships and shipments of other
4 dangerous cargos such as in ammonia, none of these need to
5 result in closing the water way.

6 We take your comments seriously and the more
7 specific and detailed your comments are the more thoroughly
8 we can analyze and address them. Please take the time to
9 make them orally today or submit them in writing, thank you
10 for your time today it is my pleasure to be of service to
11 each and every one of you and to ensure the safety and
12 security of the maritime community, thank you.

13 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you Captain. Now I have a
14 short power point presentation to explain FERC's review
15 process so power point please. The purpose of today's
16 meeting is to give you an opportunity to provide comments on
17 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement EIS. The specific
18 proposed projects and Draft EIS explain the FERC review
19 process here today.

20 FERC is an independent regulatory agency and it
21 is responsible for waste, for interstate transmission of
22 electricity, natural gas and oil and is also responsible for
23 siting the interstate natural gas and hydro-electric
24 facilities and LNG import and export facilities. DOE
25 approves the export of LNG. FERC is the main federal agency

1 for NEPA review and EIS preparation.

2 FERC is an advocate of the environmental review
3 process not the projects. A Notice of Availability of the
4 Draft EIS issued August 5, 2015, Draft EIS comment period
5 ends October 6, 2015. Comments will be addressed in the
6 Final EIS.

7 The EIS is not a decision-making document. FERC
8 Commissioners determine whether a project should be approved
9 based on review of environmental information in the EIS,
10 public comments, engineering, market and rate information.
11 What is the EIS? The EIS is an analytical document. The
12 EIS takes a hard look at the environmental impact of the
13 project and compares alternatives.

14 The EIS addresses environmental issues identified
15 by the public and agencies during scoping. There are
16 multiple ways that you can provide your comments. Draft EIS
17 comment meetings like the one today here, written comments
18 by U.S. mail, you can also pick up a comment form from the
19 table in the back and write your comments and hand it in to
20 us or simply send your letters whichever way to FERC.

21 You can also send us written comments to the
22 e-library or click comments in the e-library. Written
23 comments are given the same weight as oral comments. Now I
24 will give you a little bit of information about the two
25 parts of the project Oregon LNG and the Washington Expansion

1 Project.

2 Oregon LNG Project consists of import and export
3 LNG terminal in Warrenton, Oregon. It has 86.8 miles long,
4 36 inch diameter bi-directional pipeline, 140 megawatt,
5 48,000 horsepower electrically driven gas compressor
6 station. Now this slide is showing the map of Oregon's part
7 of the project, Oregon terminal and also the pipeline and
8 I'm sorry you won't be able to see this but we have maps at
9 the table where the Oregon LNG folks are and you will be
10 able to look at that at the close of this if you prefer to.

11 Basically if you look at the top left there is a
12 red triangle that is the location of the terminal, the
13 pipeline begins from the terminal, crosses Clatsop County,
14 Columbia County, crosses Columbia goes to Cowers County or
15 Woodland in Cowers County, Washington, that's where it will
16 receive gas from Northwest.

17 Washington Expansion Project it consists of 140.6
18 miles of 36 inch diameter pipeline loop in 10 non-contiguous
19 sectors within Sumas and Woodland. 96,000 horsepower of
20 additional compression at 5 existing compressor stations, it
21 involves abandonment and removal of the existing pipeline
22 and above-ground facilities.

23 This map is very difficult for you to see again
24 but I have a poster in the back. If you look at the poster
25 in the back afterwards you will see that there are segments

1 markets in red, those are the ten non-contiguous segments.
2 They would be the place where the existing pipeline is
3 there, we will replace that and some of them may be new.

4 Thus far we have several concerns identified.
5 Safety and geologic hazards, export of natural gas, impacts
6 to the project resources, wildlife, listed species, water
7 quality and coastal resources, forest clearing, cumulative
8 impacts and alternatives, LNG carrier traffic impacts,
9 emissions, visual impacts.

10 For today's meeting we have certain rules so here
11 are the meeting rules. Please turn off mobile phones,
12 summarize main points and submit additional information in
13 writing. Refrain from personal attacks, do not interrupt
14 speakers, any disruption will only restrict your fellow
15 citizen's ability to speak. I notice some of you have
16 posters, please do not use them to obstruct any speaker's
17 presentation here.

18 Procedure for the speakers, come up to the
19 microphone when your number is called, speak clearly into
20 the microphone, spell your name for the stenographer, adhere
21 to the 3 minute time limit, the yellow light will show that
22 there are 30 seconds left, the red light time is up. Please
23 do not interrupt the speakers.

24 I have one more slide here, this slide is
25 basically to show you the FERC process, the take-away point

1 from this is I know you can't read that we have posters
2 outside at the table where you can get a closer look at.
3 There are three gray portions identified which is for the
4 public input opportunities and if you would look at the
5 arrow that shows where we are in the process at this time.
6 That means that we have already issued the DEIS and we are
7 conducting our comment meetings, one of them is today's
8 meeting.

9 After we receive your comments we will provide
10 the DEIS and develop the Final EIS. The Commission will
11 look at the EIS, look at the market rates, engineering, all
12 of the issues that they will have and then they will make a
13 decision whether to approve the project or not.

14 And also after the Final DEIS is issued there
15 will be time for you as well. Once the Commission approves
16 the project the two applicants, both Northwest and Oregon
17 LNG will have to submit any outstanding information and also
18 all of the conditions that are in the Order or the
19 Authorization. After we receive all of the federal
20 authorizations FERC will issue a Notice to Proceed. That is
21 provided if the project is approved.

22 So I have some more things to take care of and
23 power point is taken care of, you will note that we have
24 arranged for a court reporter here today and he is going to
25 transcribe the meeting so that we have an accurate record of

1 this public comment meeting. The dockets for this meeting
2 will be placed in the public record after a few weeks. If
3 you would like a copy of the transcript before that you may
4 make arrangements with the court reporter following this
5 meeting.

6 Oregon LNG requests authorization under Section 3
7 of the Natural Gas Act, NGA to site, construct and operate
8 an import and export facility, natural gas LNG terminal in
9 Warrenton, Oregon. Oregon LNG also requests a Certificate
10 of Public Convenience and Necessity Certificate pursuant to
11 Section 7C of the NGA to construct and operate a natural gas
12 pipeline from the proposed LNG terminal to an interconnect
13 with the interstate transmission system of Northwest near
14 Woodland, Washington.

15 Northwest requests a Certificate pursuant to
16 Section 7C of the NGA to expand the capacity of its existing
17 natural transmission facilities between Woodland and Sumas,
18 Washington, that is to the border of Canada. The primary
19 purpose of the project is to export an increment of about
20 456.3 billion cubic feet of natural as to foreign markets.

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

1 Draft EIS.

2 I would like to again clarify that these projects
3 are being proposed by Oregon LNG and Northwest and that FERC
4 is the federal agency responsible for evaluating
5 applications to site and construct onshore and near-shore
6 LNG import and export facilities as the last application to
7 construct and operate interstate natural gas pipeline
8 facilities.

9 The FERC therefore is an advocate -- is not an
10 advocate for the project. Instead as mentioned throughout
11 this process FERC is an advocate for the environmental
12 review process. Giving our review of the process which we
13 assemble information from a variety of sources including
14 Oregon LNG, Northwest, you the public, federal, state and
15 local agencies as well as Indian tribes and our own
16 independent analysis.

17 We analyze this information and prepare the Draft
18 EIS that was distributed to the public for comment. A
19 Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was issued for the
20 project on August 6, 2015. We are near the end of our 60
21 day comment period of the Draft EIS. The comment period
22 ends on October 6, 2015. All comments received, written or
23 spoken will be addressed in the Final EIS.

24 I encourage you if you plan to submit comments
25 and have not please do so here tonight either orally during

1 the comment portion of our meeting or in writing using one
2 of the forms in the back of the room. You may also submit
3 comments using the procedures outlined in the Notice of
4 Availability of the Draft EIS which includes instructions on
5 how to submit your comments electronically.

6 Your comments will be considered with equal
7 weight regardless of whether they are spoken during the
8 comment portion of the meeting or submitted in writing. If
9 you received a copy of the Draft EIS paper or CD you will
10 automatically receive a copy of the Final EIS.

11 If you did not get a copy of the Draft EIS and
12 would like to get a copy of the Final EIS please sign up at
13 the meeting desk at the back of the room. Provide your name
14 and address and we will make sure you get a copy of the
15 Final EIS. There is a form outside of the table where you
16 could sign in at.

17 I would like to state that neither the Draft nor
18 the Final EIS are decision-making documents. In other
19 words, the EIS does not determine whether the projects are
20 approved or not. I also want to differentiate between the
21 roles of two distinct FERC groups, the Commission and the
22 environmental staff.

23 Bob next to me and Lisa is outside and I am part
24 of the FERC environmental staff. We oversee the preparation
25 of the EIS for these projects. We do not determine whether

1 or not to approve the projects. Instead the Commission
2 consists of 5 Presidentially-appointed Commissioners who are
3 responsible for making a determination on whether to issue
4 an Authorization for Oregon LNG and a Certificate of Public
5 Convenience and Necessity or a Certificate to Northwest.

6 As I mentioned already the EIS is not a
7 decision-making document but it does assist the Commission
8 in deciding whether or not to approve the project. The
9 Commission will consider the environmental analysis in the
10 EIS, public comments as well as a host of non-environmental
11 information such as engineering, markets and rates in making
12 its decision to approve or deny Oregon LNG's and Northwest
13 request for an Authorization and Certificate respectively.

14 There is no review of FERC's decision by the
15 President or Congress thus maintaining FERC's role as an
16 independent regulatory agency and providing for fair and
17 unbiased decisions. Only after considering the
18 environmental and non-environmental factors the Commission
19 will make its final decision whether to approve or not
20 approve the projects.

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

25 FERC's environmental staff will monitor the

1 projects through construction and restoration to document
2 environmental compliance with applicable laws and
3 regulations, Oregon's and Northwest's proposed plans and
4 mitigation and the additional conditions required by the
5 Authorization and Certificate.

6 That is kind of my overview of the FERC's role
7 here. Now we will move to the next phase and that is we
8 will hear comments from audience members. If you would
9 rather not speak tonight or do not get to say everything you
10 wanted in the allotted time you may hand in written comments
11 tonight using the comment form found at the table at the
12 back of the room or send them in to the Secretary of the
13 Commission by following the procedures outlined in the
14 Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS. Either way your
15 comments will be considered with equal weight.

16 As I said before the meeting is being recorded by
17 a court reporter so all of your comments will be transcribed
18 and put into the public record. We will be calling speakers
19 in order according to the numbers we handed out during the
20 sign-in. Due to the length of the speaker's list we ask
21 that you please limit your comments to 3 minutes or less.
22 If we have additional time at the end we will allow more
23 time for anyone that would like to. I ask that each speaker
24 first identify themselves and if appropriate, the agency or
25 group you are representing.

1 Also please spell your name for the record and
2 speak clearly into the microphone. My number one rule is
3 here is please show respect for everyone speaking. We are
4 now ready to call our first speaker, speaker number 1
5 please, yes.

6 MS. PHILLIPS: My name is Glenda Phillips, its
7 spelled G-l-e-n-d-a P-h-i-l-l-i-p-s. I live in Seaside,
8 Oregon and I commute to Astoria three times a week on the
9 average and the purpose is to go shopping, take classes and
10 take guests to tourist attractions.

11 I went to the Draft EIS trying to see what the
12 impacts would be on my commutes, this is what I found. On
13 page 4-294 I'm looking at 617 trips per day heavy truck
14 traffic, 309 trips per day light duty trucks, add to that 65
15 trucks per hour during dredge and excavation operations, I'm
16 going to make a quote here. This is from the Draft EIS,
17 "Because the volume to capacity ratios and levels of service
18 at most of the studied intersections currently fail, added
19 trips due to growth and operations may further worsen
20 traffic conditions." Page 4-295 and page 4-296.

21 I look for a mediation plan for these failures
22 and worsening conditions. I saw them I saw no safety plans
23 to address the public's concern about all of this traffic on
24 their roads, nor did I see an excavation -- excuse me an
25 evacuation plan for the public should any hazardous

1 conditions arise.

2 Just as important but a subject you would rather
3 not address is the effects to our neighbors and communities
4 who unleashed affordable changes of this project. I want to
5 go back in time to the Federal A Highway Act in 1956
6 President Dwight D. Eisenhower approved an original 25
7 billion dollars, 41,000 thousand miles of interstate in a 10
8 year period to construct it. The purpose of it was to make
9 Air Force bases to transportation systems to defend against
10 attack.

11 These highways were built in areas of least
12 resistance which means cities and low-income minorities were
13 impacted. There was a disregard for environmental impacts.
14 Fortunately in 1969 NEPA was established. What that did is
15 it make the state -- the federal agencies had to state
16 potential environmental effects of proposed federal actions.

17 In other words they were supposed to protect
18 communities and the environment. Also connected to Order
19 12898 was to identify disproportionate impacts to minorities
20 and low-income. If you will look at the Draft EIS the
21 annual income people receive here in this area is \$20,000 to
22 \$30,000 annually. These people in a small community, they
23 are a non-professional work force and many are retirees on
24 limited income.

25 With that in mind these people are unable to

1 afford lawyers and studies to call that this project. I
2 suggest to you that an Executive Order also applies to
3 people that cannot afford to combat this other than the
4 methods you see today. This project is not compatible with
5 this community they have made this clear to you -- no amount
6 of terminal safety features mitigate the effects outside of
7 these terminals.

8 The surrounding communities feel the effects
9 through gridlocked traffic, air quality decline, less
10 travelers and a loss of quality of life, thank you for your
11 time.

12 MS. MEDHA: Thank you speaker 2 please?

13 MS. DOMINEY: Do I have to hold this?

14 MR. TERHAAR: No, it does not sit, do you want me
15 to hold it?

16 MS. DOMINEY Please I would appreciate that. My
17 name is Jean Dominey, am I recording?

18 MR. TERHAAR: You are.

19 MS. DOMINEY: I live at 3647 Dwayne, Astoria,
20 Oregon. I have been testifying in opposition to this
21 project since its inception which was an invalid meeting
22 according to the Oregon-advised statutes there was not a 24
23 hour notification. And it seems to me that this project
24 keeps on going since the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers has an
25 easement on the property I see Oregon LNG's application that

1 is continuing without a new route, not particularly valid
2 because they do not have permission from the U.S. Army Corp.
3 of Engineers to continue with the project at present.

4 You will find and as the testimony goes through
5 today that there are hundreds of people who are going to
6 speak. There were only three of us who started from the
7 testimony that you have in your possession now and the
8 excellent testimony that you are going to receive today that
9 opposition to this project has continued to grow.

10 I fully concur with all of the thousands of pages
11 that have been submitted in testimony in opposition to this
12 project. I fully concur with all of the oral testimony that
13 has and is offered and will be in opposition to this
14 project. My statement:

15 Oregon LNG is contrary to the laws of the state
16 of Oregon especially those pertaining to air quality, water
17 quality, coastal management and Oregon land use goal 16.
18 Unintended causes to fish and the air that there is
19 absolutely no way this can be environmentally approved. The
20 mitigation processes for the fish in particular would delete
21 thousands of organisms as is enumerated and explained in
22 Ladados C.

23 These will never been recovered. One may
24 mitigate but it is never going to be the same. We have had
25 an exceptionally heavy fish run this year of the federally

1 protected fish. Now we are going to have occasion later on
2 because of the climate change and the warming of the waters
3 to see that the fish are going to go below 6 feet, that the
4 numbers will be lessened due to tanking of the millions of
5 gallons of water to the cooling tower.

6 MS. KOCHHAR: Your time is up. You can come back
7 if we have time afterwards and make your statement.

8 MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 3.

9 DR. MONAHAN: Good afternoon my name is Doctor
10 Gregory Monahan, spelled M-o-n-a-h-a-n. I'm a resident of
11 Portland, Oregon. I'm submitting written testimony today
12 along with this oral testimony in writing. I have watched
13 with growing concern the fact that climate change has
14 matured.

15 What is clear is that we need to leave much of
16 the world's own fossil fuel reserves in the ground and
17 immediately begin to transition to clean renewable energy
18 sources. I speak here today on behalf of my three
19 grandchildren and the other children of their age cohort who
20 are unable to appear here today. It is for these children
21 that we need to stop developing fossil fuel infrastructure
22 and make a switch to clean renewable energy.

23 The fossil fuel industry has done its best to
24 mislead the public by exaggerating the benefits and
25 downplaying the cost of rampant fossil fuel extraction.

1 This project is a prime example of this practice. The idea
2 that natural gas is a great fuel to a clean energy future
3 and then projects such as this one where it will provide
4 good jobs with no environmental down-sides and minimal risk
5 to all that Oregonians hold dear is completely ludicrous.

6 The environmental impacts of this project are so
7 extreme that the best way to characterize the companies that
8 are driving this project is that they are morally bankrupt.
9 One thing with this practice is the lack of a serious
10 analysis of project's impact on climate change. Based on
11 the data supplied by the product description and the simple
12 calculations this project will export each year close to two
13 times the amount of natural gas consumed in the state of
14 Oregon in 2013. This calculation does not make a complete
15 carbon accounting which is not included in the DEIS because
16 it is difficult to make such an analysis in part because the
17 industry does not collect data on the inefficiencies of
18 extracting, processing and transporting natural gas.

19 As a rough estimate it is safe to say that the
20 carbon impact of this project is at least twice that as the
21 gas being shipped resulting in a total of four times the
22 amount of natural gas used by Oregon for a year. To its
23 credit the DEIS recognizes that climate change is known to
24 be caused by human activity.

25 It is disgraceful that the EIS claims that

1 "because we cannot determine whether the project's
2 incremental and physical impacts due to climate change on
3 the environment, we cannot determine if the project would
4 result in significant impacts related to climate change."

5 For a company that is planning to spend 9 billion
6 dollars on this project their refusal to produce a climate
7 change impact analysis of the project can only be construed
8 as an admission that the impact would be significant and the
9 company wishes to cover it up.

10 Based on this one issue alone the project is a
11 direct threat to the health and well-being of my
12 grandchildren and their peers and should not be allowed to
13 continue. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

14 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you sir.

15 MR. KOPKA: If number 5, 6, 7 and 8, we have
16 extra seat chairs here so you would be ready to go if you
17 like.

18 MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 4 please.

19 MR. BJORK: Thank you for coming to Clatsop
20 County. My name is Bernie Bjork and I live at 36293
21 Bartoldus Loop, Astoria, about a quarter of a mile from
22 here.

23 MS. TERHAAR: Can you please spell your name?

24 MR. BJORK: It's B-j-o-r-k. I am the grass roots
25 coordinator of the Lower Columbia Alliance for Sustainable

1 Fisheries, Post Office Box 14, Warrenton. Our alliance has
2 taken a strong hold with the result being that most of our
3 members are either for the Oregon LNG Project or not
4 against. Our Alliance was formed back in 2003 to bring
5 attention to the fact that far too many closed fishing areas
6 were being formed in the ocean off of Oregon and Washington
7 and that this closure of fishing grounds could cause real
8 dangers to our local fisherman, especially in the winter,
9 for indigenous crab flee.

10 Our 100 plus members are made up mostly of mostly
11 commercial sport fishing entities and small businesses that
12 cater to the fishing industry from both sides of the river
13 up and down the west coast. In our fight to stop the
14 closure of fishing grounds we have received letters of
15 support from the Columbia River Craft Fisherman's
16 Association, Local Trough Fisherman's Associations, Salmon
17 for All, Fish Association and the recreational Fishing
18 Alliance.

19 Through the years we have received letters of
20 support from the Ports of Ilwaco and Chinook, Washington,
21 part of the City of Astoria, Clatsop County and our greatest
22 support was from the city of Warrenton.

23 The safety of our fisherman is of utmost
24 importance and our number one concern. We see nothing that
25 Oregon LNG will do that will get in the way of our vessels

1 transiting the Skipanon or Columbia. There is a possibility
2 of having to wait a bit for an LNG ship to go by the
3 entrance of the Skipanon or maybe someplace else, however
4 that would be for only a short time and it is already
5 standard operating procedures for vessels transiting the
6 area.

7 Our vessels are used to waiting for cruise ships
8 which have the same exclusions as an LNG ship. Around the
9 Port of Astoria docks we wait for them all the time, our
10 fisherman do. The fact that LNG ships will be crossing the
11 bar at night will help for both our commercial and sport
12 fisherman, the safety of our small business, local
13 family-owned vessels is our number one concern.

14 In fact we can only see positive aspects if
15 Oregon LNG will be allowed to build their facility. A deep
16 and wide dredged Columbia River bar is absolutely essential
17 for their safety.

18 In conclusion our Alliance wants to make it
19 perfectly clear that a majority of our small business
20 members, commercial and sport fisherman are for this
21 project. We are for anything that enhances safety aspects
22 for our fisherman. We feel that the positive aspects of
23 this project far outweigh the negative, thank you people for
24 coming to listen to us.

25 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you sir.

1 MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 5?

2 MS. CRAWFORD: My name is Carolin Crawford.

3 C-a-r-o-l-i-n C-r-a-w-f-o-r-d and yes I am an old retired
4 woman. I live in Naselle, Washington across the river. I
5 do not live in the blast zone of the proposed Oregon LNG
6 terminal site, nor am I close to any railroad or pipeline
7 that would feed this LNG terminal but however my
8 grandchildren live and go to school in the blast zone.

9 I am speaking on behalf of their welfare, and the
10 welfare of my grandchildren and all the many children that
11 inhabit Warrenton and Astoria who have no voice. This
12 terminal would endanger their health and lives. Oh I hear
13 you know that there is an acceptable risk and how you can
14 mitigate. My grandchildren are not acceptable risks, my
15 grandchildren's lives cannot be mitigated. It is our job as
16 adults and in the community to make sure our children's
17 home, school and community is safe. I will read 8 points
18 from the LNG terminal siting organization. As I read them
19 ask yourself is this site a fit, does it protect civilians,
20 does it endanger the children, are children playing in the
21 shadow of this proposed site in harm's way? Here are the
22 points.

23 This is from LNG itself. There is no acceptable
24 probably or catastrophic LNG release that LNG leaks must be
25 located or LNG vapors from a spill or release on the effects

1 civilians.

2 Number 3 -- LNG should be far from the ship
3 transit. A -- to prevent collision or lesion from other
4 vessels. B -- to prevent surging and raging along the LNG
5 pier and jitney that may cause the ship to break its
6 moorings and board LNG connection.

7 C -- Since all the other vessels must be
8 considered an emission source.

9 4. LNG ports as being located where they do not
10 conflict with other water way uses now and into the future.
11 This requires long-range planning for the entire port area
12 prior to committing to a terminal location.

13 5. Long and narrow water ways are to be avoided
14 due to greater navigation risks.

15 6. Water ways containing navigation data are to
16 be avoided as LNG boards.

17 7. LNG ports must not be located on the outside
18 curve in the water way since other transmitting vessels will
19 be at some time during their transits be headed directly at
20 the port or LNG ship.

21 And Number 8. Community error potential always
22 exists and must be taken into consideration when selecting
23 and designing the LNG port. Thank you.

24 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

25 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you could we have speaker

1 number 6 please? 7?

2 MS. FROMER: I'm Eileen Fromer, F-r-o-m-e-r and a
3 homeowner in Seaside. Frankly it makes me sick to envision
4 the future of our coastal towns, rivers, estuaries, and land
5 when I think of the effects of an LNG terminal in Warrenton
6 in pipelines in our communities.

7 The first picture that enters my mind is the ugly
8 site of two 17 story tall story tanks and the huge LNG
9 hangars crossing the bar. That in addition to the constant
10 noise, toxic and unsightly placed 69 feet call and the
11 flames even with no wind would be about 150 feet, destroying
12 the beautiful and natural physical environment of our coast.

13 The value of our property will go down the drain.
14 No one wants to live next to or near a concrete jungle build
15 to liquefy and export fracked natural gas that has 86 times
16 the global warming potential of carbon dioxide. Right when
17 every government in the world agrees that we cannot risk
18 warming our atmosphere to 2 degrees Celsius without causing
19 catastrophic damage to our planet and civilization.

20 I cannot understand how the profit-loaded trust
21 preserving our eco-systems and our people however I
22 understand you are here to prepare an impact statement about
23 how those toxic and high flames will affect the environment,
24 communities and public health.

25 The LNG project will decrease property values,

1 curtain tourism and recreation-related jobs. Natural gas
2 range will increase by forcing us to outbid high-priced
3 Asian markets. Every homeowner, farmer buying fertilizer
4 and business trying to create jobs will feel the impact.
5 Huge risks from pipeline explosions that continue to incur
6 in spite of modern safety standards and distractions demand
7 that federal, state and local agencies must level with the
8 public about who is at risk with loss of life, property,
9 impacts on wildlife from wildfires from a pipeline
10 explosion.

11 Siting explosion toxic facilities in Warrenton
12 where the Oregon coast is guaranteed to suffer the most
13 catastrophic earthquakes and tsunami damage in U.S. history
14 and that has a one-third chance of hitting within the 50
15 year life span of the Oregon LNG plant.

16 I must also look at the big picture. Personally
17 I don't want to leave a legacy of a community with an acid
18 ocean, deadly severe storms, draught, fires, earthquakes and
19 tsunamis, less wearable land, war zone territories and
20 innumerable refugees whose homes have been destroyed or no
21 longer livable not when we know that we are fully capable of
22 switching to renewables that are clean and cheap.

23 I am here because I don't want to tell my family
24 that I didn't try to do anything to stop catast.

25 MR. ZENN: And maybe 9, 10 and 11 want to come up here.

1 MR. ZANETKIN: Good evening my name is Michael
2 Zanetkin, Z-a-n-e-t-k-i-n. I have lived in Astoria for 44
3 years. During my first 20 years I made and sold pottery and
4 fished commercially. I married Lorna and raised two sons
5 here. The local economy at that time was primarily
6 commercial fishing, logging, small manufacturing and service
7 industries.

8 I was attracted to this area because of its
9 natural beauty and affordable housing. Many were concerned
10 that our economy was sagging and dying, that we need new
11 business ventures to offset lost revenue from our
12 traditional industries. I understand that. As time passed
13 I needed more reliable income so I enrolled in and completed
14 a teacher preparation program that was offered through
15 Bloomfield College, a classic community college and then for
16 the next 25 years I taught in our areas public schools and
17 at the job core and I retired at the end of 2014.

18 Astoria has changed dramatically in the last 44
19 years. Since 1990's the vibrant tourist economy merged and
20 continued to grow and evolve. We had become a national
21 destination because of our natural beauty, ecological
22 sustainable values, thriving artsy and outdoor recreational
23 opportunities. This has happened in an organic way from the
24 bottom up by individuals like me who saw and continues to
25 see the future in this place, our place, my home.

1 We continue to attract individuals with talent,
2 energy and more. But the problem is the LNG project
3 threatens my way of life and the values I share with my
4 neighbors. A project of the scale of the Oregon LNG is
5 incompatible with the tourism economy that is based on
6 natural beauty, the thriving artsy and historical commercial
7 fishing industry.

8 The proposed security measures on the Columbia
9 River will negatively impact our environmental interests,
10 recreational and commercial fisheries. No liquefied natural
11 gas facility has ever experienced the magnitude of a major
12 subduction zone event.

13 There is no technology known that has exemplary
14 survived such an episode. The only LNG facility within
15 miles of the blast zone would be insane. The best guess is
16 that this will happen in our lifetime, sooner rather than
17 later. When not if, the blaze gives way, massive
18 earthquakes and the devastating tsunami will follow within
19 minutes.

20 The proposed LNG plant will be affected because
21 it is in the tsunami devastation zone. These are the deal
22 breakers. A liquefied natural gas facility is an
23 unnecessary gamble for our future, it is not needed or
24 wanted, this is a disaster waiting to happen.

25 Clatsop County did not permit the Oregon LNG

1 pipeline. The city is supported by our citizens and with
2 the council's support, the proclamation exists.

3 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

4 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 9?

5 MR. HUHTALA: Welcome to our extraordinary river
6 actuary area and sorry you have got to spend the afternoon
7 inside. My name is Peter Huhtala, that's H-u-h-t-a-l-a.
8 Respectfully, this EIS is premature, incomplete and in any
9 event requires additional time for public review.

10 The EIS is premature for three reasons. First,
11 the application does not have the control of the site
12 proposed for construction and operation. A significant
13 portion of the site is covered by the easement on behalf of
14 the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers.

15 Second it would have been reasonable to delay the
16 EIS until all state's had, including federal consistency
17 review under the Coastal Management Act. The application
18 does not have a functional land use compatibility statement
19 for the proposed pipeline route through Clatsop County.

20 Clatsop County in reviewing LNG's pipeline
21 application for a permit on the proposed route is not
22 compatible with the county's comprehensive plan and zoning
23 ordinance. These findings are all within the boundaries of
24 Oregon's Coastal Zone and applicable to the state's
25 delegated authority to determine the consistency of the

1 federally improved project.

2 I command you to review the record of the county
3 process which was conducted in good faith. I sat on the
4 Clatsop County Board of Commissioners at the time and I
5 incorporate the record of that process by reference. This
6 EIS is incomplete. It is conditioned upon the applicant
7 providing several studies and reports prior to the end of
8 the comment period, I'm talking October 6th. These
9 documents relate to vital health and safety issues, the
10 public deserves the opportunity to review these documents
11 and comment.

12 This is clearly a project of such magnitude that
13 has never been seen in this area. The existing pre-mature
14 and incomplete EIS is large and complex. If the applicant
15 provides all the required documents by October 6th then I
16 think it's more than reasonable to allow a full 120 day
17 comment period, thank you.

18 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

19 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 10
20 please.

21 MS. HITES-CLABAUGH: My name is Lucinda,
22 L-u-c-i-n-d-a Hites-Clabaugh, H-i-t-e-s (hyphen)
23 C-l-a-b-a-u-g-h. I live in Forest Grove, Oregon. I have
24 taught science in schools and I am also a bilingual teacher
25 and taught bilingual science and math for Portland

1 Community College.

2 I have taught my students because I want them to
3 see the beauty of the earth and understand the relationship
4 to it. I'm a native American Indian Cherokee tribe, so
5 that's part of who I am and that is my filter.

6 I attended college in '74-'75 and one of the
7 classes that was offered was a class benefit risk analysis
8 class, taught by Dr. Steven Slezak. And was political
9 science. I also took a physics class by Dr. John Delore, in
10 the physics department where which gave out solar
11 refrigerators, solar cars designed and this was in '74 -
12 '75. My understand of risk analysis would be that if you
13 took that seriously, the impacts to human beings along, let
14 alone wildlife, and the planet, would keep the scope warmer.
15 Because if you wanted to look at in an unbiased manner, a
16 scientific model and seriously look at what is happening.

17 If you look at the chemistry, I taught chemistry,
18 if you would look at it and understand that there is
19 chemical bonding taking place in our atmosphere so that we
20 cannot have the gas, the oxygen we need to breath to sustain
21 life, beyond a certain point.

22 If you study something and teach children about habitats so
23 that they understand that they are connected --- they have
24 to have a habitat, you cannot drain up to a stream edge and
25 expect it to be the same. You cannot dredge to a stream

1 edge and expect the temperature not to go up. You can't
2 clear cut the stream for the same reason, there are federal
3 forest service, EIS'S, designed back in the early 70's that
4 will tell you from expert foresters that you can't do that
5 and expect things to come back and be the same. You're
6 talking about 500 years. Mitigation is a joke.

7 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

8 MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 11 please.

9 MR. KOPKA: 11, 12, 13, 14.

10 Ms. Haight: My name is Lori Haight. I live in
11 Long Ridge, Washington and come to the Astoria area
12 regularly for business and pleasure. When I think of the
13 destruction that will be caused by the construction and
14 operation of the proposed import/export LNG facility I just
15 can't wrap my mind around it.

16 Here I am in a thriving community, a growing
17 community, a beautiful community that cares deeply about the
18 environment and its heritage. When Oregon LNG talks about
19 the jobs it will create it does not consider all of the jobs
20 it will be eliminating -- jobs in the housing industry, jobs
21 in the restaurant industry, jobs in the tourist industry,
22 jobs in the service industry and the daily lives, the people
23 who call this area their home.

24 These are jobs that the local people already
25 have, jobs that already sustain a community. Heavy trucks

1 rumbling right at your downtown all day, every day for years
2 will disrupt things so badly that tourism, one of the most
3 important industries of the area will be dissuaded from
4 coming here.

5 They will stay away, I know they will. Not only
6 will they stay away during the construction process, they
7 will not come back to the noise, the glare of an omnipresent
8 flare, the increased air pollution plus the restrictions of
9 the movement on or around the Columbia and Skipanon Rivers
10 makes our area just another industrial playground for the
11 wealthy corporations that think they can take whatever they
12 want in order to fatten their bottom line.

13 The next thing we know we will be fighting
14 against a coal export terminal. The government poured
15 millions and millions of dollars in this family restoration
16 in the Columbian River. The proposed LNG facility will
17 destroy 1.2 million cubic yards of critical fish habitat to
18 start with. They will then be dumping millions of gallons
19 of heated water back into water.

20 With the plant already getting warmer, the fish
21 are already on the edge. This warmer water will push them
22 over and the only ones to gain will be the big-money
23 grabbing corporations who put themselves above the rest of
24 us. Add to this madness the fact that the cascade zone is
25 only a few miles off our beautiful coast. The coastal

1 communities have been working long and hard to enforce the
2 dangers of a tsunami and preparing us for it.

3 What will happen to the LNG facility when things
4 start shaking? What kind of emergency response will be seen
5 when the roads are jammed with vehicles trying to get away?
6 How far away will first responders have to travel to help
7 with the event? Will the roads even be passable? We the
8 people who live in and around this community did not agree
9 and do not believe Oregon LNG. We do not want them in this
10 area and will fight tooth and nail for as long as it takes
11 to get them out of here forever.

12 It is time for them to give up and go away, find
13 something else to do, get a job that actually enhances the
14 earth and creates harmony and peace. Please do the right
15 thing and deny Oregon LNG whatever permits they need to
16 destroy our way of life, thank you.

17 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

18 MS. TERHAAR: Speaker number 12 please?

19 MR. KOPKA: Can we have 13, 14, 15 perhaps coming
20 up.

21 MR. FARRAR: Thank you for coming here today and
22 listening to us. I have two points that I want to say right
23 off the bat.

24 MS. TERHAAR: Excuse me can you spell your name
25 please?

1 MR. FARRAR: My name is Chris Farrar, last name
2 is F-a-r-r-a-r, sorry about that. I guess I'm standing here
3 like a deer in the headlights because of a couple of things.
4 One I thought this meeting today would give me an
5 opportunity to actually talk to the decision-makers and I
6 was very disappointed to learn that these is it five
7 Commission members that make the final decision, they are
8 not here to hear our statements and I don't think they are
9 going to listen to the tape recorder.

10 That's a great disappointment to me because it
11 means that our opinions are channeled through you folks and
12 then provided to them. I think they miss a lot by not being
13 here, I think they should be here and I think that if they
14 don't come here to approve it that it should not be approved
15 and I don't think anyone with a brain would accept that.

16 A couple of other points -- the document is 960
17 pages long and I have been reading through it. I'm a
18 scientist, I have a master's degree in geology. I looked at
19 the geology section and was appalled at how pathetically
20 behind times it was in the told analysis but the main thing
21 is the 960 pages and maybe 15 or 20 appendices at the end
22 and I do hereby request that the due date for comments on
23 that massive document be extended outward.

24 I was going to suggest a measly 90 days, I have
25 heard 120 now suggested and I think that's probably more

1 appropriate so I am requesting specifically that you change
2 the deadline of October 6th and move it out 120 days. I am
3 also -- before running out of time specifically asking you
4 even after that 120 days unless some miraculous revelation
5 comes about that proves everything said by LNG is correct, I
6 am asking you to not approve this project and the main
7 reason really is I'm not going to talk to you about all of
8 the environment stuff, people have, but the economic is
9 undeniable.

10 This area has a plan, we are making progress.
11 You know counter to a lot of recent comments about the
12 economy here in Clatsop County, it is not doing badly at
13 all, it has made a turnaround just like many of us have
14 since 2008 and if you look at the recent employment figures
15 here in Clatsop County and the state of Oregon and the
16 United States, they are all within a couple tenths of a
17 percentage point.

18 We have a plan here. We don't need a big
19 industrial operation here that is going to counter
20 everything we have done to have our own style of community
21 here. Our economy is working, we are going in the direction
22 we want to go, we don't want to become a little Asian
23 satellite community that's exporting our research, that
24 third world, that's not for us.

25 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

1 MS. TERHAAR: Speaker 13 please.

2 MR. STANLEY: My name is Murray Stanley,
3 S-t-a-n-l-e-y and the description at the website in their
4 mission outline is to serve the public interest and provide
5 for its safety. What public interest does the LNG plant
6 serve, I'd like to know. How do you ensure the safety in
7 the event of an explosion? How do you ensure public safety
8 in view of the high likelihood of an earthquake and an
9 accompanying tsunami?

10 The goal of natural gas has been achieved by
11 fracking which may turn out to be an ecological disaster in
12 itself. Conversely the windfall of the industry has forced
13 down the price of natural gas. The gas companies don't make
14 a cent until they sell gas. Off-shore markets will fatten
15 up our bottom line and the sole and single purpose of this
16 project make no mistake about it, below the glitter of jobs
17 and the importance of providing natural gas to Asia, the
18 real singular purpose is money. Fatten up the bottom line.

19 The facility is not a distillation plant or an
20 electrical power plant which would serve the public. The
21 monstrous industrial complex will be nestled in the front
22 yard, essentially destroys aesthetic value of Astoria and
23 Warrenton most likely tourism and other industries.

24 It begs to question if this project was proposed
25 on a title basin of the Potomac just below the Washington

1 Monument we will say, I wonder if it this project was
2 located in Washington just below the monument, say about a
3 mile from the White House, I wonder if this project would
4 even be considered.

5 I wonder if the industry would have the uberous
6 to even propose a project that would sit on the Potomac
7 River. The U.S. is only vested in China and carbon
8 pollution. Per capita we lead the world. The 28 sovereign
9 nations that make up the European Union accumulatively rank
10 below the U.S.

11 We in the Northwest have posted the warmest
12 winter in the history of the record-keeping. The usual
13 snowfall fell as rain. Lake Shasta Reservoir, is currently
14 252 feet below -- thank you.

15 MS. MEDHA: Thank you.

16 MS. TERCHAAR: Speaker 14 please?

17 MS. JENKINS: I'm Beatrice Jenkins,
18 B-e-a-t-r-i-c-e J-e-n-k-i-n-s. I'm with the operating
19 engineers. I've heard a lot of gloom and doom here about
20 this proposed project and heard a lot about the
21 environmental impact and the effects that it is going to
22 have on the community.

23 Well I have had a chance to work on three
24 pipelines. One of them was a Ruby pipeline. People got
25 together, also city council members and everybody else

1 deciding on whether they wanted that pipeline coming in.
2 And you are going to feel the effects of that pipeline,
3 nobody is going to tell you that it's not, but what are the
4 effects that are going to happen? I mean when I worked over
5 there for a year, you know what happened a lot of people --
6 the residents that were there they opened up their homes,
7 rented some rooms to the pipeliners, people that were on a
8 fixed income were able to make money.

9 You could ride down the street and you see little
10 kids opening up lemonade stands selling cookies. Those kids
11 need money. There were three hotels over there I mean it
12 was -- people didn't want that but if you go there today
13 people -- you don't see the bad anymore it is all back to
14 normal, life is back to normal.

15 That all improved with the pipeline coming in so
16 everybody talks about the bad things that is going to happen
17 and nobody is looking at the good that it will do. We have
18 members that actually live here and work here, some of them
19 live in Warrenton, Oregon, we have one that lives about 10
20 miles from the proposed site where this terminal is going to
21 be built.

22 These people are for the project also and they
23 want this project so I hope you take that into consideration
24 that not everybody is against these projects, thank you.

25 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

1 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, speaker 15?

2 MS. MEYER: My name is Sara Meyer, S-a-r-a
3 M-e-y-e-r. I live in the last zone in the direct line of
4 the pipe. That's not what I am here for. I am a collector
5 of historical images, we have a retail business that I
6 started over 31 years. I have pictures of big ships
7 breaking lines when they would come in and come up to
8 Colonia. They can't withhold them, one ship slammed against
9 the ridge, we have bad weather here, we have weather that
10 blew out several of our business windows.

11 We had a hurricane come here. You look at what
12 we are we have a lot of rain here for some reason, it is a
13 beautiful place. I think that you who are making decisions
14 on the internal here should look at the surrounding
15 environment and I also want you to deny this CP09-6 permit
16 application, it is wrong for this area.

17 I did do a little research on the FERC yesterday
18 and assessed that you have 8 LNG proposed export terminals
19 that are already approved and 27 export terminals that are
20 under your review. How many do you really need to provide
21 the profit to the corporations that want them and how
22 quickly will those exports deplete energy sources for our
23 future use?

24 Does this Commission care? I'm not sure anymore.
25 I'm very concerned for America. Our resources are depleted

1 by greed and not need we don't need to export resources. Is
2 there a FERC plan for our nation's healthy energy future?
3 If not, I think all proposals need to be postponed until
4 this democracy leads with knowledge.

5 The raping of resources for the immediate dollar
6 is so short-sided and horrible. FERC is supposed to be our
7 guide of sustainability and best use of energy for our
8 todays and our tomorrows. It is not your charge to enable
9 corporate profiteering. Deny the Oregon LNG CPO9-6
10 application it is not wanted by a majority of Clatsop County
11 voters.

12 Exporting fracked gas from Canada and the
13 Dakotas, the chemical environmental aggravating of
14 destruction -- I also think that you need to really look at
15 what happens to the chemicals from the fracking that
16 happened and how they are vented and supposedly cleaned out
17 as the hot gas is cooled to ship out, what happens to that,
18 what happens to us with those chemicals in our area, where
19 will they be stored, how will they be -- what happens to
20 them? Are they going to be piled up over like in Hanford?
21 What happens to the bad stuff that is already banned, put
22 into the gas?

23 MS. KOCCHAR: Thank you.

24 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you speaker 16.

25 MR. ISAACS: Hello, thanks for being here. My

1 name is David Isaacs. I put together a small synopsis of
2 the last 15 years of my experiences with the LNG and the LNG
3 community and what I have seen and heard. The warrant of
4 the LNG enterprise has no relationship to the weather, heavy
5 wind and swift tides of tsunami-owned geology.

6 The choice of this siting has no relationship to
7 any of the ongoing contiguous facts of the geophysical
8 events and their unavoidable implications. The LNG company
9 already stated they would discharge the cooling liquids into
10 Young's Bay and we can leave that further formulation for
11 the fishing industry that already per-exists there.

12 Earlier I had submitted the framework to the 911
13 Commission on the function of communities of thought and how
14 they function in the processing of the exchange of
15 information and I believe they found those citations and
16 information very useful.

17 It's pretty costly calculus for the Skipanon and
18 surrounding areas infrastructure, no financial bonds to
19 protect for the eventuality of a mishap, no umbrella for the
20 residential or business community, just an LNG home office
21 that will be outsourcing the exporting of LNG foreign
22 interests that have no familiarity, connection or
23 responsibility with their habitat or the femoral casual
24 factors that link to the shape, scale and proportion of the
25 variable other safety issues not in the Coast Guard's

1 control as well as their all three of their local bases in
2 the Columbia River inundation zone and the Warrenton station
3 that's build unfiltered.

4 The LNG company has no community responsibility
5 subsequent to an ad hoc business venture and no special
6 liability for a bowed Paul BP Valdez, Fukushima-like
7 occurrence. It is all left to sort after the occurrence,
8 not even a financial bond because everybody seems to omit
9 themselves from responsibility.

10 And the property owners and businesses are left
11 to even out this process. The inhabitants should not remain
12 disenfranchised in much the same way corporate secrecy
13 protects the image of the organization first and usually
14 uses denial as a tool when public impositions occur.

15 The largest single industry endeavor in our area
16 would be installed on a continuum of construction to a few
17 gauge readers in the facility. The residents and other
18 nearby enterprises are really the last ones considered in
19 this process. To listen to this large industry as it is so
20 obviously and then take the instance of an earthquake or
21 tsunami, anything --

22 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

23 MS. TERCHAAR: Number 18 please?

24 MR. KOPKA: Number 18? Can I have 19, 20, and
25 21 if you want to come up.

1 MS. HAYES : Good afternoon and thank you for
2 your time. I traveled here from Portland because I believe
3 in the urgency of this issue. My name is Glenna Hayes,
4 G-l-e-n-n-a H-a-y-e-s. I'm really proud to be here in
5 support of these citizens of this area who have dedicated so
6 much of their time and energy to educate themselves and
7 their community about this project. I am in awe of them and
8 I am in complete agreement with all of the testimony that
9 you have heard from them.

10 I am opposed to this project. I think Oregon LNG
11 is the opposite of a public benefit. As Oregonians we have
12 everything to lose, our state bee, our natural resources,
13 and our children and grandchildren's futures and we have
14 nothing to gain from energy projects such as Oregon LNG.

15 There are so many obvious reasons for Oregonians
16 to reject this project and we will. Safety concerns,
17 damaged property, natural resources, the rate increases that
18 will be created by exporting LNG to Asia. I also think we
19 should proceed as a nation to address our energy needs and
20 global climate prices is a moral issue and that's probably
21 what encouraged me to drive here today the most.

22 It's an accepted scientific understanding that we
23 must turn off fossil fuels and turn on sustainable,
24 renewable energy sources. The development of Oregon LNG
25 will lock us into at least 20 years of a dirty,

1 carbon-producing energy consumption and that is what is
2 morally unacceptable for our world. I hope this Commission
3 will really consider the concerns raised here today, the
4 thoughtful comments, the science that the people have
5 brought to you, it's amazing what we as citizens can
6 understand, believe me, we can.

7 And I must say it appears to me that government
8 bodies such as FERC seem more and more to be rubber stamped
9 for the fossil fuels industries and less and less about
10 protecting our environment, thank you.

11 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

12 MS. TERCHAAR: Speaker 19?

13 MR. LARSON: Hello my name is Jim Larson, J-i-m
14 L-a-r-s-o-n and I know a lot of people in the room here.
15 Eight generations in Clatsop County. I'm a friend of Bernie
16 Bjorks, he spoke to you earlier about the fishing industry
17 and I heard a lot of comments today about what about the
18 fish, well if you have got Bernie Bjork, the head of the
19 fishing industry and thumbs up to you and says "hey we are
20 all for this," it would be foolish to think Bernie would say
21 something like that if he was concerned about what the LNG
22 terminal would do to the fish in the area, wouldn't it?

23 Well anyway and as far as fossil fuels is
24 concerned, I would love to see all of us not using fossil
25 fuels, but anybody that drove here in a car today and

1 doesn't want fossil fuels, they are a hypocrite, I'm sorry,
2 really -- so as far as the LNG terminal goes, you know the
3 people that are out working in Clatsop County right now,
4 they can't be here at this meeting, they can't so I just
5 wanted to say that not everybody in Clatsop County is
6 against this thing, okay thank you.

7 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

8 MS. TERCHAAR: Thank you, do we have a speaker
9 20?

10 MR. EXUM. : Good afternoon, I didn't actually
11 have time to write something up.

12 MS. TERCHAAR: Can you please give us your name
13 and spell it?

14 MR. EXUM: George Exum, E-x-u-m, 541 W. Birnie
15 Road, Cathlamet, Washington. I really am not prepared so I
16 am going to sort of wing it. Mostly talking about the
17 organization that you work for -- it's great that it's a
18 grammatical organization because it can be a noun, a verb or
19 an adjective as in what the FERC or to the FERC, or FERcing
20 idiots, but some of the process you are a regulatory agency
21 and part of the definition of what regulatory means is to
22 allow and so you could go through this process when you
23 start with the premise of to allow.

24 It is disgraceful and I know FERC says oh we
25 follow all the rules, well this meeting is just a checklist

1 item. It is not -- you are not here to listen to people.
2 We have been through this a number of other energy projects
3 and other projects and this is just you checking off a box
4 and not listening to the people, thank you very much.

5 MS. TERCHAAR: Thank you. 21? Okay, -- those
6 are the speakers that have signed up, do we have anyone who
7 hasn't spoken yet and that would like to speak?

8 Okay we have time if there is any -- sir?

9 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: My understanding is that
10 you will have a second?

11 MS. TERCHAAR: Yes that's true we will have
12 another meeting tonight at 6 o'clock. Is there anyone that
13 has already spoken that would like to speak for a second
14 time?

15 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: I'd like to finish.

16 MS. TERCHAAR: Okay at this point raise your hand
17 first and then you can go.

18 MS. HITES-CLABAUGH: My name is Lucinda
19 Hites-Clabaugh. I would like to talk about first
20 responders. When I was growing up I was a girl scout and
21 starting at 12 years old I took advanced first aid, a junior
22 first aid card with American Red Cross and the standard
23 first aid and advanced first aid and then went into EMT and
24 then became and also went through CNA training.

25 I'm the kind of person that when somebody

1 collapses I give them mouth-to-mouth. I help people, I
2 respond to accidents when I see them happening and I am
3 nearby because I know how. And as teachers and I taught for
4 30 years we have first aid cards so we often find ourselves
5 in a position of being first responders.

6 I want to talk about Bellingham, Washington some
7 friends of mine, good friends of mine, two teachers years
8 before the pipeline had an explosion from a leak so they
9 also took after pictures when an unexpected leak caused a
10 huge explosion and to this day years later I have friends
11 who are still PTSD traumatized by what they saw and
12 experienced.

13 Because there was a gentleman an older fisherman
14 who was in the stream at the time when the pipeline goes
15 through -- the little boys, however, the two little boys who
16 died were playing in their yard, they were not in the
17 stream, they were off in their yards so the blast zone is
18 much greater than people realize when they think about
19 pressurized compressed gas, they need to think in terms of
20 big like not just 30 feet high explosion, you are talking
21 about 100 or more feet high and you are talking about well
22 like an atomic bomb explosion.

23 When people are burned on that much of their
24 bodies it's not a pleasant sight. Those little boys did not
25 die right away, they were crying out, screaming in pain,

1 they did not die immediately and the whole neighborhood in
2 Bellingham, near Walking Creek was traumatized by that.

3 This could be any of the people here who are
4 going to be affected by this. This could be any of you and
5 there are environmental impact statements that can
6 adequately look at that. I know for a fact that when we
7 tried an environmental impact statement, emergency scenario
8 planning, years ago for the nuclear power plant, the Trojan,
9 this was in '75 that everybody failed miserably.

10 Everybody, every agency, every person that was
11 supposed to connect -- nice people, sheriffs and various
12 people and coast guard and you know but people failed
13 miserably -- there was no way that you can prepare for those
14 things really and they didn't do well. If people wanted to
15 have information before the event to have numbers and know
16 about it so that they would be able to respond and pass --
17 you cannot prepare, but you can't prepare for the trauma
18 years later of what people saw happen in their neighborhood.

19 The little boys are etched in their memory
20 forever and when we look at actual physical impacts like
21 that and the lack of preparation and the lack of "well it's
22 not my backyard," that just isn't okay, that's not
23 acceptable. I really liked the guys analogy about taking it
24 to the Potomac at the White House, you know would they dare
25 do it there, of course not -- but if you don't do it there

1 you don't do it to anybody.

2 If you don't do think around pregnant women you
3 don't do them around anybody. If you don't do them for your
4 grandchildren then don't do them for anybody. You just do
5 what's right and you think about real science and you
6 realize that there is no mitigation for salmon and salmon
7 streams, that is a joke and it just won't happen. It will
8 be so many years and those years when the salmon didn't come
9 back, those three years you are lacking you know, the
10 population goes down.

11 We love our salmon here, we really -- we are
12 salmon people, we love our salmon and they are impacted. We
13 as people are impacted too. The health effects -- there
14 have been a number of people from OH, doctors and physicians
15 for social responsibility I'm sure that provided testimony
16 and written testimony for you already but it concerns me
17 again that the costs and the risk analysis is not seriously
18 being looked at the way it was meant to.

19 You convince any mom you want to justify whatever
20 you want but you have to look at the risk piece, the health,
21 the medical, actual conditions and then what happens and
22 take it more seriously. No man's greed or company's greed
23 could possibly be worth the suffering of any more of those
24 little boys.

25 And you know I can talk about turbidity you want

1 specifics, I can go into specifics on turbidity because I
2 worked for the National Park Service as a back country
3 ranger, I worked in Alaska doing Department of Fish and
4 Game, egg counts and fish channels, I have done inventories,
5 I actually can use specifics but we shouldn't have to
6 because people of integrity with professional integrity in
7 their swank suits, shouldn't have to be going against
8 somebody saying that there are no significant impacts
9 because you just know that's simply not true, that's just
10 not true.

11 And if you are worried yourself as a professional
12 you just don't do that. So there are habitat impacts, there
13 are wildlife impacts, not just from the dredging, not just
14 from the fluid releases, not just from leaks, not just from
15 explosion but of course they are all of the things that are
16 dear to everyone here that we have talked about, the beauty,
17 the value of beauty, the value of tourism because of that
18 beauty.

19 And I find it interesting that the fisherman are
20 for this because I did fish before I became a certified
21 teacher, I fished in Alaska, I fished all the way from
22 Washington State, I have fished for my living and I know
23 that if you study science, you know good science teachers,
24 but if you study science then you know that this will affect
25 your fishing over time. You are going to know boys, I hate

1 to be the one to break it to you.

2 Please do not allow permits for any of this
3 because you really have no basis in science or almost any
4 aspect of it.

5 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

6 MS. DOMINEY: Jean Dominey I would just like to
7 finish my testimony quickly. I was stopped by the clock at
8 the warming of the waters for the fish. Finishing up with
9 the fish are the intact pipes, no one has assessed the
10 fullness of the pressure of the water and the tides with the
11 intake of the waters against I don't care what kind of
12 screens they have they are going to smash the fish.

13 The next thing on the air quality -- Semi-vac of
14 Warrenton have their nose out of joint a bit that so many
15 people from outside showed up at the hearing last week but I
16 sit in my front yard inhaling please God the fresh marine
17 air on the hot days and on the storm days I don't mind it at
18 all. We are subject to the air currents coming right over
19 that Skipanon and all of those gasses that are being
20 released and they are hitting us. They are going to affect
21 our health.

22 And with the Coast Guard keeping their engines
23 running the whole time that the ships are docked, the LNG
24 ships are docked, that's going to add to the gasses. I
25 conclude Jon Wellinghoff when he was Chairman of FERC came

1 out here and saw the estuary and his comment was this
2 project does not belong here and I concur.

3 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

4 MS. TERHAAR: Anyone else? Okay.

5 MR. ISAAC: Okay David Isaac again. I wanted to
6 finish part of what I was talking about had to do with the
7 people, the community, the residents and the businesses that
8 have pre-existed this proposed facility and that actually as
9 far as I can see have no -- correct me if I am wrong, have
10 no particular interest in the process as far as what
11 consequences might exist for the people outside of this
12 facility's parameters.

13 That should be taken into consideration when you
14 have a plan that has the potential magnitude of gee this one
15 ship I believe it was in one of the former national security
16 advisors talked about LNG shipping very briefly -- the
17 training ground for terrorists and something 17 Harashima
18 bombs compressed into the hull of one of these ships and
19 that concerned me when I heard that one of the testimonies
20 that the company Oregon LNG had nothing to do with the
21 off-loading and this was a franchise operation that was
22 contracted to whoever was you know picking up or off-loading
23 or loading the material.

24 So it seems to me that there's a fine line of
25 what responsibility is and there is no umbrella for the

1 residential or business community, that is a huge concern
2 for I'm sure a lot of people in Warrenton. And I live in
3 Astoria on the south side and I can see this facility from
4 where this proposed facility would be from the upstairs of
5 my house and the winds would also be a concern, the lighting
6 and the noise. I listen to the Coast Guard it wakes me up
7 often when they are running their engines.

8 The issue remains un-delineated and should not
9 remain a morphus and be left for the formulation. The area
10 has two public ballots and the unanimous county commissions
11 vote not to support an LNG venture in this location. Plus
12 the city of Warrenton is trying to shelter their desire in
13 an unsuitable rezoning issue. They gave an upgrade in
14 zoning from small industry to moderate industry. Moderate
15 because there was an issue of non-compliance with a public
16 statute in trying to designate a large industry within the
17 city limit or within that particular area.

18 There was a conflict of interest so rather than
19 siting it as a large facility as what it is they decided to
20 call it a moderate one and that's what they did. And then
21 in the instance of an earthquake or tsunami anything at the
22 far north end of Skipanon entrance such as a docking
23 facility will be ripped to chards or possibly sink in the
24 silt of that liquefaction zone.

25 If you listen to one LNG company's explanation

1 that boulders would be placed strategically underneath one
2 of these concrete superdomes was nonsensical given the fact
3 that it is a liquefaction zone. How does a company oversee
4 a project such as this with no experience in this type of
5 site? It is not amusing to us locals to know that there is
6 two Peter's that were responsible for this meeting here
7 today. Peter Garron who was support director then at the
8 original lease signing, took a weekend journey with a guy
9 named Peter Hanson I believe down to -- he was the Oregon
10 LNG like marketing manager and he is the only one that has
11 ever been here, as a marketing manager and he has managed
12 the image and the news coming in and out of the company.

13 And these two took a weekend to San Jose where
14 the LNG company apparently has a home office of some kind
15 under a different name and they came back with this great
16 plan of theirs to lease the property.

17 Gosh I think that just about sums it up. I think
18 this location under the geophysical conditions that exist
19 and our inheritant in it does not fit the situation or the
20 conditions that are apparent here in Skipanon Inlet motive,
21 and its geophysical implications, thank you.

22 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

23 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, next this gentleman here
24 in the front.

25 MR. DOMINEY: Yes my name is Carl, C-a-r-l

1 Dominey, D-o-m-i-n-e-y from Astoria, Oregon and the City of
2 Warrenton is at the epi-center of everything that has been
3 happening over there and so I think that it is interesting
4 to note what the City of Warrenton has done to protect
5 themselves.

6 At some point in its history and with great
7 wisdom the City of Warrenton realized the important part of
8 the Skipanon Peninsula and the surrounding estuary play in
9 our economy, our well-being, both locally and globally and
10 indeed our very survival. The importance is so great that
11 they wrote protections for this area into their
12 comprehensive plan and development coded.

13 Now this is not an opinion or my guess, this is
14 what is in the Warrenton City Code and development would
15 require. Examples are Warrenton Development Code 16.64.010
16 say "Warrenton will maintain the integrity of the actuary
17 and coastal waters. The definition of integrity is to save
18 our quality of being complete, undivided or unbroken, pure."
19 Directed 1.2 million cubic yards, 131 acres of critical fish
20 habitat for the turtle basin right out of the instinctual
21 route that sailors have followed for thousands of years is a
22 clear violation of this code and will severely hurt a proud
23 fishing industry that ranked number 1 on the United States
24 west coast as recently as 2014.

25 Warrenton Comprehensive Plan 5.323 states that

1 Warrenton must maintain public access to the east Skipanon
2 Peninsula -- public access. The proposed terminals
3 mandatory exclusions resulting in sheer volume of truck
4 traffic on King Avenue, the only access road to the Skipanon
5 will deny the public and is a clear violation even if
6 Warrenton LNG proposed mitigation with a hiking trail, it
7 would still violate the Americans with Disabilities Act.

8 Restricting access to the Columbia River from the
9 Warrenton boat marina is a clear violation of Warrenton
10 Development Code 6.164.030(1) which states, "Any project
11 must exceed all adverse impact it causes." How is Oregon
12 LNG planning to mitigate not only the lost revenue from
13 fishing plus other businesses fishing supports but also the
14 declining property values and higher insurance rates for a
15 large number of Warrenton's homes and businesses that will
16 suddenly be in the blast zone?

17 This zone would also include the Shallow Inn,
18 Walgreens, Rite-Aid, and Fred Meyer Shopping Mall and
19 possibly the Astoria Airport and Coast Guard base due to the
20 prevailing west to east winds. We are supposedly a nation
21 of laws but if we fail to follow them we become hypocrites
22 when we criticize other countries of the world for the very
23 same thing.

24 I back up the gentleman's request with the
25 extension on time for reviewing the DEIS be extended at

1 least a full 120 days. Thank you.

2 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

3 MS. TERHAAR: This gentleman here.

4 MR. FARRAR: My name is Chris Farrar, C-h-r-i-s
5 F-a-r-r-a-r. I spoke earlier and only got part way through
6 and I have no way to complete everything I would like to say
7 here to you today but let's go back to the tsunami for just
8 a minute. I looked through the 960 page document, and I
9 also looked through the appendices to see if there was
10 something I might have missed there and I find the analysis
11 there really sorely lacking in a very important way.

12 A lot has been done by the state here, DOGAMI, is
13 the state agency for geology and they you know did a great
14 job of mapping the inundation zone based on geologic
15 deposits of the last 10,000 years, looking at sand deposits,
16 turbidity deposits, turbidite deposits and they mapped out
17 in time the frequency of these things and how high the
18 resulting tsunami wave would run up into the area and so
19 that's pretty well known. It's modeled, it's -- nobody has
20 a video of it to see it but we think the modeling is
21 probably pretty good on the wave train.

22 So we know how far the water is going to come in,
23 we know how high the wave heights will get, we know the wave
24 lengths, we know the frequencies and we have some idea of
25 how long it might go on and it's not just a single wave, I

1 guess you guys have heard that by now, most people have in
2 several ways -- waves that go on for hours, if not a full
3 day after a large event.

4 The part that is left out completely in the
5 geologic discussion other than a couple of sentences that
6 talk about an estimated 1 to 2 feet of scour, the erosion
7 from a passing tsunami wave -- 1 to 2 feet of scour it
8 didn't say over what area, it doesn't map it out, it shows
9 no detail of that and we are kind of fortunate, the United
10 States maybe in the fact that there have been a couple of
11 really large tsunamis that have hit other places and now we
12 can go study those places and those studies are finally
13 starting to hit the scientific literature.

14 Obviously the big one in Japan a couple of years
15 ago is now just getting studied, the full effects of it --
16 the one in Indonesia is better studied but there was one in
17 the Kuril Islands up toward Russia, 1996 and fortunately
18 they had light of surveys of the beach areas before a
19 tsunami ran aground there. They did work afterwards and
20 they showed that in many cases the amount of erosion was up
21 to 200 cubic meters per meter of shoreline on which the wave
22 ran up, 200 cubic meters per meter width.

23 You have a mile-wide tsunami coming in across the
24 sand spin, the sand is un-cemented, it's not even fully
25 compacted, much of it is in there just for 50-60 years, the

1 stuff underneath just for a couple of hundred years, that's
2 nothing. What will happen to those materials? Where is the
3 analysis of the erosion that that tsunami will produce
4 because this plan is designed -- I'm sure the engineering
5 design is great, it's got these columns that extend way down
6 and they can support it and everything but you know what
7 those columns are engineered with the idea that there will
8 be at least some soft sand, maybe it's going to liquefy and
9 settle down 20 or 30 meters, big deal -- when the sand
10 washes away from the columns it will be a big deal and they
11 are not going to be able to just sit there and take that
12 lateral force anymore.

13 They are designed with the sand around them that
14 is part of the structure. You need to require the company
15 to go back and get qualified geo-engineering, geo-technical
16 firm to make a three dimensional model that will
17 specifically show what amount of erosion is going to take
18 place in and around the project area. An exasperating
19 action that they are going to take is the dredging of the
20 big hole in front of the spin, it is going to change the
21 dynamics of the river there, it is going to change the
22 dynamics of the tide running in and out and it is going to
23 change the dynamics of a tsunami wave, has that been
24 factored in?

25 Has somebody re-ran the tsunami analyses with

1 this spin out right there and through their pork? It hasn't
2 been done, it is not in the document. If you are basing
3 your decision on that you are basing your decision on
4 seriously flawed information. The whole geological section
5 should be re-written and you will be hearing later on
6 testimony that will be submitted in writing from another
7 person who will be talking to you about some of the lack of
8 fault mapping that was used in the assessment of the site.

9 The site is geologically a horrible place to put
10 a project like this. It doesn't have to go there I think
11 much more of the document should have looked at alternative
12 sites. Put this somewhere else, it does not belong here in
13 a tsunami zone, it does not belong in an estuary and it does
14 not belong on material that is so young and so erodible that
15 it is going to make the Kuril Islands look like a small
16 scale event when it happened.

17 I could go on more with the economic issues and I
18 am just going to pack it together and just say you don't
19 realize what the huge impact this project's additional
20 traffic to this region is going to do to our local economy.
21 Three to five years of that the tourists will never come
22 back. This place will be painted as just a congested
23 industrial town with a bunch of big obnoxious trucks with
24 their diesel engines running day and night and they are
25 going to light up these 160 foot towers, 24 hours a day

1 they are going to be lit so we can all look at this
2 beautiful thing so some wealthy Chinaman can go buy more
3 stolen ivory.

4 Well this project does not belong here. Do not
5 approve it and give us more time. I will write an extensive
6 document but I need time, I need 120 more days.

7 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you, next.

8 REP. BOONE: Okay thank you. My name is
9 Representative Deborah Boone. I am a State Representative
10 from this area and for the last 2 years --

11 MS. TERHAAR: Can you spell your name please?

12 REP. BOONE: D-e-b-o-r-a-h B-o-o-n-e and I would
13 like to say to Medha and I'm sorry I can't pronounce your
14 last name but I could go back a ways I was at the first
15 meeting when you were here in Warrenton some years ago. So
16 welcome back to my District now and welcome to you Pat and
17 Robert, for coming to Astoria today.

18 And you have heard a lot I will probably same
19 some of the same things but from other people before me but
20 I will just state as a quick amusement on the other side of
21 things on your site. So I appreciate that that you are
22 sitting up there taking in all of this and listening
23 carefully.

24 I have strong reservations and concerns with the
25 proposed development of the LNG export facility that Oregon

1 LNG proposes to build in Warrenton, in the tsunami,
2 earthquake zone on land that will likely dwindle when the
3 earthquake does occur thus collapsing the structures.

4 When the proposal was first presented to Clatsop
5 County residents it was to be an import facility. They said
6 that if the locals didn't want them here they would locate
7 somewhere else and this is 10 years ago. Now there has been
8 a change to an export terminal. The fact that they will
9 drill over 365 feet on the proposed location of the tanks
10 without hitting solid ground is additionally concerning.

11 The fact that the Columbia River will be closed
12 to commercial and recreational traffic during the time that
13 the transfer vessels are in port, grounded from a number of
14 days each week representing closure of the lower Columbia
15 River to traditional economic activity that represents the
16 lifeblood of this region. It affects not only the northwest
17 corridor of the state but also the upriver into the
18 agricultural lands of eastern Oregon.

19 All of the barges carrying those bins will be
20 stalled while the LNG vessels come in to load and then
21 leave. The land over which the company pipeline is proposed
22 will also be greatly affected. There is much opposition to
23 this project from many centers including agriculture,
24 forestry and produce in the inland areas of the state.

25 In fact the height of the two tanks has risen now

1 into the bright path designation designated for the Astoria
2 Airport presents a real threat to aircraft, especially
3 during times of winter, is fogged in and these risks are too
4 great.

5 Finally there has been a repeated local
6 opposition to this proposal over the past 10 years by both
7 locally elected officials and the public for many reasons
8 from those listed above to concerns about the general safety
9 of the project that will be located within close proximity
10 to the dangerous blast zone should there be an explosion.
11 For the aforesaid reasons many more do not support this
12 project.

13 And I just wanted to say I would also encourage a
14 longer examination period as long as it has been 10 years
15 now people were based on what really matters. Thank you for
16 coming, thank you for paying close attention and I hope that
17 you will not support this and look into more renewable
18 energy that we have a lot of substance here such as the
19 river and ocean and the other renewables, thank you.

20 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you.

21 MS. TERHAAR: Do we have anyone else that would
22 like to speak?

23 MS. KOCHHAR: Since there are no more people to
24 speak this concludes all of the commenters who have signed
25 up to speak and others that were added. Is there anyone

1 else who would like to speak at this time, I'm going to ask
2 one more time? Yes? Okay, you are welcome, come on.

3 MR. DOMINEY: Thank you, do you need my name
4 again?

5 MS. KOCHHAR: Yes please.

6 MR. DOMINEY: Carl Dominey. Metaphorically
7 speaking I went to the bank to apply for a loan to realize
8 the American dream of building my own home. When the bank
9 found out the property I wanted to build on is not available
10 and I cannot get permission to run utilities through a
11 property I don't own, they said, "don't let the door hit
12 your backside on the way out."

13 So what's the difference here? Oregon LNG has no
14 property to build on. The Army Corp. easement was upheld by
15 the court nearly 7 of 10, 68% of Clatsop County voters
16 including Warrenton denied the supply pipeline to the
17 proposed terminal. Which part of no is so hard for Oregon
18 LNG to understand?

19 In America we supposedly value and honor
20 individual rights and freedoms, so why is Oregon LNG still
21 getting a chance when I did not? This project will pollute
22 the world's atmosphere by releasing 2.6 billion tons of
23 carbon dioxide, plus methane gas annually, hurt Warrenton
24 financially, destroy downtown Astoria with hundreds and
25 hundreds of trucks bringing construction materials from

1 Tongue Point to the Skipanon, violate the democratically
2 demonstrated will of the people about the pipeline, trample
3 on Warrenton's protective city codes and put all lower
4 Columbia area residents at serious risk because of the
5 earthquake tsunami location.

6 If you don't care about that you better check
7 your pulse to see if you heart is still beating. The 22
8 billion dollars of annual commerce on the Columbia River
9 will be severely interrupted by the 500 yard security zones
10 around each of the proposed 125 LNG tankers per year either
11 eliminating or negatively effecting an estimated 44,000 jobs
12 throughout the Columbia River Basin, that includes Oregon,
13 Washington, Idaho and even in Canada.

14 Our country's sputtering economic recovery does
15 not need more unemployment it only condemns more people to
16 inescapable poverty. No matter how hard you try you cannot
17 mitigate a major earthquake tsunami, global air pollution,
18 extinction of a salmon run or the will of the people.

19 No matter what denomination a person follows or
20 the amount of faith a person has or not I recommend that
21 everyone read Pope Francis's just released encyclical
22 "Laudato Si", which describes human behavior and how it is
23 altering this planet we call our home. Please read it
24 before making a decision on pollution-producing projects
25 like this. It only takes about an hour and it is available

1 in any book store, thank you.

2 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you. Anybody else? Okay.

3 MS. HITES-CLABAUGH: This is Lucinda

4 Hites-Clabaugh, my last time. I am the proud owner of an
5 electric car. When I was 15 and my parents needed a new car
6 in 1971 I said let's put our money where our mouth is or
7 something snotty that teenagers say and they did. They
8 bought a secret Vanguard made solar electric vehicle. It
9 looked like a little wedge of cheese. If you were here in
10 the Portland area in the 70's there was a white one, a
11 yellow one, a blue one, mine was orange and looked like a
12 wedge of cheese.

13 Solar electric vehicles do exist. Electric cars
14 do exist. The Tesla company has offered to share their
15 technology with the world so that we can put political will
16 towards clean and renewable energy and not be battered by
17 oil companies or gas companies, fossil fuels which will
18 destroy our atmosphere.

19 If we really took that understanding seriously
20 that things have to change and there has to be a shift and
21 we really have to do it tomorrow. I think back to Churchill
22 and Roosevelt, they came in secret in the night Churchill
23 came and he talked to Roosevelt about making change because
24 he had to stop the world and he did it. It was only I think
25 two months, they managed to re-tool American industry. They

1 put the case together and shipped them over and we stopped.

2 It did change the world. And it took the
3 political will to do that, it can be done. If all of the
4 money from the Department of Energy started going only to
5 truly clean renewable resources which will not have ethanol
6 which destroys our atmosphere, then we could actually see
7 some change.

8 But there are electric cars now, it costs \$25.00
9 to buy the manual for converting any vehicle to an electric
10 vehicle, all electric vehicle. You don't have to be an
11 engineer to do it, it is pretty simple actually, simple
12 technology and if we actually started to re-tool American
13 and tried to put our energy into this instead and focus on
14 what we could do because there are big solar projects which
15 can produce the energy which is needed on a large scale.
16 There is no excuse for saying that we have to have this
17 nuclear plant and we have to have these other things we
18 really don't. We really don't. We just need to make up the
19 will and make the conversion. And we need to do this soon,
20 very soon because things just start healing at all and
21 getting the balance back so we still have an atmosphere to
22 breathe.

23 We already lost our union are you aware of that?
24 You say you are environmental review experts but I don't
25 know anything about your background. I apologize that I

1 didn't read your resumes before I came so I don't know how
2 much background in science you have, each of you but I know
3 that we need to do something now and we need to go ahead and
4 have the political will to do it.

5 And you guys who are in this wonderful, wonderful
6 opportunity and position where you can do something about it
7 if you stay true to science and facts that are accurate and
8 not slip into anything else as far as a source and encourage
9 our President to do the right thing and to stick to his guns
10 and not give in to oil companies or gas companies, because
11 the fossil fuels really need to stay in the ground.

12 And I am going to list for you, that's just a
13 small little thing that our next generation will get to
14 enjoy the way we did. I like helium balloons at parties
15 they sound like Donald Duck and they make you laugh but what
16 I really miss about helium is we are going to lose a lot
17 more than just helium.

18 It's about chemistry and it's about biology and
19 hopefully it is about human compassion and how we have to do
20 this together very soon so please give people at least 120
21 days and then seriously look at the risk piece of cost and
22 risk analysis, make it mean something, thank you.

23 MS. KOCHHAR: Thank you is there anybody else
24 before I close the meeting? Okay. Please give your name
25 and spell it.

1 MS. JARYCE: My name is Jaryce, J-a-r-y-c-e.
2 Anyway I live at Fort Warren. Everyone has come and talked
3 Fort Warren but I live there and I know what would happen if
4 this is going to be. We will have to move, we have 56
5 condominiums in there, most of them are past 50 years old.

6 We have only one child in there and we have a
7 wonderful place but if you are going to work and go in there
8 you are going to have a lot of people moving out and going
9 some other place and we have had our place in there for 30
10 years and it would be a real heartbreak for a lot of people
11 to have to come to our age and have to move and I would like
12 to have you think that over.

13 Because it's -- I'm less than a half a mile from
14 where this will be put in and I hear that you are going to
15 have your flares and things at night, we have a lot --
16 several people that have problems with breathing and things
17 and if you are going to have that 24 hours a day it is going
18 to kill people and they will all have to leave and you are
19 going to have a lot of people going other places and we are
20 trying to build up Warrenton as much as we can.

21 But I don't know if you have ever walked down
22 there to see where this was going to go in. If you would
23 you would see what we are talking about, all three of you
24 would have really an eye opener when you get out there
25 because it is not good. Anyway, thank you.

1 MS. KOCCHAR: Thank you, anybody else? Well if
2 there are no more speakers at this time I would like to
3 close the meeting and it's about 7 minutes past 3 o'clock
4 the meeting concludes and all the commenters who signed up
5 have spoken so far so if not the formal part of this meeting
6 will close now.

7 Within the FERC website there is a link called
8 e-library. If you type the docket number for the Oregon LNG
9 Project CP09-6 and CP09-7 for the Washington Expansion
10 Project, CP13-507 you can use e-library to gain access to
11 everything on the record concerning these projects as well
12 as all the findings and information submitted by Oregon LNG
13 and Northwest. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
14 Commission I would thank you for coming here today. Let the
15 record show that the comment meeting concluded at 8 after 3
16 o'clock now, thank you very much for coming.

17 (Concluded at 3:08 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25