

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

Summit Grove Lodge
30810 NE Timmen Road
Ridgefield, Oregon 98642

Wednesday, September 23, 2015

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

1 P R O C E E D I N G

2 MS. KOCHHAR: I'm going to start the meeting
3 now. Good evening on behalf of the Federal Energy
4 Regulatory Commission or FERC. I want to welcome all of you
5 to the meeting, the public comment meeting on the Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement of the Draft EIS for the
7 Oregon LNG Terminal and Pipeline Project and
8 Washington Extension Project.

9 Let the record show that the Draft EIS comment
10 meetings began at 6:02 p.m. on September 23, 2015 in
11 Ridgefield, Washington. My name is Medha Kochhar and I am
12 the Environmental Project Manager with the Office of Energy
13 Projects which is a division of the FERC.

14 Tonight we have Pat Terhaar on my right and Matt
15 Hutchinson on my left and also we have Joe Subsits,
16 Washington DOT, utilities and transportation commission.
17 Both Pat and Matt both are from HDR, HDR is assisting FERC
18 staff in their environmental analysis of the projects. In
19 addition we have Elisa Lykens who is with FERC she is
20 outside at the table and we also have Molly Brown, she is
21 with HDR at the sign-in table.

22 In addition we have representatives from Oregon
23 LNG Development Company, LLC, Oregon Pipeline Company LLC
24 together we call Oregon LNG and also Northwest in the corner
25 in front of us. They have maps and will be around after the

1 meeting to answer any specific questions on the project that
2 you might have.

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

8 I would like to thank the cooperating agencies
9 for their continued assistance with the NEPA review. I have
10 a short power point presentation to explain the FERC
11 process. The purpose of today's meeting is to give you an
12 opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental
13 Impact Statement and specific to proposed projects and Draft
14 EIS and also to explain the FERC review process.

15 FERC is an independent regulatory agency and its
16 responsibilities are to assess rates for interstate
17 transmission of electricity, natural gas and water, siting
18 of interstate natural gas and hydro-electric facilities and
19 LNG import and export facilities.

20 DOE approves the export of LNG products. FERC is
21 lead federal agency for NEPA review and EIS preparation.
22 FERC is an advocate of the environmental review process not
23 the projects. A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was
24 issued on August 5th, 2015. Draft EIS comment period ends
25 October 6, 2015.

1 Comments will be addressed in the Final EIS. The
2 EIS is not a decision-making document. FERC Commissioners
3 determine that a project should be approved based on the
4 review of the environmental information in the EIS, public
5 comments, engineering, market and rate information. What
6 is the EIS? The EIS is an analytical document. The EIS
7 takes a hard look at the environmental impacts of the
8 projects and compares alternatives. The EIS addresses
9 environmental issues identified by the public and agencies
10 during scoping.

11 There are many ways that you can provide your
12 comments. The Draft EIS comment meetings, written comment
13 by U.S. Mail, comment on the common forms outside on the
14 table you could use those and give them to us today or send
15 them by the mail, or written comments to e-library. There
16 is also click comments through e-library. All comments,
17 written comments are given the same weight as spoken
18 comments.

19 I will give you bring information of both of the
20 projects. Oregon LNG Project consists of import and export
21 LNG terminal in Warrenton, Oregon. It includes 86.8 miles
22 long, 36 inch diameter bi-directional pipeline, 140 megawatt
23 48,000 horsepower electrically-driven gas compressor
24 station.

25 Next is a map of Oregon LNG Project that is

1 rather difficult for you to see but the takeaway of this
2 slide is you look at the top right corner there is a red
3 triangle that is where the terminal is located in Warrenton
4 and there is a blue line that goes down in Columbia County
5 to Clatsop County, crosses the Columbia River and goes into
6 Woodland, Washington. And there is a poster outside of our
7 desk that you can look at the map -- no not by us but the
8 Oregon LNG table and you can look into that more in details.

9 Washington Extension Project consists of 140.6
10 miles of 36 inch diameter pipeline loop in 10 non-contiguous
11 segments within Sumas and Woodland, 96,000 horsepower of
12 additional compression at five existing compressor stations.
13 It also includes abandonment and removal of existing
14 pipeline and above ground facilities.

15 Washington Expansion map gives the same things,
16 it is difficult to show everything here but if you
17 concentrate on the line that goes from north to south there
18 are some red segments shown there those other segments are
19 replacement and abandonment.

20 William is sitting in the back there, they have a
21 big poster they can explain to you their project more and
22 you can look at everything on that.

23 Thus far we have identified comments through the
24 public of the safety and geological hazards, export of
25 natural gas, impacts on the public resources, wildlife,

1 listed species, water quality and natural resources, forest
2 clearing, cumulative impacts and alternatives, LNG carrier
3 traffic impacts, air emissions, visual impacts.

4 Now something about our meeting according to date
5 I would like you to pay attention to. Please turn off
6 mobile phones, summarize main points and submit additional
7 information in writing. Refrain from personal attacks. Do
8 not interrupt speakers. Any disruption will only affect
9 your fellow citizen's ability to speak.

10 Producer for the speakers -- come up to the
11 microphone when your number is called, speak clearly into
12 the microphone, spell your name for the stenographer, adhere
13 to the 3 minute time limit. Yellow, 30 seconds left, red
14 light your time is up. Please do not interrupt the
15 speakers.

16 The last slide that we have is about the FERC
17 process. The important thing you need to take from here is
18 the three bands of gray these are the areas that the public
19 input opportunities are there. The red arrow shows where we
20 are in the process. It tells you that we have already done
21 the DEIS and we are conducting comment meetings on the DEIS
22 which is one of the reasons today here.

23 Once the DEIS comment meetings are over we will
24 get all the comments and we will revise that to develop a
25 Final EIS. The Commission will look into the EIS and other

1 known environmental factors such engineering, marketing,
2 rates, et cetera and will be able to make a decision either
3 to approve or to deny the project.

4 If the project is approved parties could also
5 apply for re-hearing. If the project is approved the
6 applicants will be required to submit any outstanding
7 information to satisfy conditions of the Order or
8 Authorization. Once we have all the information from the
9 applicants and also the applicants have received all the
10 federal Authorizations we will issue a Notice to Proceed
11 with Construction.

12 So you will note that we have arranged for a
13 court reporter to transcribe this meeting so that we have an
14 accurate record of the public comment meetings. He is
15 sitting on my right here. The transcript for this meeting
16 will be placed in the public record after a few weeks. If
17 you would like a copy of the transcript before that you may
18 make arrangements with the court reporter following this
19 meeting.

20 Oregon LNG requests Authorization under Section 3
21 of the Natural Gas Act, NGA, to site, construct and operate
22 an import and export liquefied natural gas LNG terminal in
23 Warrenton, Oregon. Oregon LNG also requests a Certificate
24 of Public Convenience and Necessity subject pursuant to
25 Section 7C of the NGA to construct and operate the natural

1 gas pipeline for the proposed LNG terminal to an
2 interconnect with the interstate transmission system of
3 Northwest near Woodland, Washington.

4 Northwest's request a Certificate pursuant to
5 Section 7C of the NGA to expand the capacity of its existing
6 natural gas transmission facilities between Woodland and
7 Sumas, Washington. The primary purpose of the project is to
8 export an equivalent of about 456.3 billion cubic feet of
9 natural gas to foreign markets.

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

16 I would like to again clarify that these projects
17 are being proposed by Oregon LNG and Northwest and FERC is
18 the federal agency responsible for evaluating applications
19 to site and construct onshore and near-shore LNG import and
20 export facilities as the last applications to construct and
21 operate interstate natural gas pipeline facilities.

22 The FERC therefore is not an advocate for the
23 projects. Instead as mentioned throughout this process the
24 FERC is an advocate for the environmental review process.
25 During our review of the projects we assemble information

1 from a variety of sources including Oregon LNG, Northwest,
2 you the public, federal, state and local agencies as well as
3 Indian tribes in our own independent analysis.

4 We analyze this information and prepared a Draft
5 EIS that was distributed to the public for comment. A
6 Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was issued for the
7 projects on August 15, 2015. We are near the end of the 60
8 day comment period of the Draft EIS. The comment period
9 ends on October 6, 2015. All comments received, written or
10 spoken will be addressed in the Final EIS.

11 I encourage you -- I encourage you if you plan to
12 submit your comments and have not, please do so here tonight
13 either orally during the comment portion of our meeting or
14 in writing using one of the forms in the back of the room.
15 You may also submit comments using the procedures outlined
16 in the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS which
17 includes instructions on how to submit your comments
18 electronically.

19 Your comments will be considered with equal
20 weight regardless of whether they are spoken during the
21 comment portion of the meeting or submitted in writing. If
22 you have received a copy of the Draft EIS, paper or CD form
23 you will automatically receive a copy of the Final EIS. If
24 you did not get a copy of the Draft and you would like to
25 get a copy of the Final EIS please sign up for the mailing

1 list at the back of the room, provide your name and address
2 and we will make sure that you get a copy of the Final EIS.
3 This one is available at the desk outside.

4 I would like to state that neither the Draft or
5 the Final EIS are decision-making documents. In other words
6 the EIS does not tell you whether the projects are approved
7 or not. I also want to differentiate between the roles of
8 two distinct FERC rules. The Commission and the
9 environmental staff -- Elisa and I are part of the FERC
10 environmental staff which oversees the preparation of the
11 EIS for this project.

12 We do not determine whether or not to approve the
13 projects. Instead the Commission consists of five
14 Presidentially-appointed Commissioners who are responsible
15 for making a determination of whether to issue an
16 Authorization to Oregon LNG and a Certificate of Public of
17 Convenience and Necessity Certificate to Northwest.

18 As I mentioned earlier the EIS is not a
19 decision-making document but it does assist the Commission
20 in determining whether or not to approve the projects. The
21 Commission will consider the environmental analysis in the
22 EIS, public comments as well as a host of non-environmental
23 information such as engineering, markets and rates in making
24 its decision to approve or deny Oregon LNG's and Northwest's
25 request for an Authorization and Certificate respectively.

1 I would like to add another thing the
2 Commissioners have their own staff who look into all the
3 comments that are posted on the e-library and if they have
4 any questions they will check out everything. So it's not
5 just that our document is used as environmental information
6 they look into all the record.

7 There is no review of FERC decisions by the
8 President or Congress thus maintaining FERC's role as an
9 independent regulatory agency and providing for fair and
10 unbiased decisions. Only after considering the
11 environmental and non-environmental factors the Commission
12 will make a final decision whether to approve or not approve
13 the projects.

14 If the Commission votes to approve the projects
15 Oregon LNG will be required to meet certain conditions as
16 outlined in the Authorization and Northwest will be required
17 to meet the conditions outlined in the Certificate.

18 FERC's environmental staff would monitor through
19 construction and restoration to document environmental
20 compliance with applicable laws and regulations, Oregon
21 LNG's and Northwest's proposed plans and mitigation, any
22 additional conditions required by the Authorization and
23 Certificate.

24 That is the overview of FERC's role and now we
25 will move to the next step here. Now we are moving into the

1 part of the meeting that we will hear comments from audience
2 members. If you would rather not speak tonight or do not
3 get to say everything you wanted in the allotted time, you
4 may hand in written comments tonight using the comment form
5 found at the table in the back of the room or send them to
6 Secretary of the Commission by following the procedures
7 outlined in the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS.

8 Either way your comments will be considered with
9 equal weight. As I said before this meeting is being
10 recorded by a court reporter so all of your comments will be
11 transcribed and put into the public record. We will be
12 calling speakers in order according to the numbers given out
13 during the sign-in.

14 Due to the length of the speaker's list at this
15 time we have not too many but we ask that you please limit
16 your comments to three minutes or less. If we have
17 additional time at the end we will allow more time for
18 anyone that would like. I ask that each speaker first
19 identify themselves and if applicable the agency or the
20 group you are representing.

21 Also please spell your name for the record and
22 speak clearly into the microphone. My number one rule is to
23 show respect to everyone speaking. We are now ready to call
24 our first speaker so will speaker number 1 please come
25 forward to the microphone and Nat will be operating the

1 timer, Pat will be calling the names, thank you.

2 MR. DRAGVICH: Mr. Dragvich, Clatsop County,
3 D-r-a-g-v-i-c-h. Two things that I am going to be real
4 technical on -- the National Gas Act was amended to include
5 exports. You mentioned public use and necessity or public
6 convenience and necessity. Who is it going to convenience
7 -- any citizen of the United States? Any use of the gas is
8 any citizen in the United States going to use the gas? The
9 answers to those questions have already been answered and
10 this is going directly to Asia.

11 So explain to me the public convenience and need
12 for this technical aspect in addition to re-writing the
13 National Gas Act you also re-wrote the regulations for
14 construction of the pipeline. In 2005 the Energy Policy Act
15 go to Federal Regulation 49 Subsection 171 to 174 class
16 locations -- deals with the construction of a natural gas
17 line for safety purposes. In the Energy Policy Act of 2005
18 you eliminated those whole three sections, what did they
19 include? Increased construction standards for the
20 construction of the pipeline and removed for single family
21 residences, multiple family residences and public facilities
22 such as schools, this was all eliminated.

23 All through this current document, your EIS for
24 Oregon LNG and the Williams Corporation, you note acceptable
25 risk that can be mitigated. Well if your example of

1 re-writing the National Gas Act to include exports for no
2 citizens in the United States as any public use or
3 convenience and re-writing the section for safety and Code
4 Federal Regulation 49-171 through 174 in 2005 is an example
5 of an acceptable mitigation for a risk you are putting every
6 citizens in the United States at risk.

7 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you. Speaker number 2
8 please.

9 MR. SERRES: My name is Dan Serres, I'm
10 Conservation Director for the Columbia River-Keeper.

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

12 MR. SERRES: S-e-r-r-e-s. Tonight I want to
13 point out one of the critical flaws in this review process
14 which is the fact that the Army Corp. of Engineers holds a
15 valid property right on the site where the terminal will be
16 located. So for people who are new to this process and you
17 are listening in, the Army Corp. of Engineers was sued by
18 Oregon LNG in a quiet-title case to remove a valid easement
19 for dredge disposal on the entire site where the terminal
20 will be located.

21 About two months ago a federal magistrate judge
22 dismissed that case and a few weeks after that an Article 3
23 judge upheld that decision and confirmed it so I brought
24 copies of those decisions with me tonight and I will submit
25 them into the record here just so you have those maybe for

1 the next meeting if you are interest you can read that, it
2 is pretty straight-forward.

3 What the judge wrote was, "LNG Company and the
4 Army Corp. of Engineer's dispute the Corp's right to an
5 easement that covers land LNG leased from the Port of
6 Astoria. The Corp's easement and LNG's leased land are
7 located on the Skipanon Peninsula near Warrenton. The
8 Corp's claimed easement interferes with LNG's attempt to
9 build upon and use the leased land."

10 The decision goes on to discuss Oregon LNG's
11 challenge, meaning at this time the Corp has a valid
12 easement over the entire terminal property site. What
13 doesn't make sense about this process is that you would
14 proceed now with the Certification process the end point of
15 which is a Certificate of Public Need and Necessity or
16 Public Convenience and Necessity that confers on Oregon LNG
17 the right of eminent domain for the pipeline.

18 You have two pieces here that are really
19 fundamentally disconnected -- the terminal which makes no
20 sense that you would even proceed with your view at this
21 point because the entire site is a dredged disposal area and
22 the pipeline. So if you don't resolve this up front you
23 could go through this entire process, grant the right of
24 eminent domain for the pipeline and the head of the snake,
25 the terminal itself, would have no basis to move forward.

1 I wanted to raise that as sort of a fundamental
2 flaw with this process. There are other issues that are
3 more locally significant like on the big display board of
4 what a pipeline easement looks like kind of from the ground
5 level view and that will be in the comments we will submit
6 that as an image you could look at.

7 It was from a farmer on the original pipeline
8 route who also happened to be a graphic designer who said
9 okay a hundred foot wide right-of-way through my farm what
10 does that do to my business and he has a nursery. And he
11 took out a significant model of his productive plan, it also
12 impacted a wetlands right behind this productive area and I
13 was surprised to find in the Draft Environmental Impact
14 Statement and in Oregon LNG's submission the Army Corp. that
15 there is no compensatory mitigation for impacts on streams
16 and wetlands in Southwest Washington, they cross the river
17 in Oregon for the impacts to happen here.

18 And a lot of the mitigation is not so much in for
19 instance, a large reprieve damage with returning process, it
20 is like well we will have a conservation easement somewhere
21 and that offset the damage we are doing here. Not doing
22 damage somewhere else doesn't repair the damage you have
23 done here. There is no net gain in large wooden debris in
24 that case so I would point to places and I'll wrap up in the
25 EIS where you look at mitigation schemes that say, "will

1 forestall some future damage to an area in exchange for
2 damage we are doing right there."

3 That doesn't restore as an active mitigation that
4 is compensated and that is a major flaw particularly in
5 Southwest Washington with this document, and I'll probably
6 have more at the end, thank you.

7 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 3 please?

8 MR. WICHAR: Hello, Dean Mark Wichar, three
9 words, Dean and Mark and W-i-c-h-a-r in Hoover, Washington,
10 a science teacher. The room is different and the proposals
11 are different but I feel like I have been here before
12 because Pacific Northwest is undergoing an onslaught of
13 proposals, coal, oil, LNG, there is no end to these
14 proposals, it's almost like if you throw into corporations,
15 throw a thousand projects out there that well 50 of them or
16 80 of them of whatever will succeed which was the goal in
17 the first place.

18 One of the things I try to instill in my students
19 is context. Nothing happens without context. And part of
20 context here with these proposals is the numerous proposals
21 that are being made, nothing exists in a vacuum. The
22 proposals that we have just outlined, the proposals covered
23 by EIS are not the only proposals that are extended right
24 now in this area. All of those should be taken into account
25 because the context matters.

1 Is this the 20th Century? Is this the 19th
2 Century? The part of the context here is that this is the
3 21st Century and it is a long opportunity that we start
4 transitioning away from carbon-based energy. Long over-due,
5 and little projects here and there that are green are not
6 good enough, we should be totally turning our backs on such
7 things as LNG, totally turning our back. Not by flipping a
8 switch but by making the transition and the transition is
9 not happening earnestly, not intentionally, not honestly and
10 it is unacceptable.

11 It's a fact that wind power off the Pacific Coast
12 of Washington, Oregon and California alone can supply enough
13 energy to cover this entire country multiple times and yet
14 we are not turning away from carbon based energy. It's a
15 fact that more energy hits this planet from the sun every
16 single day than has ever existed within the planet in all of
17 history.

18 Those are facts and that's part of the context.
19 So this EIS is not good enough if it does not recognize this
20 is the 21st Century and that we have alternatives that we
21 should be turning toward more quickly, far, far more quickly
22 than we are turning to right now. The future matters and
23 the future starts now.

24 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 4 please?

25 MR. WICKLANDER: Robin Wicklander, R-o-b-i-n

1 Wicklander, W-i-c-k-l-a-n-d-e-r. I'm will operator
2 engineers, heavy equipment operators. We are a mixed blend
3 of local we are stationary engineers and head of
4 construction engineers so this project would impact both of
5 our crafts.

6 This I guess I'm at a loss here to figure out why
7 we would turn our backs on a project that would put you know
8 thousands of people to work building this pipeline,
9 especially at a time now when we need jobs to do. You look
10 at the income you know the medium income of Oregon is like
11 \$50,000 a year and you know you look at Warrenton, they are
12 \$34,000 for their median income you know this is ridiculous.
13 We need jobs that can pay you know, this is the way it is.

14 And you know I am a fisherman. I love to fish
15 this is what I do in my off time, I love to fish and I have
16 yet to have these people tell me that the first one that was
17 going to Redford Landing they said oh, save the fish, save
18 the fish, save the fish. I would still like to know how
19 this LNG is now affecting the fish. We dredge that river
20 all the time that is what my members do is dredge the river
21 so I mean -- I don't know that's what I have to say so.

22 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 5.

23 MS. LIVELLA: Hi it's Therese Livella,
24 L-i-v-e-l-l-a and I'm from La Center, Washington.
25 Repeatedly in the document it was stated that the public

1 health and safety measures that need to be in place prior to
2 the construction of this terminal are still incomplete.

3 The location of hospitals and local services were
4 sited but partnerships were not identified, training plans
5 for emergency professionals were not developed and public
6 education delivery strategies were not provided.
7 Furthermore with the incredible risk that the LNG terminal
8 brings the nearby level 3 trauma center will not be
9 sufficient. A level 3 trauma center will have emergency
10 services 24/7 but may not always have surgeons and
11 anesthesiologists on duty when disaster strikes.

12 And although the hospital may in fact have life
13 flight services available, anything that is with level 1
14 trauma centers in Portland that will not be enough in the
15 event of a major catastrophe. I have spoken directly with
16 trauma surgeons and healthcare professionals. I work with
17 them daily and every day I were my button to work and at
18 least three times a week I get a thumbs up from the
19 physicians and surgeons that I work with.

20 Some really shocking statistics that I found in
21 the DEIS is that the proposed 86 mile long LNG pipeline will
22 cross 184 water bodies and the 136 mile long WEP pipeline
23 crosses 271 water bodies. Each will cross 7 water bodies
24 with a span of 100 feet or more bumping them into the
25 category of major water crossing.

1 In the DEIS it is stated that the greatest risk
2 to pipeline would be from corrosion and erosion. A foreign
3 body of water has worker bees in abundance so that means
4 that this project is planned with 455 flaws that run through
5 2 seismic zones and an aquifer nearly that really concerns
6 me.

7 This project would also cause devastation to vast
8 areas of natural resources, draining, destroyed, or
9 repurposing nearly 580 acres of wetlands, relocating up to
10 45 threatened or endangered species and clear cutting a path
11 for a high-voltage power line and a high pressure pipeline
12 through forests is just poor stewardship.

13 Was I alone in watching the west burn this
14 summer? I am not sure how these things can be called
15 mitigated. Toward the end of the DEIS I was almost swayed
16 by the numerous pages of documentation regarding the safety
17 of the marine carriers that would be exporting the LNG.
18 That is until I learned just how enormous these vessels are.

19 According to a document published by Columbia
20 River-Keeper, one LNG tanker along is bigger than three
21 football fields and towers 20 stories high. According to
22 Oregon LNG's filings, its terminal would require roughly 125
23 new ships crossing the Columbia River Bar inbound and
24 outbound every year.

25 Each departing tanker would carry a staggering 8%

1 of total U.S. daily gas consumption. That was the moment
2 when the proposed dredging of 1.2 million cubic feet of
3 Columbia River bottom really sank in. Thank you.

4 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 6 please?

5 MR. STEINKE: Two months ago -- my name is Don
6 Steinke, S-t-e-i-n-k-e. Two months ago Washington State
7 Labor Council passed Resolution Number 28 saying we support
8 Governor Inslee's plan to combat climate change because it
9 is important but at least be equitable and we agreed there
10 are far more jobs in the clean energy field than there are
11 in exporting somebody else's gas.

12 A recent NASA study has reported that the 9
13 lowest ice years in the Arctic have occurred in the last 9
14 years. Another recent NASA study said that Greenland has
15 lost a trillion tons of ice in the last 15 years and it will
16 take centuries to reverse that trend.

17 The Russians have discovered that includes that
18 the Arctic mile's wide, where they used to be meter's wide,
19 hundreds of them and that thing is very potent greenhouse
20 gas. I opposed this pipeline and the terminal because we
21 are very close to crossing the tipping point to irreversible
22 global warming.

23 Some scientists say we have already done that.
24 I'm speaking about this issue of the pipeline expansion in
25 the hope that maybe we can prevent irreversible global

1 warming and save civilization for our grandchildren. We
2 used to think natural gas was 50% cleaner than coal but we
3 recently learned that methane used in the system were much
4 greater than we previously assumed.

5 Leaks at the well head, leaks at the collecting
6 area or leaks in the distribution system and leaks from
7 abandon wells. Once the infrastructure is built, the
8 pension fund investors will demand a return on investment
9 and lock us in for a lifetime. Pope Francis has come to
10 America today to urge us to transition away from fossil
11 fuels as rapidly as possible. He said climate change should
12 no longer be left to future generations to solve. The more
13 we delay our efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions now,
14 the more hardship we bestow upon our children but
15 particularly children of the poor. We can't transition away
16 from fossil fuel until we have our fossil fuel
17 infrastructure. I urge you to reject the proposal and
18 furthermore regarding AGR, I just read the Draft
19 Environmental Impact Statement for Grace Harbor and he
20 wouldn't allow the permitting -- merely a representative
21 process properly, the sub-contractors who drafted the
22 Environmental Impact Statement it was funded to favor the
23 oil industry.

24 For example they have since said that there 14
25 and 16 derailment spills and 14 of them caught fire. He

1 said most oil trade spills don't catch fire. You just
2 change a few words. It didn't look they were trying to spin
3 it. As -- HDR rumors working for this --- thank you.

4 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you speaker number 7?

5 MR. MONTGOMERY: Hello my name is Chris
6 Montgomery, I represent the operating engineers
7 M-o-n-t-g-o-m-e-r-y, last name spelled. I want to speak to
8 you in reality for deciding for the Board of LNG terminal
9 and pipeline. When you hear about the end tie LNG group
10 speak, it's nothing short of what we have heard before. The
11 shock and awe of earthquakes, tsunamis, blasts zones,
12 nothing short of a movie.

13 Frankly all of these movies are something they
14 shouldn't be watching. The anti-group wants to paint a
15 picture of horrible things to occur as if they are part of
16 Nostradamus yet. They have lived in the same areas and
17 brought on these same concerns even while living in their
18 own stories. Natural gas disasters or natural disasters are
19 of nature they are not natural gas disasters.

20 Not one time have we heard of a natural gas
21 disaster or a terminal causing a disaster yet. They speak
22 of the eco-system and global warming although 95% of the
23 cars in the parking lot driven here today are affecting
24 those same ecological systems. I hear of blast zones, they
25 throw out blast zones like it's Chernobyl but in reality

1 every time we pay for the fuel for a gas pump or we go to a
2 gas station and fill up the same fuel or to pay a bill for
3 our homes, we are using that same natural gas so we are
4 creating and supporting that same natural gas blast zone
5 inside of our own homes.

6 So I don't understand what the current -- is for
7 the LNG terminal. I ask that you look at and observe the
8 company that speaks against the LNG terminal. They are the
9 same group that drives in these vans, I saw one the other
10 day at the Astoria place that had a burping tank on the side
11 of his vehicle that was kind of ironic.

12 There are the same ones who spread emissions into
13 the air. They are the same people who wear the clothing and
14 buy goods that are made from oil. Do they have a complaint
15 about that? They are the same group that uses those natural
16 gasses as I said in their homes. LNG is a great fuel for
17 our country it is a great fuel for the world. We have
18 complained about finances and oil prices and all of these
19 other things we have complained about jobs for years.

20 We have been hearing about complaints of jobs for
21 over 8 years and now we have a chance to create more jobs. I
22 ask that you approve the LNG terminal and pipeline, thank
23 you.

24 MS. TERHAAR: Do we have speaker 8? Okay that
25 ends our list of speakers who have signed up, is there

1 anyone who didn't sign up who would like to speak now? Okay
2 is there anyone who has already spoken who would like a
3 chance to speak again? Okay.

4 MR. SERRES: So Dan Serres, S-e-r-r-e-s. I spoke
5 earlier. A couple of points that I wanted to bring up
6 before that I didn't get to. The first is the spacing of
7 the main line block valves. Part of the reason why people
8 are very concerned about the safety of the pipeline is that
9 there are places where blocked valves are almost 20 miles
10 apart. In Clatsop County between mile post 4.7 and mile
11 post 24.3 that's over 19 miles obviously of gas, 36 inches
12 high-pressure, non-motorized gas pipeline and if there were
13 an accident in that very rugged and rough terrain even if
14 the mainline block valves operated perfectly and shut that
15 gas line down, that pressure would have to burn all of that
16 gas off if there was an ignition source or vent in the
17 atmosphere.

18 Neither is a really good eventuality. The volume
19 of gas involved in this sort of pipeline is absolutely
20 enormous. It is not like the little feeder gas line that
21 people have going to their homes and so the people who live
22 in these communities and the world service districts that
23 provide things like fire and emergency response to them are
24 really going to be taxed by this project and that's an
25 onerous burden to put on those communities and you have

1 heard from them as you have gone along the line.

2 For instance in Vernonia last night where you
3 heard from the Mayor and he is very concerned and expressed
4 in a Resolution their opposition to the project because of
5 that weight, that burden it would be putting on the public
6 services.

7 The second piece of this is you don't have to
8 look very far to have an example of what is involved in an
9 LNG emergency. In Plymouth, Washington in 2014 on March
10 31st an accident at a Williams facility through a piece of
11 metal into an LNG storage tank, one that is much smaller
12 than what is proposed in Warrenton, Oregon.

13 That rupture caused the LNG to leak out and the
14 first responders to their credit acted very quickly and they
15 evacuated an area 2 miles around the Plymouth LNG facility.
16 Now you have likely touched on the Plymouth accident in the
17 EIS but I encourage you in the Final -- I hope you never get
18 there but if you do proceed to a Final EIS to look at the
19 report that is coming out from WTC about the causes of that
20 and the response.

21 The wind direction was very helpful on that
22 particular day. It stopped the LNG that was leaking from
23 igniting but people remained evacuated overnight. If you
24 take that same zone, that 2 mile zone that was evacuated in
25 a real life incident here in the Northwest in Williams

1 system and you superimpose that on Warrenton, you are
2 encompassing 5 schools, all of downtown Warrenton, hundreds
3 of pumps and in fact that extends all the way in to the edge
4 of Astoria, across the river, so that is why people are
5 concerned about this project and are coming and testifying
6 with you in huge numbers. You had over 150 people attend
7 hearings in Astoria this week.

8 And what they are telling you is that you haven't
9 treated this issue with as much concern as it deserves
10 because people are very aware of these risks. They read the
11 news they know what happened in Plymouth, they said, "we
12 couldn't deal with that here, we couldn't evacuate our
13 town." Plymouth is pretty sparse in Eastern Washington by
14 comparison.

15 So you don't have to look very far to see you
16 know exactly why people are concerned and to imagine what
17 this would mean for these small communities. When it comes
18 to salmon I do work with Columbia River-Keeper, we are very
19 concerned about the impacts on salmon from this project and
20 the dredging that would occur at the mouth of the Skipanon
21 River would dramatically impact and alter a very critical
22 area for salmon habitat.

23 It's the area where sub-yearling juvenile salmon
24 swim out of Young's Bay which is the most productive net and
25 fishery in the entire lower Columbia system and all of those

1 salmon as juveniles swim right through the hole that Oregon
2 LNG wants to dig so we encourage you to take a hard look at
3 the neighborhood where Oregon LNG is proposing this project
4 and to consider the full range of impacts, thanks again.

5 And for folks who are new to this project and who
6 want more information about this please see me or sign up
7 thanks.

8 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you.

9 MR. STEINKE: Don Steinke again. The rivers were
10 so warm this year that salmon were dying by the millions
11 because of we think climate change and we care about the
12 concern of labor and jobs but we have got to transition and
13 when the transition is made there would be more jobs in the
14 clean energy field than there will be in the fossil fuel
15 field, solar panels, windmills provide lots of jobs and we
16 have been called hypocrites for years because we drive
17 gasoline powered cars but I would like to say that the car
18 that we have now uses half of the gasoline of my previous
19 car and my next car might not need any.

20 The country of Norway says by the year 2025 they
21 are not going to sell any cars that require gasoline. In
22 California the car -- the Air Response Report said that we
23 could do that by 2030 and so we are in the process of
24 transitioning and it is uncomfortable but tomorrow night at
25 Torquee and Vancouver Coffee Shop they are going to have the

1 Alliance for Jobs and Clean Energy session at 6 o'clock. We
2 are trying to push this transition away from fossil fuels,
3 thank you.

4 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you.

5 MR. DRAGICH: This is Dragvich again, Clatsop
6 County, D-r-a-g-i-c-h. My professional background started
7 in forest engineering and I ended up a firefighter. You
8 notice on my hat I have a flame in the front, this is my
9 blood type in the back in case I go down. Being that I am
10 the old man now they use me for the heart attack cases, to
11 train the new guys.

12 Now specifically about industrial accidents, they
13 are a lot closer, they are not pie in the sky. I started
14 firefighting in 1985, that first year the Climate Chemical
15 Plant exploded, benzene. I watched 55 gallon drums go 400
16 feet in the air. We had to back off over 500 feet, we
17 couldn't even get close to the fire. Twice in the 1990's
18 the Williams main line exploded in Clatsop county, once in
19 CastlerockWashington, once in Kalama, not far from where we
20 are standing now.

21 They had to shut down I-5. There's no way a
22 rural fire district or even a metropolitan fire district can
23 fight a fire like that. You have to cut off the fuel. It
24 took hours because of the blocked valves you just heard
25 mentioned were so far apart. On my old property I had one

1 of your licensed facilities by FERC when they built it they
2 set fire to my tree farm, they didn't bother telling local
3 fire district or the Washington Department of Natural
4 Resources, they quickly covered it up with their excavating.

5 When they tested the line, they test these lines
6 with water first. It exploded less than a quarter of a mile
7 from my bedroom and the only reason I knew about it was it
8 was elk season and two elk hunters came into the neighbor's
9 house and said, "Ed you have got an old faithful geyser in
10 your pasture."

11 That's the extent of the emergency response
12 plans. There's another little item that was passed with the
13 Energy Policy Act of 2005 called CEII. That stands for
14 Critical Energy Infrastructure Information. You have to go
15 to court to find out what the hell the emergency plan is and
16 then you have to go before a federal judge to get a
17 subpoena. That's just to know what the hell the plan is.

18 If that's the policy of FERC and the U.S.
19 Department of Energy it's another point of putting the
20 citizens of this country at risk.

21 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you is there anybody else who
22 would like to speak?

23 MS. LIVELLA: Theresa Livella, Northern Clark
24 County. When I was preparing my comments for this evening I
25 tried to research a natural gas explosion that happened when

1 I lived in Tonganoxie, Kansas or near Tonganoxie, Kansas and
2 I couldn't find the exact explosion that I was looking for
3 but I did find about a dozen or more other incidents that
4 were reported on-line just for that one gas service which
5 really got me to thinking about the safety of these
6 projects.

7 And having just recently moved to Clark County
8 about two years ago, my husband I relocated here from Kansas
9 City. When we were exploring the property in the area we
10 found a cute little house on 5 acres which is what we were
11 really looking for was about 5 acres and we didn't know it
12 at the time when we went to go look at the house but it had
13 a natural gas pipeline running right through the yard.

14 Of course they disclosed that to us and we
15 immediately left and didn't come back. We immediately went
16 home and googled where is that pipeline and so when we were
17 looking for property we created two maps, one where do we
18 really want to live and where do we not want to live. That
19 map of not wanting to live was anything that had pipeline
20 under it or high powered energy lines.

21 We didn't want to be living near or on property
22 that had these things. The DEIS talked a bit about it
23 wouldn't destroy the property or decrease the property
24 values, it does, it matters to the people who are going to
25 be buying any properties. While the property tax value may

1 not go down, the property does lose value, thank you.

2 MS. TERHAAR: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

3 MS. KOCHHAR: This concludes all the commenters
4 who signed up to speak and any additional commenters who
5 were willing to speak. Is there anyone else I'll ask again,
6 is there anyone else who would like to speak at this time?
7 No? Okay, if not the formal part of this meeting will
8 close.

9 On the FERC website, www.ferc.gov there is a link
10 called e-library if you type in the docket number for the
11 Oregon LNG project CP09-6 and CP09-7 and for the Washington
12 Expansion Project CP13-507. You can use e-library to gain
13 access to everything on the record concerning these
14 projects. After that all of the filings and information
15 sent in by Oregon LTG and Northwest. On behalf of the
16 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission I will thank you for
17 coming here tonight, let the record show that the comment
18 meeting concluded at it is 6:56 p.m.

19 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 6:56
20 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25