

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

Vernonia High School
1000 Missouri Avenue
Vernonia, Oregon 97064

Tuesday, September 22, 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: Hello can I have your attention
3 please? I am going to start the meeting now. Good evening,
4 on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or
5 FERC I want to welcome all of you to the public comment
6 meeting on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or Draft
7 EIS for the Oregon LNG Terminal and the pipeline project and
8 Washington Extension Project.

9 Let the record show that Draft EIS comment
10 meeting began at 6:02 on September 22, 2015 in Vernonia,
11 Oregon. My name is Medha Kochhar and I am the Environmental
12 Project Manager with the Office of Energy Products which is
13 a division of the FERC.

14 Also today with me I have Pat Tehaar on my right
15 side at this table and also I have Matt Hutchinson, both of
16 who, Pat and Matt are from HDR. They are third party
17 contractors who are assisting us in the preparation of the
18 Environmental Impact Analysis of the projects.

19 In addition we have Elisa Lykens in the back she
20 is from FERC and we also have Molly Brown she is from HDR
21 and then we have Doug Zenn here from HDR.

22 We also have representatives from Oregon LNG
23 Development Company LLC, Oregon Pipeline Company LLC
24 together referred as Oregon LNG right here on my right at
25 the table. We have nobody here from Northwest tonight.

1 They have maps and will be around after the
2 meeting to answer any specific questions on the projects
3 that you might have. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
4 U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S.
5 Department of Energy, U.S. Department of Conservation and
6 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency participating as
7 cooperating agents in the preparation of the EIS.

8 I would like to thank the cooperating agencies
9 for their continued assistance with the NEPA review. Now I
10 have a short power point presentation that will explain the
11 process we have at FERC.

12 The purpose of the meeting tonight is to give you
13 an opportunity to provide comments on the Draft
14 Environmental Impact Statement specific to the proposed
15 project and Draft EIS, explain the FERC review process.
16 FERC is an independent regulatory agency whose
17 responsibilities are for rates for interstate transmission
18 of electricity, natural gas and oil and also have the
19 responsibility for siting of interstate natural gas and
20 hydro-electric facilities and LNG import and export
21 facilities.

22 DOE approves the export of LNG projects. FERC is
23 the lead federal agency for NEPA review and EIS preparation.
24 FERC is an advocate of the environmental review process not
25 the project. FERC issued a Notice of Availability of the

1 Draft EIS issued August 5, 2015. That EIS comment period
2 ends October 6, 2015.

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

11 The EIS addresses environmental issues identified
12 by the public and agencies during scoping. There are
13 multiple ways that you can provide your comments of the
14 Draft EIS -- Draft EIS comment meetings like the one today
15 here, written comments by U.S. mail, comment forms on the
16 table we have comment forms on the table outside there, you
17 can use those to write your comments and mail those in or
18 you can send your letters the way you want, written comments
19 through e-library or click comments through e-library.

20 For your information all written comments are
21 given the same weight as spoken comments. Now I will give
22 you a brief description of the two projects. Oregon LNG
23 Project consists of an import/export LNG terminal in
24 Warrenton, Oregon. It also has a 86.8 mile long, 36 inch
25 diameter bi-directional pipeline, 140 megawatt, 48,000

1 horsepower electrically-driven gas compressor station.

2 The next slide shows the project location and I
3 am sorry if you may not be able to read everything but we
4 have a poster over there and also Oregon LNG folks have a
5 map here and you can take a look at it closely. Basically
6 if you look at the right top corner there is a red triangle
7 that is where the terminal is located. The pipeline will
8 originate from the terminal goes through Clatsop County and
9 Columbia County, crosses the Columbia River, goes into
10 Woodland, Cowlitz County, Washington.

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

17 The next slide that shows the map of Washington
18 Expansion Project, we are closer to the over there on the
19 left side here you can look at it closely. The things you
20 want to look at the pipeline route from Canada to Sumas and
21 it ends at Woodland. There are red strips shown around the
22 pipeline those are the areas that are proposed for
23 replacement or abandonment.

24 And the compressor stations are also marked on
25 that. Thus far public concerns that we have identified are

1 safety and geological hazards, export of natural gas,
2 impacts on aquatic resources, wildlife, listed species,
3 water quality, coastal resources, forest clearing,
4 cumulative impacts and alternatives, LNG carrier traffic
5 impacts and emissions, visual impacts.

6 For today's meeting decorum I request you to
7 please turn off mobile phones, summarize main points and
8 submit additional information in writing, refrain from
9 personal attacks, do not interrupt speakers. Any
10 distraction only restricts your fellow citizens' ability to
11 speak so those of you who have brought any posters or
12 anything I would suggest hold them and keep them to the
13 back, do not show any of the spots here.

14 Speaker procedures -- come up to the microphone
15 when your number is called. Speak clearly into the
16 microphone, spell your name for the stenographer, adhere to
17 the 3 minute time limit. The yellow light will flash when
18 30 seconds are left. When that light timer is up it also
19 buzzes so please do not interrupt the speaker.

20 Now the last slide this is a slide that shows
21 FERC process. The takeaway from this slide is that that
22 poster is also by the desk there where the folks are
23 sitting, takeaway points is to look at the gray bands, both
24 are the public input opportunities. The red arrow
25 identifies where we are in the process today. We have

1 already filed the DEIS, we are holding public comment
2 meetings such as today's. After we receive all of the
3 comments at the end of the comment period we will use those
4 comments to qualify the DEIS and develop a FEIS which is a
5 Final Environmental Impact Statement.

6 Then the Commission will look at this
7 environmental report as well as other items such as
8 engineering, rates and markets and make a decision of
9 whether to approve or deny the project. Once the project is
10 approved if approved, you will have a chance for re-hearing
11 and also at that point the evidence will be required to
12 provide any outstanding information that information
13 required by conditions of the Authorization or
14 Certificate.

15 Once we have all the information from the company
16 and they have obtained all federal Authorizations we will
17 issue a Notice to Proceed with Construction. Thank you that
18 concludes the presentation and I'll move further now with
19 the rest of the procedures here.

20 You will note that we have arranged for a court
21 reporter to transcribe this meeting so that we have an
22 accurate meeting of this public comment meeting there he is
23 sitting to the far right. The transcript for this meeting
24 will be placed in the public record after a few weeks. If
25 you would like a copy of the transcript before that you may

1 make arrangements with the court reporter following this
2 meeting.

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

12 Northwest requests a Certificate pursuant to
13 Section 7C of the NGA to expand the capacity of its existing
14 natural gas transmission facilities between Woodland and
15 Sumas, Washington. The primary purpose of the project is to
16 export an equivalent amount of 456.3 billion cubic feet per
17 unit of natural gas to foreign markets.

18 The primary purpose of this meeting is to give
19 you the opportunity to provide specific environmental
20 comments on the Draft EIS prepared by FERC state on the
21 projects. It will help us the most if your comments are as
22 specific as possible regarding the proposed projects and the
23 Draft EIS. I would like to again verify that these projects
24 are being proposed by Oregon LNG and Northwest and FERC is
25 the federal agency responsible for evaluating applications

1 to site and construct onshore and near-shore LNG import and
2 export facilities as the last applications to construct and
3 operate interstate natural gas pipeline facilities.

4 The FERC therefore is not an advocate for the
5 projects. Instead as mentioned throughout this process,
6 FERC is an advocate for the environmental review process.
7 During our review of the projects we assembled information
8 from a variety of sources including Oregon LNG, Northwest,
9 you the public, federal, state and local agencies as well as
10 Indian tribes and our own independent analysis.

11 We analyzed this information and prepared a Draft
12 EIS that was distributed to the public for comments. A
13 Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was issued for the
14 projects on August 5, 2015. We are near the end of the 60
15 day comment period of the Draft EIS. The comment period
16 ends on October 6, 2015.

17 All comments received written or spoken will be
18 addressed in the Final EIS. I encourage you if you plan to
19 submit comments and have not please do so here tonight
20 either spoken here or during the comment portion of our
21 meeting or in writing using one of the forms in the back of
22 the room. We have forms at the table there.

23 You may also submit comments using the procedures
24 outlined in the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS
25 which includes instructions on how to submit your comments

1 electronically. Your comments will be considered with equal
2 weight regardless of whether they are spoken during the
3 comment portion of the meeting or submitted in writing.

4 If you received a copy of the Draft EIS paper or
5 CD, you will automatically receive a copy of the Final EIS.
6 If you did not get a copy of the Draft EIS and would like to
7 get a copy of the Final EIS please sign up for the mailing
8 list at the back of the room on our FERC table. Provide
9 your name and address and we will make sure you get a copy
10 of the Final EIS.

11 I would like to state that neither the Draft nor
12 the Final EIS are decision-making documents. In other
13 words, an EIS does not determine whether the projects are
14 approved or not. I also want to differentiate between the
15 roles of two distinct FERC roles, the Commission and the
16 environmental staff. Elisa and I are part of FERC
17 environmental staff. We oversee the preparation of the EIS
18 for these projects we do not determine whether or not to
19 approve the projects. Instead the Commission consists of
20 five Presidentially-appointed Commissioners who are
21 responsible for making the determination of whether to issue
22 an Authorization to Oregon LNG and a Certificate of Public
23 Convenience and Necessity or Certificate to Northwest.

24 As I mentioned earlier the EIS is not a
25 decision-making document but it does assist the Commission

1 in determine whether or not to approve the project. The
2 Commission will consider the environmental analysis in the
3 EIS, public comments as well as a host of non-environmental
4 information such as engineering, markets, and rates in
5 making its decision to approve or deny Oregon LNG's and
6 Northwest's request for an Authorization and Certificate
7 respectively.

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

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

19 FERC environmental staff will monitor the
20 projects through construction and restoration to document
21 environmental compliance with applicable laws and
22 regulations, Oregon LNG's and Northwest's proposed plans and
23 mitigation and the additional conditions required by the
24 Authorization and Certificate. That is the overview of our
25 FERC's role here now we are going to move into the part of

1 the meeting where we will hear comments from audience
2 members.

3 If you would rather not speak tonight to don't
4 get to say everything you wanted in your allotted time, you
5 may hand in written comments tonight using the comment form
6 found at the table at the back of the room or send it in to
7 the Secretary of the Commission by following the procedures
8 outlines in the Notice of Availability in the Draft EIS.

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

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

23 My number one rule is please show respect for
24 everyone speaking. We are now ready to call our first
25 speaker. Would speaker number one please come to the

1 microphone and that Pat will be calling the numbers, thank
2 you.

3 MS. TEHAAR: Also would speakers 2 and 3 please
4 come to the front so you will be ready to start. Okay
5 speaker 1 you may begin.

6 MR. SKANES: My name is Quentin Skanes,
7 Q-u-e-n-t-i-n S-k-a-n-e-s. I am here to talk to you guys
8 today about not only the environmental impacts that this
9 would have but also about the children here. The pipelines
10 here are meant to last 10 or 15 years but after that we are
11 the next generation here in Vernonia and we have to deal
12 with whatever is left.

13 Beyond there is a lot of rockslides that do
14 happen but also there is the fact that it is a big strain on
15 a community like this to have a pipeline that brings in
16 absolutely zero money when we are ripping apart our own
17 properties. I personally know some of the people that are
18 here and its plan is to run it right through some of their
19 properties.

20 And from what I am hearing we are not getting any
21 compensation for that as well as it is decreasing property
22 value. In addition to that when that happens it makes it a
23 lot less usable for forestry which is basically the only
24 reason why Columbia County still exists, that is how we have
25 survived here in Vernonia and when we bring this down even

1 when you are running the pipelines through the ground it is
2 still hard when machinery goes through it.

3 These machines weigh thousands of pounds and I
4 know that a half an inch pipeline is not going to hold the
5 entire weight of an excavator or a loader. But as far as
6 the high school goes would you allow your own kids to be
7 here even though you know that there is a pipeline that's 2
8 miles away like in Warrenton where it basically starts or
9 ends and Astoria High School is only about 2 miles away --
10 what about the kids?

11 What are they going to say if one day they look
12 up and there is this cloud of smoke that is rolling down the
13 hills and they are stuck there, what are we going to do
14 then? Sure there's way to turn off the gas, but you still
15 have to purge an entire 12 mile line, that takes a while.

16 Think about the kids not only the environmental
17 impacts, thank you.

18 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 2.

19 MS. DAVIS: It doesn't really matter who I am but
20 my name is Victoria Davis, V-i-c-t-o-r-i-a Davis D-a-v-i-s.
21 I am here to represent the Nehalem Indians. Their lands
22 were taken. Here we are, my grandfather was on a
23 reservation taken off the reservation where the Nehalem
24 Indians were sent the last of them that remain from
25 Birkenfeld, Oregon, where the drillers are now drilling in a

1 wetland.

2 They are drilling right now in a wetland over
3 here in Birkenfeld. Nobody seems to care. Right along the
4 river over here in Pittsburg there's a haul they take for
5 gas, nobody even talks about. There's a big giant holding
6 tank right along the river, okay so now this line -- we have
7 got options, we can run it over the rivers, we can run it
8 over it. Stay away from the rivers. There's not a lot I
9 can say, it's not a matter of when it's a matter of if it
10 will happen, they will corrode, they will eventually damage
11 something, we have got to find a better way.

12 And we are smart, we are smart people. We can
13 figure out a better way to do this so I don't have anything
14 else to say, thank you very much for your time.

15 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 3 and can
16 we have speakers 4 and 5 come up here in the front please.

17 MR. GREGG: Bob Gregg, B-o-b G-r-e-g-g. From
18 what I understand Columbia County gets absolutely nothing
19 for this liability that it is going to get from this
20 pipeline. There won't be any work for the people up here.
21 They are going to bring in their own crew of pipeline
22 boomers and slam that pipe into the ground they probably
23 won't sell 5 gallons of gas at the mini-mart down here even.

24 There's just -- if this is Canadian gas which I
25 guess it is let Canada build a port and ship it out of up

1 there, we don't need it down here so that's all I have,
2 thank you.

3 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker number 4?

4 MS. DAVIS: My name is Carol Davis, C-a-r-o-l
5 D-a-v-i-s. We have to talk about the people of Vernonia,
6 the impact on the people. We live in a special community
7 amongst a special area of Vernonia, Vernonia is a way of
8 life, it's kinder and gentler than most. I don't want to
9 see that ruined. I am a fifth generation Vernonian,
10 Columbia County, it is very important for me to maintain our
11 way of life.

12 The prospect of having this pipeline come
13 directly through our area makes no sense. People play in
14 Rock Creek, they fish, they have for generations, the salmon
15 spawn, in fact if you go out and look now they are starting
16 to come up and spawn. What is this going to do to the
17 salmon?

18 Vernonia gets its drinking water from Rock Creek.
19 The pipeline is supposed to cross -- go under about 4 miles
20 from the intake of the Vernonia water supply. That's pretty
21 dangerous to me. There's just way too many things put in
22 danger and one of my big questions is why? Why do you feel
23 it necessary to bring dirty tar sands from Canada to
24 Washington and Oregon directly to China? There's no benefit
25 for us.

1 Jobs -- non-existent, they provide their own.
2 There is only danger. Danger to our water, our forest, our
3 way of life. I urge you not to allow this to go forward.
4 With the main bulk of the money coming from China I can't
5 imagine they will be very interested in spending more for
6 inspections and safety. Nothing is worth the danger this
7 pipeline presents. Thank you.

8 MS. TEHAAR: Speaker 5:

9 MS. PEACH: My name is Diana Peach, that's
10 D-i-a-n-a P-e-a-c-h like the fruit. I'm going to talk about
11 frack outs from horizontal directional drills. Horizontal
12 directional drills under rivers frequently cause something
13 called frack outs where the drill fractures the river
14 bottom. In your EIS FERC acknowledges that frack outs occur
15 and pose a potential risk to wetlands and water bodies
16 through inadvertent releases of drilling fluid.

17 In Vernonia a 36 inch pipeline will be installed
18 under Rock Creek, the city's water intake is 5 miles
19 downstream of the pipeline crossing. In 2003 Maz-Tech's
20 drilling of a near 12 inch bore in Coos and Douglas Counties
21 fracked out 18 times. The worst incident occurring in the
22 Coquille River and impacting drinking water. Michael
23 Nerring, an attorney from Maz-Tech said frack outs are an
24 expected by-product of such a project. He says I quote, "It
25 happens all the time."

1 Tim Sullivan an attorney representing Coos County
2 said the spills occurred because the stream banks were steep
3 requiring bores of 1,000 feet long. I would argue that the
4 same conditions exist in the coastal range and according to
5 the EIS the proposed drill under Rock Creek would be 3,000
6 feet long, three times as long as the one in Coos County.

7 During frack outs a drilling lubricant called
8 sodium bentonite spills into the river despite claims that
9 bentonite is dirt and harmless, Coos County paid a resident
10 \$500,000 to compensate for the loss of 6 goats that died
11 after drinking muddy run-off. Frack outs can occur on dry
12 land as well forming puddles of bentonite when the mud dries
13 it turns into a fine powder. Bentonite based lubricants
14 contain a contaminant called crystal lime silica which
15 according to OSHA is a mineral based dust that can cause
16 disabling, irreversible and sometimes fatal lung disease
17 when breathed.

18 The EIS states that drilling liquid can
19 negatively affect water quality by increasing turbidity.
20 The higher the turbidity levels the more harmful the effects
21 on not only aquatic life, but water treatment systems and
22 suitability for drinking. Federal laws state that turbidity
23 levels may increase no more than 10%. The southern Oregon
24 frack outs increase turbidity 1,200% in the Coquille River
25 and 2,400% in Rock Creek.

1 Based on the potential threat to 184 water bodies
2 alone I urge you to re-visit your analysis of the
3 environmental impact and deny Oregon LNG authority to put
4 your U.S. citizens at risk. Thank you.

5 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you. Speaker number 6 please?

6 MR. PHILLIPS: I'm Jack Phillips, I live on Keeze
7 Road near where you are going to cross.

8 MS. TEHAAR: Could you please spell your name
9 sir?

10 MR. PHILLIPS: It's actually John Phillips,
11 P-h-i-double l-i-p-s. Just to mention a couple of things
12 here. First I have a degree from UCLA macro-economics and
13 history, I did post-graduate studies at Golden Gate
14 University School of Law and I have 30 years in finance and
15 investment real estate so I know who, what and why you are
16 doing things.

17 And all the objections that you are hearing
18 tonight I am not going to repeat because they are extremely
19 valid, we just heard that. I want to speak more to the
20 historic and moral issues involved in your work and I think
21 the real issues. In my opinion FERC is not doing what it
22 should and listening to what the people are saying.

23 I appreciate the work that you are doing and that
24 massive gargantuan EIS but it is just you know, if you don't
25 understand this, watch our dance step and it is all being

1 done on behalf of what I consider rogue investors looking
2 for short-term profit and destroying the long-term
3 environment and they are doing it in the name of jobs and
4 economy.

5 So what you are doing is disrupting, poisoning
6 and destroying our environment. You are wanting to
7 sacrifice our long-term environment for the paltry
8 short-term profits and in my book that's one short-term
9 nonsense and two long-term greed so I want FERC to take a
10 deep breath, stand up straight, go forward and deny this LNG
11 project.

12 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker number 7.

13 MS. PHILLIPS: My name is Nancy Phillips, I'm
14 following my husband there. Nancy N-a-n-c-y Phillips
15 P-h-i-l-l-i-p-s. I'm a native Oregonian and I live in
16 Vernonia for the last 15 years in Rock Creek, running right
17 through my property and as far as I can tell during the year
18 the creek bed moves dramatically and it splits and little
19 islands form and in high water they disappear and it is a
20 continuous movement.

21 Therefore it's my belief that anything put
22 underneath that stream bed will have to be made so that it's
23 stronger than any of the other building technology that we
24 have to keep it in one piece because of the shifting of the
25 bed and the shifting of the walls of the bed. That means

1 that there is going to be an incident with the current
2 technology of building pipelines.

3 And the other thing that I know about is that the
4 pipelines tend to have serious leaks that go on and we have
5 seen all through this country what happens. The compressed
6 gas seeps out and it moves and it travels and it seeps
7 moisture and when it seeps moisture and there is any kind of
8 a spark or any kind of a condition where that might explode
9 it does and it takes out more than anybody can come to the
10 rescue for.

11 And in Vernonia we have a fire department with
12 one paid fire fighter and 11 volunteers and I can tell you
13 that there is never going to be a time when they are going
14 to be able to help that situation if it arises and I believe
15 that it will because of what I have seen already.

16 So I think that any kind of certification on this
17 project would be a criminal act. I believe it would be an
18 act of terrorism to the people who live here and I want that
19 thing stopped.

20 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 8?

21 MR. CALHOUN: My name is Steve Calhoun,
22 C-a-l-h-o-u-n. I have been a resident of Vernonia for 38
23 years, taught at the high school here, presently a real
24 estate broker. I live in Rock Creek about less than a mile
25 from where the pipeline will be coming through. When we

1 first came to Vernonia and built my home I knew I'd be
2 taking water from the creek.

3 Vernonia is an area of lack of water not by
4 rainfall but how they get it. In my real estate business I
5 see people using spring water because they couldn't drill a
6 well. Often we get water with less than 1 gallon a minute.
7 Most lenders want to see 3 or 5 so given potable water into
8 this community. Most wells are between 60 to 80 feet, if
9 you go deeper than that you run into pockets of salt water.

10 So Vernonia has a very good source of water.
11 It's its own viable source of water. When I decided I was
12 going to use it as drinking water I tested it for oxygen for
13 temperature which I knew, when I taught ecology when I used
14 to teach in San Diego, it has a high oxygen content. I
15 compared that with the Nehalem number and it's not that the
16 Nehalem was bad, Rock Creek was better.

17 Good oxygen content is a good indication that
18 fluid from septic systems are not leaking into the river.
19 The water was cooler than the Nehalem also, another
20 indication it is more spring fed, it is more stable, and it
21 doesn't have the blow outs that the Nehalem has. Vernonia
22 is very fortunate in having Rock Creek as it's water -- it's
23 only source of water.

24 It's a very pristine creek. Two days ago I saw
25 the first salmon coming up and I had a small group of people

1 out at our house and people formed on que. Running past us
2 when it passed us pretty neat. Later in the day there was
3 fish biologists just over the river and asked permission to
4 come across the property and they gave you a little of the
5 history that these are very unique fish they have their own
6 DNA identification, they are not the same as the salmon that
7 come in later in the season.

8 This community has gone through two disasters,
9 two floods, 1996 and 2007 it impacted many, many people. A
10 lot of homes lost in the past couple of years, they had to
11 tear down, about 50 of them.

12 As a realtor I was asked by a few when they came
13 in here in 2007 to view damage of homes that were non-owner
14 occupied and wanted access. I kept on hearing the comments.
15 You guys are glad we are here but you couldn't have done it
16 without us, and we're on the way to recovery.

17 In the middle of the recession you couldn't
18 rebuild the schools, they were too badly damage. So the
19 public in the middle of the recession, built this high
20 school that we're in. This high school last May, receive the
21 highest league standard K-12, in the United States. I am
22 proud of this community. I am proud to see people work hard
23 to obtain and recover and are very resilient. I don't think
24 we could afford another disaster that we cannot recover
25 from, the impact to this community would be huge not only to

1 the water but also fire -- blast zone --

2 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you there will be time
3 afterwards if you want to speak.

4 MR. CALHOUN: Okay thank you.

5 MS. TEHAAR: Speaker number 9 please.

6 MR. BRUHN: Thank you my name is Rande R-a-n-d-e
7 last name Bruhn, B-r-u-h-n and I live on Keze Road also just
8 outside the proposed blast zone to this pipeline. I would
9 like to say that I am a native Oregonian, I'm almost 60 and
10 I have lived in Oregon my whole life and in addition to that
11 my grand-daughter who is expected to be borne within a day
12 will be the 6th generation Oregonian born in this state.

13 So I love this state I live here, I have invested
14 myself in that both as a resident as well as a professional
15 person. I have been a CPA for over 30 years, I have run
16 multi-million dollar companies, I have audited multi-billion
17 dollar federal agencies and I am very good at analysis and
18 with that there are two comments that I would really like to
19 make.

20 One is based on my analytical skills as a
21 non-scientist and trying to push my way through 2,500 page
22 document it is my opinion that there is a lot missing in
23 this Draft EIS. Now I am not as familiar with this process
24 as perhaps some but I see big gaping holes in this document
25 and those gaping holes are very important to the City of

1 Vernonia and to the residents of Oregon, Clatsop County,
2 Columbia County and I am a little disappointed in the public
3 comment process that document that was circulated to us that
4 is missing so many important factors.

5 Steve talked about the water, several people have
6 talked about water, soil, forestry management and the
7 company who has come right out and said that they are not
8 intending to follow the practices in Oregon that has from an
9 environmental perspective created a great state so that's my
10 first comment and I think there should be rules in this
11 environmental statement and I am very disappointed from the
12 public's perspective.

13 The second point is that I think from a public
14 policy perspective this particular pipeline should be denied
15 straight out. This is foreign gas being shipped to a
16 pipeline, gas coming from Canada being shipped through our
17 backyard to an on-loading station in Warrenton, Oregon to be
18 shipped to Asia.

19 I know there is a lot of money to be made in this
20 process, I personally don't object to making lots of money.
21 I try to make lots of money whenever I can but in this
22 particular case they are doing it on the backs of the
23 residents of the state of Oregon who basically I expect they
24 will get close to nothing.

25 There really is some small temporary jobs for a

1 period of time, some local spending will be available to the
2 local vendors, probably a small amount of payroll taxes and
3 income taxes, et cetera to the state of Oregon but largely
4 when you give weight to the cost that Oregonians are being
5 asked to bear by having a long-term pipe bomb in their
6 backyard the benefits are very miniscule and so based on
7 that I would recommend and I asked FERC and all of the state
8 of Oregon agencies to deny this permit.

9 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 10?

10 MR. CALHOUN: Hi there my name is Michael
11 Calhoun, C-a-l-h-o-u-n. I was born and raised in Vernonia
12 and I am very proud I have been here most of my life. I
13 think growing up in a town like this you have a very strong
14 sense of community and a very good respect of the
15 environment around you. And unfortunately what I see
16 happening here is exploitation from this project,
17 exploitation of the citizens and the environment in which we
18 live.

19 I did find it interesting just now going through
20 the pamphlet that was passed out from FERC there's a section
21 in there that proudly says after the right-of-way
22 restoration. The very definition of restoration is to bring
23 something back to the way it was -- that is not possible
24 with this project.

25 What is in that pamphlet is not a true definition

1 of environmental restoration it's very odd to have seen
2 that. While we do appreciate you here tonight and that you
3 are hearing us we also hope that you are also listening to
4 us and what we are saying as a community is no to LNG.

5 MS. TEHAAR: Speaker number 11.

6 MR. SERRES: My name is Dan Serres and I am
7 speaking on behalf of the Columbia River-Keeper. I'm the
8 Conservation Director for CRK. I want to start by asking
9 for an extension which I have done in previous meetings.
10 This document is incomplete and there are studies referenced
11 in the document that do not yet exist that haven't been made
12 publicly available to make sense for you to extend the
13 public comment period for no less than 60 days beyond
14 October 6th.

15 I also want to tell a story of two easements that
16 are at play here. The first is the Army Corp. easement of
17 the entire terminal site that's the head of the snake. The
18 Army Corp. owns a valid property right where this terminal
19 would be located. FERC should immediately deny this project
20 because there is no control of the property for Oregon LNG.
21 You can't put in an LNG terminal in a site that is supposed
22 to be dredged disposal area, those two things are
23 fundamentally conflicting.

24 The end of this process is close to results and
25 FERC always improves these projects we are aware of that,

1 and the right of eminent domain a different easement, a
2 second easement. So as this company has no right to build
3 at the terminal site, FERC is engaging in a process that is
4 supposed to result in granting the right of eminent domain
5 to a pipeline company through this community through
6 Columbia County.

7 It's unjust, it's unfair, it's ridiculous, it's
8 embarrassing to the federal government that you have two
9 agencies, one of whom claims to have a right to dredge soil
10 on the terminal site and the other one is out gearing up to
11 give away the right of eminent domain to the Oregon LNG
12 Pipeline Company, it's absurd. And so I ask you today to
13 act quickly and deny the project.

14 Recognizing that FERC doesn't always do what we
15 ask I'm also here to publically ask Governor Brown to do the
16 same. We realize that the state of Oregon was the real
17 actor in this they are where we put stock in terms of
18 decision-making. We know that FERC has approved every LNG
19 terminal it's come in front of including the Bradwood LNG
20 terminal which after FERC's approval was rejected by the
21 state of Oregon, went bankrupt and was cancelled all
22 together.

23 The state denied the 401 water quality
24 certification because it had exactly the same flaws that we
25 are seeing in this Oregon LNG project and I want to point to

1 a few of those.

2 The first one is your public safety analysis
3 which is just outrageous in that you actually point to a
4 section of the Environmental Impact Statement that makes no
5 reference to the pipeline. You say our public safety
6 analysis is included in Section 4.1.13.10 and that section
7 is entitled "Facility Security and LNG Vessel Security."
8 That has nothing to do with the pipeline.

9 Again and again you point to sections of the EIS
10 to rely on the public safety analysis that doesn't exist.
11 That is almost entirely trouble specific and so that's a
12 huge flaw, it's one that is a fundamental issue for this
13 community is why the city of Vernonia passed a Resolution --
14 that's one of the reasons why the city of Vernonia passed a
15 Resolution in opposition to this project.

16 I was very disappointed to see the DEIS that you
17 references their concerns in a very dismissive way and said
18 no, you can look at this part of our EIS and you go to that
19 section in the EIS and it doesn't even answer the question
20 that was posed. There are a lot of these flaws in the EIS
21 and I encourage you to withdraw it or save yourself the work
22 and just deny this project today, thank you.

23 MS. TEHAAR: Speaker 12 please?

24 MR. GLEICHMAN: Good evening thank you for being
25 here, my name is Ted, T-e-d Gleichman, G-l-e-i-c-h-m-a-n. I

1 represent National and Oregonians here with our 2.4 million
2 members nationally and supporters and 16,000 in Oregon and
3 even a few here from Columbia County who typically as I
4 understand it did everybody receive a cop of our wonderful
5 magazine in a plain brown paper wrapper for basic
6 protection, that was a joke.

7 I want to affiliate us wholeheartedly with the
8 cogent and well-developed comments of the brother from
9 Columbia River-Keeper, well done Mr. Seeres and I want to
10 ask the three of you now to look up I'm serious please look
11 up, come on look up, look at this room. You drove up the
12 hill because of the extreme weather, you knew that, you knew
13 about the floods, the design of this room is because you
14 have never seen this kind of bracing before except the other
15 times you have been here for the scoping hearings.

16 This is necessary because of the earthquake and
17 it is not an if but a when and the Class 1 pipeline that you
18 proposed to run under Rock Creek, that the applicant
19 proposes to run under Rock Creek with FERC's active
20 participation and I suggest sadly collusion given the
21 fallacies in the process to date.

22 These 40 foot segments of pipe at the thinnest
23 possible dimension will fracture at every segment when the
24 magnitude 9 earthquake its which it has statistically a
25 one-third change of doing within the 50 year lifespan of

1 this project. And then those metal edges will rub against
2 each other for many minutes while the flammable well-head
3 gas, preconditioned gas, many flammable components methane,
4 butane and propane, e-panes are exposed to that sparking.

5 This is a catastrophic proposal. It is
6 fundamentally flawed because of the Corp. of Engineer's
7 easement on the property and there is a basic irrationality
8 to the way that FERC is proceeding without considering the
9 global climate impacts. The fallacies of the project or the
10 direct impact on the many individuals who will be
11 permanently harmed if this project goes through.

12 We believe that the efforts that you have made to
13 date have been seriously flawed and are holding up -- I
14 personally believe speaking for myself only here now that it
15 will be impossible for you to remedy those in the FEIS
16 certainly on the schedule involved. We also request that
17 the comment date be extended for at least another 60 days
18 past this irrational shortage outline, thank you.

19 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker 13? 13 please?

20 MS. FAYLOR: Thank you my name is Gerri Faylor,
21 G-e-r-r-I F-a-y-l-o-r. I have lived in Vernonia going on 23
22 years on the Rock Creek very close to where the proposal is
23 for going under the creek. I followed in the footsteps of a
24 very wise man Ben Franklin and drew a pro and con statement
25 for this project.

1 But as you can see the con side is full and the
2 pro side I could not come up with one thing to put on that
3 side. Primary I have listed the city of Vernonia's water
4 supply is the con. The Rock Creek salmon habitat, the fire
5 danger -- and I worked at the Vernonia Fire Department for
6 three years, I know how small they are, how long it takes
7 for a response and with the pipeline being out in the very
8 rough terrain I really doubt if they would be able to
9 adequately put out any fire.

10 The eminent domain to personal property is also a
11 great concern because of the loss of property value. Also a
12 very large concern is the low-grade of the piping material,
13 the Class 1, only because we are not a large population that
14 it doesn't seem to warrant anything better than that and the
15 long distance between the shut-off valves to me seems to be
16 just going to be a problem.

17 There also seems to be no level of responsibility
18 if there is a problem we are on our own as we have recovered
19 from floods I don't see us recovering from this. We lived
20 before Oregon in the area near Middletown in California that
21 has just been wiped out by a fire and I would certainly not
22 want to see that happen here but it certainly could if this
23 project is put through.

24 I see no local jobs being created and no
25 financial benefit to this community, no financial benefit to

1 our state, the pollution threat. I feel also the inadequate
2 studies that have been conducted for the impact and there is
3 a history of pipeline failures, more in the recent decade.
4 Properties are being condemned and there is other waterway
5 habitat whose destruction we don't want, thank you.

6 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker 14?

7 MS. ANDERSEN: My name is Noni Andersen, N-o-n-i
8 Andersen is A-n-d-e-r-s-e-n. I wanted to talk a little bit
9 about landslide hazards, earth movements primarily because
10 the EIS and I quote says, "Steep slopes and unstable
11 geologic formations are common in the coast range and have
12 the greatest potential for landslides."

13 Now there is 74 miles of the pipeline in the area
14 identified, specifically identified and also in that area
15 Oregon LNG identified 85 landslide hazards on the pipeline
16 route.

17 Now to aid that sort of thing along you are going
18 to clear cut a right-of-way, remove vegetation so they can
19 get heavy equipment in there on earth that is already
20 unstable and in order to trench in soil that may not be more
21 than 5 feet deep in some areas before they hit bed rock.
22 That happens in various places in the coast range.

23 Now the EIS also says that climate change is
24 expected to produce more frequent extreme precipitation
25 events which could lead to an increased risk of landslides.

1 That's in the EIS. Not in my statement but I believe it.
2 Now prior to -- okay before construction there needs to be
3 much more detailed geo-technical investigation and the --
4 prior to construction this environmental review, the next
5 one needs to include the results of investigations necessary
6 to support the final route, that's not in here.

7 It only has these vague statements. You need a
8 final landslide inventory, specific mitigation measures and
9 post-construction monitoring progress. These are
10 mentioned, they are not required.

11 Now I realize that the F-E-R-C, FERC is a
12 regulatory Commission but it seems that you make
13 recommendations not regulations because throughout this EIS
14 which has just been accepted wholesale FERC merely says
15 should instead of must make these changes. I thank you.

16 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker number 15 please?

17 MR. DRAGICH: Mr. Dragich from Cowlitz County,
18 Washington. If you consider ground central for fossil
19 fuels, in the state of Washington -- I'm going to be brief
20 because I get another two shots at when you come across the
21 river tomorrow. Now I have met one of you before, the
22 chairperson on the end if you remember Woodburn scoping
23 meeting for the secret pipeline that was going to supply
24 Bradwood outside of Clatskanie. That was a hell of a
25 meeting wasn't it.

1 We actually needed the boys in blue back then.
2 My professional background is I started life as a forestry
3 engineer in fire science and police science and I just
4 calculated this year I have been in it 29 years. And I have
5 been dealing with FERC for 23 years since 1991 and it
6 brought back some bad memories.

7 This is one of my old textbooks, Fire Officers
8 Guide to Dangerous Chemicals. And the in-page is a blevy
9 which is a technical term for a gas explosion. This is just
10 one -- back then 28,000 gallon tank car of liquid propane.
11 The new standards they are proposing are 40,000 gallons
12 which will be passing through my county.

13 Now I brought two EIS's which you people
14 approved, you have been here before back in the 1990's on
15 the Williams Expansion Project and a lateral line which is
16 on my property called the KB line which crosses near West
17 Port, Oregon. I am in court now because the company of the
18 EIS that you approved does not want to abide by that EIS
19 anymore, the one that FERC approved.

20 Now the two things you should realize -- I'll go
21 back and give some history here. A former President of the
22 United States Lyndon Baines Johnson once was quoted why he
23 never took any oil money. His direct quote was "Once it
24 gets you it never lets you go", but then he never took any
25 money.

1 Second on that came from our own U.S. Congressman
2 in the 3rd District in the State of Washington which he
3 comes to Southwest Washington and we asked her for help in
4 1991 and we mentioned your organization she replied to a
5 group much like this, "Don't get FERC'ed".

6 The last one came from the CIA Director, William
7 Casey, the late and they were always asking them, "Well how
8 do you route out who is really behind the project", and it's
9 already been mentioned the finances for this project are
10 off-shore and he said, "Follow the money", and you can
11 follow it directly to China.

12 MS. TEHAAR: Speaker number 16 and could we have
13 17 and 18 up in the front please?

14 MR. PARROW: Hi, I'm Randy Parrow, Mayor of the
15 City of Vernonia and business owner. I brought today my
16 Resolution 0715 which I will submit to the back desk and a
17 couple of pictures of some occurrences. My question to you
18 is how is Vernonia going to make water out of this?

19 This is Vernonia's watershed that we are talking
20 about. We don't have another source for water. This is
21 Vernonia's livelihood, the natural -- excuse me, the natural
22 resources of Columbia County. What if the pipeline ruptured
23 this last summer? Who is going to put out the fire? Are we
24 going to look like John Day Oregon? Who cleans up after a
25 catastrophe?

1 If something happens to our water supply in
2 Vernonia it is going to bankrupt our community. As a
3 business owner half the people here are going to move. You
4 are going to see businesses close downtown like you wouldn't
5 believe. It will completely destroy any livelihood that
6 they have, anything that they have worked for their entire
7 life, it will be wiped out.

8 Our government is elected by the people for the
9 people it is time for our government to use some common
10 sense. How can our government put a foreign interest above
11 our own? If this is such a great endeavor why don't they
12 put it in their own backyard? They have put the risk on us.

13 The citizens of Vernonia call on the FERC and the
14 state of Oregon to deny the Oregon LNG Project, thank you.

15 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker 17?

16 MR. MIKALOW: My name is Alfred Mikalow,
17 M-i-k-a-l-o-w. I own and operate a product safety company
18 here in the Vernonia area. I have a 35 year background in
19 product safety and I want to talk about something a little
20 different that it will eventually point to the problem we
21 have here.

22 We have two corporations who are trying to get
23 this pipeline through with very little experience from what
24 I understand. Now I am going to tell you what a real
25 experienced outfit did. This little outfit up north called

1 Alyeska. I had the fortune of working for them and for the
2 United States Congress to try to unravel the mess they made
3 up there.

4 Alyeska is a consortium of 7 major oil companies,
5 those I remember are Shell, Arco, I can't remember all of
6 them but they are big -- okay it turns out that they hadn't
7 done any maintenance other than what they absolutely had to
8 for a period of between 11 and 13 years. There was one case
9 where we went up, my job there was to measure the continuity
10 of the underground conduit, electrical conduit, to find out
11 if they could use it for a good ground. The answer was
12 absolutely no. It was trashed, maybe 2 or 3 percent of the
13 pipes could actually be used for ground because they haven't
14 been maintained.

15 Okay corporation goals are to make money at all
16 costs. That's what the oil companies and the gas companies
17 do and in this case there is going to be a cost to our
18 community and I can guarantee that these corporations don't
19 have the experience that they need to pull off a project
20 like this.

21 There are 15 different nationally recognized
22 testing labs in the United States that are certified by
23 OSHA. Out of those 15 I will only recommend 2 of them and I
24 have worked for most of them or a lot of them and they are
25 not fair to their clients, the remaining 13, they don't

1 treat their clients well. This is the way corporations
2 work.

3 We should not have to take the crap that we are
4 going to get from this pipeline and the risk we have got --
5 for instance there are 5 schools in Astoria, if a ship blows
6 up they are loading the fuel, the 100% kill zone is over a
7 mile and a quarter and 5 schools are in the 100 percent kill
8 zone, it will look like Hiroshima.

9 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker 18?

10 MR. GALADAY: I'm Nick Galaday, N-i-c-k
11 G-a-l-a-d-a-y and I am a villager and I am very proud to be
12 one tonight. I am hearing some very interesting comments.
13 This seems to be a meeting that really shouldn't be
14 happening, it is a reflection of some tremendous denial --
15 denial that over 35 years ago Ron Reagan took the solar
16 cells off the roof of the White House in denial.

17 So we have known for a good many years about
18 global warming and what causes it and the impacts of fossil
19 fuels and yet here we are still talking about trying to
20 increase the fungibility of a fossil fuel so that somebody
21 in another nation can make money selling it to somebody else
22 in another nation at our expense and through my drinking
23 water.

24 And it has been pointed out that we don't have a
25 lot of choices here in Vernonia about where we get our

1 drinking water, we can't drill domestic wells that work
2 often enough though it has been done.

3 Something else that bothers me about this process
4 this whole project and why are we even talking about it is
5 of course of the Cascadia fault. Does anybody read the New
6 York Times? We are in the middle -- okay I took my double
7 wide and I nailed it to its 3 inch concrete pads like that's
8 going to help but here you are putting a 36 inch
9 high-pressured gas line across a mountain range -- again
10 benefitting somebody in this country for somebody in that
11 country and another obscene aspect of this silliness is the
12 obscene inefficiency of liquid natural gas in the first
13 place.

14 It takes 8 parts of a block of energy that they
15 pull out of the ground in Canada even making it marketable
16 encourages that they keep doing that, it takes 8 parts of
17 that block against the two that finally is able to be used
18 from well to walk if you will just to get it there. You
19 have to extract it, you have to pump it along a line to
20 Warrenton, you then have to liquefy it which is tremendously
21 inefficient and expensive and then you have to transport it
22 across the ocean in a ship.

23 All of these things represent not only hazards
24 but inefficiencies that are just mind-blowing and why are we
25 even talking about it.

1 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker number 19 and
2 would 20 and 21 come down to the front please?

3 MS. NEURINGER: Martha Neuringer, it's
4 M-a-r-t-h-a N-e-u-r-i-n-g-e-r and the DEIS Section 4, page
5 306 says, "The potential for an accident involving the
6 pipeline is very low, the pipeline would not be a threat to
7 public safety therefore the pipeline would not have
8 significant adverse impacts to local police, fire
9 departments or hospitals."

10 I just want to give you our perspective. We are
11 foresters. Our new normal is a 6 month long fire season
12 with tinder dry forests. Exactly one month ago today a
13 brush fire came within one mile of our land and home. This
14 24 acre fire required the responsive of 20 local fire
15 departments most of them volunteers and I would like to
16 express my thanks to all of them, some of them may be here.

17 Contrary to FERC's entirely unrealistic
18 assumptions we know that pipeline leaks, ruptures and
19 explosions occur on a regular basis and is regularly
20 documented by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety
21 Administration and other sources. In the 10 years from 2010
22 to 2012 according to this agency there was 800 significant
23 incidents occurring in gas pipelines including several
24 hundred explosions that killed 116 people, injured 465
25 others and caused more than 800 million in property damage.

1 But the DEIS says the potential for an accident
2 involving the pipeline is very low. We know incidentally
3 the terrain that would be crossed by this pipeline traveling
4 to the coast range over steep hillsides with extremely
5 unstable soils and frequent landslides, along earthquake
6 faults, under and through dozens of rivers and streams that
7 as people have mentioned are known to flood and change their
8 course.

9 In this unstable and sometimes violent
10 environment pipeline failures are just a matter of time. In
11 December, 2007 over 20 landslides and washouts occurred
12 along the Port of Tillamook Bay and a road line to the
13 coast range that was so severe that they permanently closed
14 this railroad and it operated for 100 years.

15 FERC acknowledges in its DEIS the data on
16 landslide hazards is incomplete and requests further
17 information from Oregon LNG and yet based on this incomplete
18 information they conclude that risks are acceptable and "The
19 potential for an accident involving the pipeline is very
20 low."

21 We also know the deep valleys and canyons along
22 the pipeline in a route that can fill billions of cubic feet
23 of gas before anyone would know and before the valves placed
24 many miles apart can be closed. We are talking about a
25 pipeline with a capacity of 15,000 cubic feet of gas per

1 second or nearly 1 million cubic feet per unit.

2 The state of Oregon suggested that the pipeline
3 be constructed as a Class 3 pipeline with thicker pipe, not
4 Class 1 as proposed with the lowest standards. They also
5 requested that block valves be placed closer together to
6 limit the gas release due to a break but FERC refuses to
7 "impose additional safety standards". There is no meaning
8 analysis of the cost or benefits of these safer
9 alternatives. A pipeline rupture resulting in explosion and
10 fire in the dry forest what would be the liability for such
11 a conflagration who would pay the cost? Who would make
12 whole the potentially hundreds of citizens and landowners
13 who could lose their homes or property and their livelihoods?

14 This document does not provide any meaningful
15 analysis of pipeline safety. Where is the emergency
16 response plan, evacuation plan, training plan for
17 responders, assessment of the equipment for resources that
18 would be essential to fight the natural gas fire, all of
19 these completely inadequate in this document, thank you.

20 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker 20?

21 MR. NEURINGER: My name is Allen Neuringer
22 spelled the same way as Martha, A-l-l-e-n is my first name.
23 Forests are burning right now, hundreds of thousands of
24 acres of forest are burning and glaciers are just
25 disappearing and storms are raging. People are dying. Do

1 you care? Because what this proposal will do will increase
2 what's going on right now.

3 The DEIS is filled with subjective and
4 ill-defined statements. I'm a scientist, I'm used to
5 reading documents like this and it should be rejected out of
6 hand. Let me give you an example. "The FERC staff
7 concludes that approval of the proposed projects would
8 result in some adverse environmental impacts, however most
9 of these impacts would be reduced to less than significant
10 levels."

11 Throughout this document you refer to there may
12 be a problem but it will not be significant. It is less
13 than significant. It would not be significant throughout
14 this document. You never define significant.

15 In scientific circles significance is a technical
16 term and you need to define criteria what you I believe
17 really mean is not the scientific interpretation but you
18 mean something more subjective to your opinion it is not
19 very important and so some impact on our river in your
20 opinion, because it is small, is not important.

21 But it is important to us. Here's one example of
22 your "less than significant" I will quote from the document.
23 "Although the pipeline facilities would incrementally
24 increase the risk of pipeline accidents we conclude that
25 construction and operation of the facilities would not have

1 a significant impact on public safety."

2 Four schools are located within 25 feet of the
3 proposed pipeline. The blast zone if it happens is more
4 than 1,000 feet, that's significant. There have been many,
5 many occasions of fires and incidents on pipelines. Perhaps
6 the most significant lacking in this document is your
7 refusal to evaluate effects on local climate change.

8 You conclude we cannot determine whether the
9 projects would result in significant impacts related to
10 climate change. Why don't you farm out some of this and ask
11 experts, ask them whether there would be significant
12 impacts? I think if you ask scientists you would find out
13 the answer is yes.

14 A few more comments, I will make them later,
15 thank you.

16 MS. TEHARR: Thank you, speaker 21?

17 MR. DAVIS: My name is Rick Davis, R-i-c-k
18 D-a-v-i-s. I'm on the side of the industry that gets you
19 oil and gas out of the ground and connects it to the
20 pipeline.
21 I have been in the industry for over 40 years between my
22 three uncles, my father and my grandfather, we have over 156
23 years combined. I have seen three pipelines explode myself,
24 I have been there I had all of the windows blown out of my
25 trailers on location. The blast was about 2200 foot from

1 the rig.

2 I managed drilling operations in 13 countries and
3 a third of the United States. I know risk assessment I am
4 an expert at it in my field. The problem keeps cropping up,
5 especially the peers and friends of mine in the industry, it
6 is the increased in pipeline explosions.

7 Right now in 2014 there were 445 pipeline
8 accidents and an average of 37 accidents a month. And a
9 majority of all of these since the year 2000 a lot of them
10 were because of lack of inspections and maintenance because
11 they don't want to spend the money on the electronic pigs
12 that you guys known, we sent in pipelines to inspect, they
13 do ultrasound, they do x-ray, corrosion you name it. It
14 just costs money and slows down production.

15 And all of this gas belongs to Canada and the
16 Chinese, they have invested 40 billion dollars in these
17 projects here. The Canadians shut down one of their plants,
18 a Chinese gathering station, because they had too many
19 pipeline accidents and there was a lack of inspection and
20 maintenance.

21 The Canadian government shut them down and I just
22 don't understand why it is being put in here. My question
23 is why is the United States Federal Energy Regulatory
24 Commission making a decision on a foreign country's pipeline
25 in our country?

1 I would love an answer to that, I'm just a simple
2 man so you have to make it easy for me to understand.
3 Anyway thank you much.

4 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you speaker number 22?

5 MR. KEDNAY: Hello my name is Floyd Kednay.
6 F-l-o-y-d K-e-d-n-a-y and I'm a newcomer to Oregon. I snuck
7 in here in 1972 when Tom McCall was Governor and most of the
8 points have already been covered. A couple of comments that
9 you folks made was the Presidential appointees, the five
10 Presidential appointees, that kind of scares me compared to
11 the past few administrations the people, the quality of
12 people that have been appointed are yes men and yes woman
13 and our federal agencies are being gutted.

14 The industry wants to police itself and it seems
15 like a lot of the federal agencies have been losing their
16 bite so to say and I would like to know more about these
17 five Presidential appointees and how much power they have.
18 They are going to be making the decision and also I don't
19 know how a foreign country can condemn land in the United
20 States to put a pipeline in, to sell to a Communist country.

21 Why should we help a Communist country, we are a
22 capitalist system here so that's probably all I have got to
23 say but before I leave I would like to know about those
24 Presidential appointees, thank you.

25 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker 23?

1 MS. WILLOUGHBY: Hi, I'm Sherry Willoughby. I
2 have been looking at pipelines and terminals possibly coming
3 into Oregon --

4 MS. TEHAAR: Speaker can you spell your name for
5 me?

6 MS. WILLOUGHBY: S-h-e-r-r-y W-i-l-l-o-u-g-h-b-y
7 and I have been looking and pipeline and terminals possibly
8 coming into Oregon for many years now. I came from the
9 desert and I absolutely treasure our beaches and the
10 beautiful vistas we have there and besides all of the
11 terrible safety problems posed by very likely earthquakes
12 that these people have talked about I say why can't we have
13 our beautiful vistas?

14 It is my understanding that activists in
15 California said no to LNG, activists in Washington said no
16 to LNG, so we are the last place on the west coast to be
17 able to say no to LNG. You guys are a federal agency and
18 you are tasked with protecting the public interest so on the
19 one-hand we have foreign investors who are looking for their
20 money, could care less about the safety and esthetic aspects
21 that we place here in Oregon, because we live here and we
22 choose to live here versus the money from foreign
23 corporations and investors all over the world because we
24 fought back other companies in the past successfully but we
25 have to go on and on and on fighting because more and more

1 money comes from corporations all over the world.

2 You are tasked with protecting the public
3 interest and the Natural Gas Act happened to be amended to
4 say that if we have a trade agreement with another country
5 then our natural gas will have to be treated for export as
6 though it were deemed in the public interest.

7 In other words the Natural Gas Act has been
8 amended to remove the public interest from the Act itself.
9 So if we get the TPP as we are likely too, then forget our
10 ability to turn this back once we have the infrastructure in
11 place, the public interest is no more. It's all about
12 foreign investors. You guys need to do your job and protect
13 the public interest and deny this project.

14 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker 24 please?

15 MS. DENISON: My name is Marcia Denison,
16 M-a-r-c-i-a D-e-n-i-s-o-n and I'm from Pacific Grand Forest
17 Wildlife Guardians, headquartered in Columbia County and the
18 EIS is based on junk science and corporate opinion that they
19 want other people to think and it needs to be ripped up and
20 thrown away.

21 Do not approve this dangerous, toxic, explosive
22 pipeline. It steals natural resources from our children and
23 gives it to China in the eastern hemisphere for the western
24 hemisphere and no benefit at all for the people in the
25 United States, only loss, eminent gas leaks that increase

1 global warming and disastrous effects, creates a path of
2 future fire that will spread far beyond the gigantic clear
3 cut it creates on other people's land and someday burn our
4 property, crafts, homes, animals and wildlife and poisons
5 our wells.

6 The methane produced in transport is a small
7 portion of methane emitted into the atmosphere that changes
8 our climate forever. It is wrecking the ground water an gas
9 beds and shale to leak forever causing wells and streams to
10 dry up and be poisoned with multiple toxins, this trend has
11 to be reversed.

12 Methane is 26 times worse of a greenhouse gas
13 than CO2 but is fairly well ignored in all relevance, CO2
14 zone is all right right? FERC may not approve this plan to
15 put us all in harm's way in the future and to steal our
16 lands, our jobs from us and you don't work for the people of
17 China, you work for the people of Columbia County, Oregon
18 and the United States.

19 You don't work for the people of British Columbia
20 either and we stand too much to lose and perhaps our lives
21 and for nothing in return and FERC will not be here to help
22 put out fires on our lands and we will shrug asking, "Did we
23 allow that to happen?" No that doesn't do us any good.

24 MS. TEHAAR: Speaker 25?

25 MS. FIORILLO: My name is Rosemarie Fiorillo,

1 F-i-o-r-i-l-l-o. I'm here as a mother-to-be. As a
2 Commission appointed by President Obama and approved by the
3 U.S. Senate it is FERC's duty to enforce the will of the
4 Americans that this pipeline will affect the most. Clearly
5 that will is through rejecting the Oregon LNG Pipeline.

6 Approval of the pipeline will have little if any
7 benefit to the citizens of Oregon while we bear all of the
8 risk of guaranteed leaking pipes, air and aquifer pollution,
9 and potential large-scale disasters not to mention
10 devastation of public forest lands and the taking of many
11 homes.

12 The pipeline would however greatly benefit
13 Canadian corporations, hedge funders and Chinese investors
14 and those non-Americans to whom the natural gas will be
15 exported. What is more American than Americans bearing all
16 of the risk of harm with no benefit?

17 When the pipes leak and cause air and aquifer
18 pollution who will bear the cost of the cleanup? We would
19 like to think that the corporations who installed them would
20 assume that responsibility but we know from past experience
21 that the burden will fall on the citizens of Oregon so it is
22 a form of corporate welfare for American and Canadian
23 corporations paid once again by the American taxpayers.

24 And what long-term energy policy do we advance
25 through this project? American taxpayer dollars should be

1 used to subsidize clean, renewable, wind and solar energy
2 for that is the energy of our children's future, not the
3 chemical-emitting oil and natural gas industry that has
4 fueled global warming to the point where we must act
5 immediately to prevent further devastation.

6 Without question the Oregon LNG Project should be
7 rejected for the future of all children, thanks.

8 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, speaker 26, 26 please?

9 MS. MURPHY: Hi, my name is Ken Murphy, K-e-n
10 M-u-r-p-h-y. I have a couple of quick stories to tell
11 tonight. One of them is a friend of mine works up at the
12 oil fields in Alberta where this gas -- most of it will be
13 coming from. Some will also be coming out of Utah, a couple
14 of other places but most of it will be coming from Alberta
15 where she works.

16 That company that took over up there is cutting
17 corners everywhere they can. Some of those corners they cut
18 where inspectors and record keepers. One of the pipelines
19 finally ruptured after not having standard maintenance
20 performed that was supposed to have been performed.

21 The records weren't even there to see when it was
22 last inspected if it had been inspected at all. 95
23 pipelines on site at the plant were shut down by the
24 Canadian government. This has been mentioned already. As
25 my friend put it that company cuts corners everywhere they

1 can, they have cut her wages also.

2 Another story I have to share this evening is one
3 of a beach I have been going to for about 30 years now on
4 the Oregon coast. Every year I go to the same piece of
5 sandstone outcropping on the beach and sit there. The first
6 time I went there there was a great little chair, I have
7 been going there ever since, over and over and over.

8 This year when I went there there had been a
9 small landslide behind it, about 25 feet of cliff behind it
10 had been clearly exposed where it had been covered with
11 brush before. In that cliff was a large log, compressed to
12 about a foot thick, four feet wide, it was quite a big tree
13 at one time. There were seven layers in that hillside, each
14 of those layers was between 2 and 3 feet thick of
15 sediment with a small layer of compressed debris in between.

16 And I have studied a little geology those
17 compressed layers of debris were the tsunamis that had hit
18 when the coast had suddenly jumped up two to three feet
19 after the large earthquakes that we have so regularly. One
20 of the layers was a little bit taller, it was about 6 -- 7
21 feet high. That was one of the 500 year breaks between the
22 earthquakes.

23 The debris on top of that little cliff that was
24 exposed is over 100 feet thick. There were a lot more
25 layers above it. Those earthquakes have happened over and

1 over and over and they will happen again very soon. That
2 coast outline has been locked up for years now, hardly any
3 movement along the line between the Wanda Fuca Plant and the
4 North American Plague, no movement.

5 Movement is good. No movement means there is
6 stress building up, it's coming.

7 MS. TEHAAR: Do we have a speaker 27? Okay is
8 there anybody else who hasn't spoken tonight that would like
9 to speak? Is there anybody that hasn't spoken that would
10 like to speak? Okay, if there's anyone that has spoken that
11 would like to speak again it looks like there is three -- a
12 lot of people, okay, so anyway let's I guess start on this
13 side and sir you can come up.

14 MR. MIKALOW: Okay one of the things that I
15 didn't mention before -- Alfred Mikalow, M-i-k-a-l-o-w. One
16 of the things that I didn't mention these are the things
17 that I expect to see out of these companies that are doing
18 this is that Alyeska they have 18 huge tanks of crude and
19 down below there -- each one is a control panel that is
20 about this wide and about this tall and about this deep
21 going into the bottom of this there is 2 storage conduits
22 for each one. That is the panel that controls -- monitors
23 the level of the oil inside of the tank and controls the
24 pump that pumps the oil down to the ships to be taken away.

25 And the question -- like I said earlier, was our

1 job at ETL for the Congress was to measure these conduits
2 and see if the can be used as ground. When I opened the
3 door to every single one of those 18 panels the conduits
4 were standing out in free space because there was no bottom
5 anymore to the bottom of the panels. And so we -- you can't
6 get continuity through that system.

7 95% of the connections at Alyeska measured above
8 the minimum standard and about 5% actually made it and those
9 were mainly the ones that had been put in in the previous
10 year or two before we got there so Alyeska is a good example
11 of what we are going to see here in the Northwest from this
12 type of pipe corporation, thank you.

13 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you. We are just going to go
14 in order, so if there is anybody in this front row here.

15 MS. ANDERSEN: Noni Andersen. N-o-n-i
16 A-n-d-e-r-s-e-n. Back to landslides. I want to know that
17 in Columbia County and Clatsop County the road departments
18 have trouble all of the time with landslides. Columbia
19 County has 22 ongoing earth movements. These are places
20 that have not stopped moving for years and they keep having
21 to fix the roads.

22 Clatsop County has 20 of those. Now in both of
23 these cases where these occur is in the mountain areas. It
24 doesn't occur along the Columbia River, it doesn't occur
25 along the ocean on 101, these are inland where you want to

1 put the pipeline, it makes no sense because they are not
2 going to stop the earth from moving and the right-of-way
3 maintenance is when they will be looking to see if there are
4 any more landslides or what is happening, that can be done
5 only in the summer.

6 Earth moves here in the winter also and you --
7 and this is to be the weakest of the pipelines available.
8 It will not hold up. The EIS even included a statement
9 about pipeline safety and noted that today's welding methods
10 are so much better than prior years, we said since before
11 1930 which I would hope they are better by now. The
12 scenario that was used was a hypothetical major earthquake
13 in southern California which is practically of no use here
14 because this terrain is so different and the potential for
15 subduction zone earthquake is huge.

16 They are not alike at all. I'm glad that the
17 welding is there. Our earth moves we know that but why in
18 the world should we put up with this for profit for foreign
19 business, natural gas for other countries, we get the risk.
20 We get no benefit.

21 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you.

22 MS. PEACH: Diana Peach, D-i-a-n-a P-e-a-c-h.
23 I'm going to talk a little bit about mitigation. Per the
24 EIS the contingency plan for frack outs, back to frack outs,
25 is a preliminary plan and more specific procedures will be

1 developed on site specific conditions.

2 FERC states that it has reviewed the Oregon LNG's
3 sole prevention control and counter-measures plan and
4 concluded that it is adequate. My question is how can FERC
5 conclude that the plan is adequate if it is a preliminary
6 plan that isn't based on site-specific conditions.
7 Regarding fire the EIS states that with the implementation
8 of emergency response plan they anticipate no long-term
9 effect on infrastructure and public services.

10 FERC has not produced evidence that communities
11 along the pipeline route have the communication
12 infrastructure since we don't have cell phone coverage in
13 the mountains, safe evacuation routes, first responders,
14 fire-fighters, hospitals, police and emergency response
15 equipment necessary to handle an emergency.

16 Mitigation plans have gaping holes in terms of
17 protecting citizens from water contamination, forest fire
18 and environmental degradation. They fail to address the
19 complete analysis of water quality prior to, during and at
20 the completion of construction and after accidents. They
21 fail to address installation of reliable emergency
22 communication systems for residents along the pipeline and
23 along fire escape routes.

24 They fail to address immediate notification of
25 local emergency response teams if an accident occurs.

1 Currently according to the EIS there's a 24 hour deadline
2 and that does not include the local authorities in your
3 Table No. 4. Should a frack out occur we have minutes --
4 near minutes before contaminated water fills our children's
5 sippy cups.

6 According to the EIS Oregon LNG's responsibility
7 ends with emergency response plan which does not address or
8 guarantee the following:

9 The provision of clean water to residents until
10 water quality is restored;

11 Reimbursement for the cost of cleaning, repairing
12 or replacing residential and municipal water systems and
13 water treatment systems;

14 Compensation to residents for damage or lost
15 property, to business owners for damaged or lost property or
16 livelihood, to municipalities for damage or loss of public
17 facilities and infrastructure; to residents for decline in
18 property taxes as a result of environmental damage; to
19 municipalities for loss in property tax revenue.

20 It does not address or guarantee the full
21 restoration of salmon habitat, watersheds, water lands,
22 forest lands, to pre-accident conditions. These costs will
23 fall to the state of Oregon, to Governor Brown and to its
24 citizens. The immense risk associated with pipeline require
25 a detailed review of the resourced gas in order to

1 adequately assess the environmental impact on citizens and
2 if the pipeline is as safe as LNG and FERC maintain why
3 aren't these guarantees included in the plan, thank you.

4 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, anyone else from this
5 side? Okay thank you.

6 MR. MURPHY: Ken Murphy, K-e-n M-u-r-p-h-y. I
7 spoke a little earlier about the seismic danger that we know
8 is real, I have seen the evidence, many of us have seen the
9 evidence around here and also the factor of when liquid
10 natural gas is exposed to water, it expands 600 times its
11 cryogenic state.

12 It's basically its own explosion without fire.
13 If a ship is docked down there in Astoria when that
14 earthquake hits, guess what? The pipes running into the
15 ship break loose and they hit the Columbia River. It's its'
16 own bomb. The entire pipeline is its' own bomb also in the
17 fact that if it breaks, someone else mentioned this, the
18 pipes rub against each other.

19 I worked as a machinist for years, I have dealt
20 with hot metal and sparks. It will explode. It won't
21 hesitate. There's one other thing about that pipeline.
22 There were two spills on the Yellowstone River in the last
23 couple of years, they happen because of flood scouring of
24 the river bed. When they put those pipes under the rivers
25 they are a single wall pipe, they aren't thicker, it is the

1 same exact pipe. They agitate the substrate and then insert
2 the pipe through the loose debris.

3 The pipe is actually scored as it goes into the
4 ground underneath the rivers. All it will take is one flood
5 and it will scour down and crack that pipe. Thank you and
6 thank you for your hard work folks, it's tough to listen to
7 all of us complainers.

8 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you. In the back, sir, yes?

9 MR. NEURINGER: The name is Allen Neuringer,
10 N-e-u-r-i-n-g-e-r. I'm going to make four requests for
11 additions to the document. The first is to provide
12 comparisons as to the amount of estimated CO2 that would be
13 emitted by this facility compared to current other
14 facilities in Oregon.

15 For example the Boardman Facility -- what Oregon
16 LNG is going to emit in CO2 will be close to the amount that
17 Boardman Coal Fired Plant is emitting now. It's going to be
18 closed down because it of the amount of CO2.

19 Secondly I ask that you show the public need and
20 public interest and the need for this facility. My
21 understanding is the way FERC demonstrates a public need is
22 by showing via market pressures that there are shippers or
23 purchasers of the proposed commodity. This facility is
24 proposing both to be an export and import facility.

25 Previously anytime someone applied for

1 importation of LNG they had to show who would be the
2 purchasers of the LNG. Who will purchase the LNG that is
3 being proposed by this facility? Both import and export.

4 Thirdly I ask that you discuss Leucadia who is
5 the true owner of this project, it is not Oregon LNG, Oregon
6 LNG is a front for Leucadia. The reason I ask that you do
7 that is that if you look at Leucadia's letters to their
8 shareholders you will see that they express some concern
9 with respect to the viability of Oregon LNG's proposal and
10 that should be taken into account before you grant the right
11 to build this if the owner is concerned about the viability,
12 that's what that concern is based on the fact that the price
13 of as you well know, the price of liquefied natural gas has
14 fallen dramatically.

15 Moody says LNG prices will result in cancellation
16 of the vast majority of the nearly 30 liquification projects
17 currently proposed in the United States that should be taken
18 into account.

19 Finally there's a second on the human environment
20 and I applaud that section, what does it do to the humans in
21 this area and so what is suggested is that Oregon LNG will
22 paint the terminal the same color as the surrounding soil.
23 That and other similar kinds of things does not surprise so
24 I would ask that you do social psychological research to
25 find out what building this facility will do to the young

1 people in our schools and to the adults who are trying to
2 preserve our sacred environment.

3 I don't think you are going to turn this down and
4 therefore I call upon our Governor, our Senators and our
5 Congressmen and women please protect the future generations
6 of Oregonians and protect our sacred environment.

7 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you. Is there anyone else on
8 this side, okay?

9 MS. NEURINGER: I'm Martha Neuringer, M-a-r-t-h-a
10 N-e-u-r-i-n-g-e-r. I just wanted to make one statement
11 about what Allen just mentioned, the CO2 emissions of the
12 plant are estimated to be 3 million measured tons again,
13 that would make it after our coal plant closes, the largest
14 CO2 emitter in the state of Oregon, thus completely
15 undermining our state's goals for reducing greenhouse gas
16 emissions and that does not include the methane emissions
17 that would come from this plant. Recent evidence we have
18 greatly underestimated and may represent 30% greenhouse gas
19 impact.

20 So when you say you can't estimate the impact
21 globally on greenhouse gas emissions we can certainly look
22 at it in the state of Oregon and it is taking us completely
23 backwards.

24 Another specific issue is where would the power
25 come from for this terminal? The Jordan Cove plan includes

1 in the project a 420 megawatt dedicated power plant that is
2 the equivalent of the supply of 400,000 homes. There is no
3 such plan for a power plant with this terminal, the
4 implication is eventually upgrading substations and power
5 lines, the implication is that it would come from the
6 existing plant, really? 400,000 homes worth of power?
7 Where are the agreements with the power companies?

8 This project is not ownership of the land to
9 build the tunnel, it seems like many problems of number 2 in
10 terms of the complete fungibility of the project, thank you.

11 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you, next.

12 MS. DENISON: Hi again, Marcia, I'm with the
13 Forest Wildlife Guardians, M-a-r-c-i-a D-e-n-i-s-o-n --
14 never mind, a pipeline in Canada recently broke. Humans
15 monitoring the pressure saw a drop so turned up the flow to
16 get the pressure back. FERC cannot protect us from human
17 error. When lines get old they aren't monitored much
18 anymore. Old lines corrode, crack and fail.

19 FERC must protect public safety and the future
20 for the hundred plus years. The only way it can is to deny
21 the application. A pipe bomb waiting to happen is not
22 FERC's duty to approve, thank you very much.

23 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you.

24 MR. SERRES: Dan Serres again, Columbia
25 River-Keeper. I want to start by first of all thanking the

1 representatives, Congresswoman Bonamici, Senator Wyden and
2 Senator Murphy's offices who came tonight to listen. It
3 takes a lot of work to make this road trip as you all know
4 very well.

5 I want to just add something I had to say earlier
6 which impacts on private property owners, which just to
7 clarify for the people in the audience. When FERC comes to
8 the end of this process and makes a decision on this, that
9 confers the right of eminent domain and that is a very
10 powerful, heavy tool and it is one that shouldn't be taken
11 lightly and it is something that as you consider this
12 project it sort of makes no sense to put it back together
13 with the terminal application that obviously faces such
14 stiff opposition and such basic structural flaws and that
15 they don't have the right to put this terminal where they
16 want to.

17 Earlier I referenced studies that were missing in
18 this document. I didn't talk as much about the studies that
19 are just really falling short so some of the things that are
20 missing as Noni Andersen already referenced, the final
21 landslide inventory, that's very important to this area.

22 As you drove in and out today you probably
23 noticed the areas in the road where even though it's the
24 middle of the summer you see rocks sliding off roads on
25 Highway 47. These are rugged areas and to not have a full

1 inventory of this route at this point represents a real
2 deficiency in the ability of the public to provide
3 meaningful input on whether or not this is going to be a
4 problem.

5 Part of that as we all know is going to be a
6 problem. The pipeline right of way at a minimum would be 95
7 to 100 feet. The steeper the terrain, what we see from
8 their construction maps, in many places they go to wider
9 rights of way where they can tack this equipment up and down
10 these steep hillsides in order to put these very large pipes
11 in the ground. If you look at some of these places they
12 have to rebuild whole networks of rough logging roads in
13 order to access the pipeline construction in the corridor.

14 The Draft Environmental Impact statement gives
15 essentially no consideration to the erosion, to the
16 watershed impacts, to the impacts on the downstream aquatic
17 species of all of this construction of these really, rough,
18 steep essentially logging roads all over Columbia County and
19 Clatsop County and that we think is a very significant
20 missing piece.

21 I just have to point out that there are places in
22 the Environmental Impact Statement where it is just jarring
23 at the dismissive tone looking at very significant impacts
24 for instance 4-142, on much of the right-of-way the pipeline
25 would not be noticed by wildlife.

1 That's the kind of thing, it's hard to justify
2 that. You know there's a lot of analysis in this document
3 that actually points to the exact opposite and what people
4 have said over and over is there is actually a lot of places
5 where this Environmental Impact Statement identifies very
6 significant negative impacts on this project and yet when it
7 comes to the final analysis there are these sweeping
8 assumptions and conclusions that brush over all of that and
9 say things like, "Along much of the right-of-way the
10 pipeline would not be noticed by wildlife." Hard to believe
11 we are building something that is going to look like a
12 highway going up and down over the coast range.

13 So again I just want to reiterate I would ask
14 that's you reject this project and deny the Certificate for
15 the Oregon LNG Project and for the Oregon LNG terminal and
16 the Washington Expansion Project. People have had 10 years
17 to take a look at the Oregon LNG terminal and people are
18 just starting to learn about it now in Vernonia, what's
19 going on with the pipeline and it's even newer the
20 Washington Expansion Project as you know, you went up to
21 Washington state.

22 So again we are at the beginning of the process
23 for a couple of these but we know enough now to say no to
24 the project, thank you very much for your time.

25 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you. Is there anyone else who

1 would like to speak?

2 MR. CALHOUN: Steve Calhoun, I spoke before. I
3 think people are worried about the coming earthquake, on
4 average maybe 250-300 years. After the tsunami and
5 earthquake in the Indian Ocean, Oregon made a much bigger
6 effort trying to find out what the impact is off the coast.

7 The Department of Geology had someone in their
8 office report on the hazards of a major earthquake, the
9 Oregon Department of Energy. Five years ago they included
10 the information they had been compiling called "Cascadia".
11 And the opening statement was Haiti had an 8.0 earthquake
12 and it killed 10,000 people. Chili during that same time
13 had a big one, 9.0 earthquake and killed 500 people.

14 The difference is Chili was probably one of the
15 nations in the world that is best prepared for an
16 earthquake. They estimated that Oregon will have over
17 10,000 people killed in a 9.0 earthquake. This state is not
18 prepared like most other countries, just not prepared for
19 that type of an earthquake.

20 I know there has been a report recently to the
21 legislature that they did a report explaining what is the
22 recovery rate in a major earthquake and they are estimating
23 on the coast every bridge along the coast will most likely
24 collapses including the Astoria Bridge and they said we are
25 looking at a recovery rate of 3 to 10 years.

1 This is a major impact and a gas pipeline isn't
2 helping the problem. I know Senator Ron Wyden recently
3 passed legislation to provide funds for victims of
4 earthquakes and the state is trying to prepare itself but it
5 is a major concern that we are not prepared for and I
6 remember Governor Tom McCall -- I wasn't here when he was
7 Governor but I admire him for how he used eminent domain,
8 made beaches for the best good of the public and that is
9 what eminent domain initially was.

10 Eminent domain today is a foreign country not
11 justifying or needing to justify what their reason is to
12 take over land, you know. Jeff Murphy was in this gymnasium
13 over 2 months ago and he said we the people is becoming
14 difficult. And you a federal agency, should be protecting
15 us and shame on you if you don't.

16 MS. TEHAAR: Thank you.

17 MS. LYKENS: Again welcome everybody my name is
18 Elisa Lykens and I am with the environmental group and FERC
19 staff member, oh I'm sorry do you want to speak? Oh sure.

20 MR. GLEICHMAN: Sorry I was trying to say rude
21 things to the representatives of our senior elected
22 officials here in the back and I appreciate your patience.
23 I'm Ted Gleichman, G-l-e-i-c-h-m-a-n. One of the things
24 that has struck me personally about what's evolved with
25 these projects and other things around the country, I

1 returned to Oregon at 1 AM this morning from the Backen, the
2 region in Western North Dakota that has been so brutally
3 impacted by the shale exploitation of blended liquid and gas
4 hydrocarbons that is so volatile it has created these bomb
5 trains now rolling through the Pacific Northwest just as the
6 one that hit Lac-Megantic in Quebec two years ago on July
7 6th, incinerated the downtown and killed 47 people.

8 These are not trivial issues and I think it's
9 really important that people understand that what's going on
10 is not an energy industry that consists of deniers, they are
11 not deniers, they understand the climate impacts, they in
12 fact themselves are engaging now in adaptation strategies
13 for their own facilities based on growing extreme weather
14 events, heat waves, droughts.

15 California now we know is in a 500 year draught,
16 information that came out just this past week. Rather they
17 are in a desperate competition with each other for market
18 share and for project initiation at this point in history
19 because about half of the stock value of these companies
20 comes out of proven reserves, not just annual operating
21 results.

22 It is the same way that Walmart gets stock value
23 out of the assets of the store itself and their inventory,
24 same concept. And they also know that as the political
25 winds shift just as the global climate winds are shifting,

1 the projects that will be stopped first are the projects
2 that have not yet started because the jobs at that point are
3 somewhat theoretical.

4 As we get to the point with 4/5th or 9/10ths or
5 19/20ths of the proven reserves required to be left in the
6 ground for a livable climate, we will see pressure that will
7 become inexorable because of the climate impacts to shut
8 down existing facilities. But those won't be the ones that
9 go first, the ones that go first will be projects that
10 haven't started.

11 So the 30 export proposals, coal, oil and gas for
12 the Pacific Northwest like this one and the FERC hearings I
13 testified at in December in southern Oregon are two massive
14 examples where the basic principal of the hippocratic oath
15 must be applied. First do no more harm, don't make it
16 worse. As we deal with this crisis do not approve massive
17 new infrastructure projects that lock in massive amounts of
18 fossil fuel combustion for the long-term because we don't
19 have the long-term.

20 What we have is about a decade to make the kind
21 of transition we need. Thank you for your consideration.

22 MS. LYKENS: Again I just wanted to come up here
23 and address a question that we had about our Commission. As
24 Medhar mentioned early, our commission is made up of a five
25 member body. This President nominates the person and is

1 approved by the Senate. Our current Chairman is Chairman
2 Norman Bay -- he's recently been our Chairman for only a few
3 months now. He comes from the state of New Mexico and his
4 background, my understanding is that he is new to the
5 Commission but he was a consumer advocate general in New
6 Mexico and now at the Commission he worked with the Office
7 of Enforcement, he was Director of Office of Enforcement in
8 the industry.

9 And then President Obama recently promoted him to
10 Chairman so he is currently our Chairman. He is a democrat,
11 the five member body is made up of three currently sitting
12 democrats and two republicans so they tried to make it a
13 fair vote with the two parties.

14 I guess the first term was three democrats, the
15 other two democrats sitting are Colette Honorable, Cheryl
16 LaFleur and the two republicans are Tony Clark and Philip
17 Moeller. So they come from a variety of different places and
18 usually their backgrounds are Commissioners, they come from
19 the states that they represent, they held the highest
20 offices at their state utility boards or similar kind of
21 positions and they have a wide variety of backgrounds in
22 energy industries, regulators, mostly regulators and most of
23 them are attorneys, courts and consumer advocates for
24 consumers. So that's pretty much if you would like to go to
25 our website, it's www.ferc.gov there is a whole background

1 on the Commission members, so thank you I just wanted to
2 give you some information on that.

3 MS. KOCHHAR: I have one more comment about the
4 eminent domain. I want to make it clear there is no eminent
5 domain for LNG facilities. The eminent domain only pertains
6 to the pipeline, okay. I just want to make sure that you
7 understand that part. FERC is responsible for siting but
8 obtain easement is the responsibility of the applicant.

9 And DOE has the responsibility to approve or
10 disapprove the import or export pipeline.

11 That's what I am saying that's the responsibility
12 of the company, they don't have to go beyond but we will not
13 use eminent domain. I want to clarify there is no eminent
14 domain for LNG facilities, that includes the site itself.

15 Well that will come forward in the next document,
16 okay thank you.

17 I wanted to make this point clear to you okay.
18 No more speakers, no more comments. Yes, would you like to
19 come forward and make your comment? You have to come
20 forward and say your name for the reporter.

21 MR. KEDNAY: The lady that was praising the five
22 members that are going to be appointed by the President,
23 they are politicians? With the citizens united how do you
24 know they aren't paid off by the oil companies and the gas
25 companies? We don't have that information to know how much

1 they are getting under the table. I would have more faith
2 in our democracy but I don't trust them.

3 MS. KOCHHAR: You can submit all of your
4 comments, okay.

5 MR. KEDNAY: I want to know how much money they
6 are getting from the oil and gas companies?

7 MR. KOCHHAR: I can't tell you anything because I
8 don't know anything.

9 Any more comments? None. Alright this concludes
10 our commenters who spoke since there is no one here to say
11 anymore the formal part of this meeting is closed. The FERC
12 website there is a link on e-library if you type in the
13 docket number for the Oregon LNG Project CPO9-6 and CPO9-7
14 and for the Washington Expansion Project CP013-507. You
15 can use the e-library to gain access to everything
16 concerning this project as well as all of the filings and
17 information submitted by Oregon LNG and Northwest. So on
18 behalf of the Federal Energy Regulation Commission I want to
19 thank you for coming here tonight. Let the record show that
20 the comment meeting concluded at 8:15 p.m.

21 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.)

22

23

24

25