

1 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

2 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13



14

15

16

17

18

19

20 BRADWOOD LANDING LNG PROJECT

21 Thursday, September 29, 2005

22 7:03 P.M.

23 41535 Old Highway 30

24 Astoria, Oregon

25

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Good evening, ladies
2 and gentlemen. My name is Paul Friedman. I work in
3 the environmental branch of the Federal Energy
4 Regulatory Commission, often abbreviated as "FERC" or
5 referred to as the "Commission."

6 This is a joint public meeting
7 hosted by the FERC and the United States Coast Guard
8 to discuss environmental issues relating to the
9 proposal put forth by Northern Star Natural Gas,
10 L.L.C. -- which will be called "Northern Star" for
11 the rest of the evening -- to construct and operate
12 the Bradwood Landing liquefied natural gas, abbreviated
13 as the "LNG project." I am the environmental project
14 manager for FERC on this project. On behalf of the
15 FERC and the Coast Guard, I want to welcome you all
16 here tonight.

17 Let the record show that this
18 meeting began at -- my watch says 7:03 p.m., on
19 Thursday September 29th, 2005. This meeting is taking
20 place at Knappa High School, 41535 Old Highway 30,
21 Astoria, Oregon.

22 You may have noticed that there is
23 a court reporter transcribing this meeting. This is
24 so that we can have an accurate record of tonight's
25 comments. The FERC has a transcription contract with

1 Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc. If you wish to obtain a
2 copy of this transcript prior to its placement in the
3 public record, you must make personal, private
4 arrangements with ACE. They sell copies at \$9.70 per
5 page for same-day service, \$3.18 a page, overnight,
6 \$3.08 a page for next-day, \$2.02 a page within five
7 days of this meeting. This transcript will be
8 available to the public at the FERC's public reference
9 room in Washington D.C. for 25 cents a page, 10 days
10 after receipt, and eventually it will be available
11 electronically through eLibrary.

12 My goal tonight are as follows: I
13 want to introduce myself and my environmental team and
14 explain the role of the FERC in its review of this
15 project. Northern Star will summarize its proposal.
16 The Coast Guard will explain its process for assessing
17 the safety and security of the project and will give
18 you, the public, an opportunity to comment on the
19 project and identify your environmental concerns.

20 Let me introduce the people from
21 the project team who have joined me here tonight.
22 Shannon Jones -- Shannon, just please raise your hand.
23 Shannon works at the FERC with me. She is the
24 project team biologist. Todd Mattson is with the
25 Natural Resources Group in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

1 And Todd is the NRG -- is the third- party contractor
2 for this project. And they will be assisting the
3 FERC in the production of the Environmental Impact
4 Statement and what we consider NRG being an extension
5 of the FERC staff. And Todd is my opposite member
6 at NRG. He's their team project manager. In the
7 back, is Kim Jesson. She's in charge of signing you
8 up. So, later tonight, I'll give you -- anyone who
9 hasn't signed up already -- and I'll get you to sign
10 up to speak at this meeting.

11 While FERC is the lead Federal
12 Agency for this project, we are not the only agency
13 which must approve the proposal or issue a license or
14 a permit for its operation. For example, the United
15 States Army Corps of Engineers would issue a permit
16 under the Clean Water Act and the Rivers and Harbors
17 Act. The Coast Guard would issue a letter of
18 recommendation indicating whether or not the Columbia
19 River waterway is suitable for LNG ship traffic. The
20 Corps and the Coast Guard have agreed to be
21 cooperating agencies in the production of the EIS for
22 this project. Later tonight, the Coast Guard will
23 have a presentation. And I hope they will introduce
24 their staff that is here tonight.

25 Now I would like to introduce Gary

1 Coppedge from Northern Star to summarize its proposal.
2 I ask that all questions be held until the end of
3 the program, if we have time, so that everyone is
4 allowed to comment tonight.

5 MR. COPPEDGE: Good evening. Thank
6 you, Mr. Friedman, for the introduction.

7 Tonight I'm going to summarize what
8 it is that Northern Star Natural Gas is proposing
9 here. And one of the biggest questions that we get
10 -- and this is where I'll start -- is, "Why did you
11 choose this area for a LNG facility?" And there's
12 been some events that have occurred in the last
13 several months that we're all aware of. Those are
14 the hurricanes that have hit the Gulf Coast. And as
15 you know from your trips to the gas station, the
16 price of fuel -- of gasoline is increasing. The
17 price of natural gas is also increasing because of
18 those hurricanes in the Gulf Coast. Ninety percent
19 of the regions of oil and gas production are located
20 in the Gulf. And roughly, a third of the U.S.
21 production is located in the Gulf. As a result, that
22 translates in to higher prices for us in the Pacific
23 Northwest.

24 And one of the things that we can
25 do to cure that problem is to put a source of supply

1 close to where a source of demand is. Currently, the
2 Pacific Northwest imports natural gas from Canada or
3 from the Rocky Mountain Region over long distances and
4 pays the price that is currently established, either
5 in Southern California or the Gulf Coast. So having
6 a source of supply here -- in natural gas here that's
7 imported -- is an important way to make the Pacific
8 Northwest more competitive.

9 I'd also like to note that during
10 the hurricanes, there was an LNG facility that was
11 directly in the path of Katrina -- or excuse me --
12 directly in the path of Rita, and it was on the
13 outskirts of the Katrina storm. And that LNG
14 facility is currently up and running. The damage was
15 very minimal, if at all. And it was because of the
16 design that the LNG facility was required to go
17 through. So, I just wanted to make that point.

18 And, basically, the reason we're
19 here is because an LNG facility that's located in the
20 Pacific Northwest would decrease the dependency on
21 other regions of the country for importing natural gas
22 and would increase the competitiveness of industries
23 within this region.

24 So basically what we're saying is,
25 it's clear that we need energy supply here in the

1 region, and we need to diversify the way that we get
2 the energy into the market. And by doing that is by
3 providing a source of natural gas that's here in the
4 region. And Bradwood Landing is our proposed site
5 for doing that. And we put together a team of
6 experts and partners that we think are some of the
7 best in the industry.

8 Many people wonder who Northern Star
9 Natural Gas is. Northern Star Natural Gas is a
10 partnership between Northern Star Holdings and a
11 company called MatlinPatterson. MatlinPatterson is our
12 financial partner. They provide the financing for
13 this project; so far have committed over \$14 million
14 to this project alone. And they also provide
15 expertise in the market. As far as financing goes,
16 they have -- They're a \$4 billion company that has a
17 lot of experience in financing energy projects. The
18 other partner is Northern Star Holdings. Northern
19 Star Holdings brings together a number of partners who
20 have substantial experience in developing these kinds
21 of projects. Northern Star Holdings has developed
22 over 40 projects worldwide; LNG facilities, natural
23 gas pipelines, power plants. More recently, biodiesel
24 production. And not only that, but we've closed and
25 invested over \$40 billion in projects like this one

1 all over the world. So we have the experience to
2 get this done. We have the expertise to get this
3 done, and that's why we're here, and that's why we're
4 excited about this project.

5 So, there's a fairly clear message,
6 I think, that we're trying to get across. And that's
7 that we're committed to providing clean, safe, and
8 affordable energy to the region for the reasons that
9 I explained. In doing that, we also commit that we
10 are protecting and will protect the environment and
11 the areas around here that are important to the
12 culture that's here and to the local population. And
13 not only that, but we will make sure that we minimize
14 the impact on river traffic and the river way of life
15 that people here have grown so used to.

16 Our commitment also, of course,
17 entails providing good paying jobs and supporting the
18 local economy. How we're doing this is -- Well, let
19 me tell you the impact. The impacts of this is \$170
20 million that will be invested into the local economy.
21 That's what the local economy benefits in the three
22 years of construction. And thereafter, while the
23 plant is operational, there's \$20 million a year that
24 goes into the local economy. That is in the way of
25 jobs that are created during construction and jobs

1 during operations. And it's also in the way of the
2 taxes that we pay to the local school districts, to
3 the fire districts, to the county tax base, and other
4 various entities.

5 As I referred to earlier, the
6 Pacific Northwest has little or no gas production here
7 in the area. That's why you're dependent on gas from
8 Canada or gas from some other part of the country.
9 We currently consume, in this area, three billion
10 cubic feet per day of natural gas. And that is
11 expected to grow by 40 percent by the year 2020. So
12 the math gets real easy to do. This facility that
13 we're talking about would provide, roughly, a third of
14 that natural gas supply to this region. And it's a
15 simple matter of demand and supply.

16 This next draft graphically shows
17 what happened to natural gas prices since the year
18 2000. When we began this project in 2002, the
19 natural gas price was about \$4 per MMBTU. Typically
20 -- Or the average now that you see posted is about
21 \$12 per MMBTU, so it's roughly tripled. This
22 morning, I believe, Si told me it was a little bit
23 more than 14. So as you can see, just in the year
24 and a half or two years since we've been working on
25 this project, natural gas prices have tripled. That

1 results in about \$180 billion per annum in increased
2 energy costs to the U.S. economy. So it's a big
3 number.

4 LNG's role in this -- The demand
5 that you see in the left-hand column going up is the
6 40,000. The years that you see on the bottom, it
7 goes out to 2025. You can see that the U.S. gas
8 production is increasing slightly, pipeline imports are
9 actually decreasing slightly. And LNG is expected to
10 make up the additional gas supply. Now, you say,
11 "Well, what happens if we don't have LNG?" Well, two
12 things happen. Number one, the gas price continues
13 to rise because there's nothing providing downward
14 pressure on prices. And secondly, because energy
15 demand is growing, the power producers will find
16 another field to use; more than likely being coal.
17 And coal is 30 to 50 percent -- a 30 to 50 percent
18 dirtier fuel than natural gas. That, again, goes to
19 the benefit of the environment.

20 So that's why we're here. Where
21 are we? We're at the Bradwood Landing site. It's
22 at river mile 38. It's in Clatsop County. It's
23 about two miles downstream from Wauna Mills. It's on
24 a 420- acre site, and it's right across from Puget
25 Island. Why did we choose Bradwood? Well, it's been

1 a zoned marine industrial site for 150 years. There
2 was a lumber mill there before that that was shut
3 down in 1962. Since that time, it's been used as a
4 dredged disposal site, but it has always been zoned
5 marine industrial, or at least the 55 acres that
6 we're building on has always been zoned marine
7 industrial. We're using basically 20 percent of the
8 site, more or less. The remainder of the site will
9 be enhanced and will be kept in its current
10 environmental state, which includes forest and wetlands
11 and creek area. Those, we will not touch, and it
12 will not impact those areas.

13 The terminal -- Basically, we're
14 going to have one berthing dock for a carrier. The
15 carriers are going to be in size between 100 and
16 200,000 cubic meters. There will be offloading arms
17 that transport the LNG from the carrier to two full
18 containment tanks. And I will say that the full
19 containment tanks that we've committed to building
20 here are above and beyond the regulations that were
21 required. Many of the facilities that are built are
22 built as single containment tanks. Double containment
23 tanks add an extra measure of safety. They also add
24 \$50 million to the price of our facility. But that's
25 the commitment that we're making to safety. And

1 there's other things that we're doing as well that go
2 to the safety of this facility, also. The throughput
3 on this; the 1 billion cubic feet of natural gas per
4 day, and the capacity of storing; 7 billion cubic
5 feet in the full containment tanks that are on site.

6 This is the proposed facility
7 layout. You can see on the right-hand side, this is
8 the ship here. That's shown as about -- I think
9 about a 1,000-foot ship. Offloading arms here that
10 -- and these are cryogenic pipelines that take the
11 LNG to the storage facilities that you see here. The
12 first thing that we're proposing is two tanks with
13 the possibility of adding a third tank in the future.
14 These are the vaporizers that basically warm the LNG
15 up to pipeline -- or to natural gas. It's then put
16 into the pipeline and shipped to market.

17 So it's a fairly simple process.
18 We unload the LNG tanks. We pump from the tanks to
19 the vaporizers. From the vaporizers, we pump the
20 natural gas into a pipeline that ties into the
21 Williams Pipeline in Washington state.

22 As you can see from this facility
23 layout that all of the area that we're building on;
24 this is the old millpond from the lumber mill that
25 was there before. We will fill that millpond. And

1 all the white that you see around here are dredge
2 disposal from the channel maintenance dredging. You
3 know, as far as what we're proposing to do for
4 terminal safety, you know, there are numerous,
5 numerous regulations and requirements that we have to
6 follow from the federal and state level. And we --
7 As you can see from some of the design that we put
8 into this, we are either meeting or exceeding all of
9 those requirements. And we have to. The FERC and
10 DOT and other regulatory bodies like that will not
11 permit a facility that doesn't meet or exceed these.

12 A little bit about LNG safety.
13 There have been 33,000 LNG transports since LNG
14 industry's inception. There's never been an accident
15 with an LNG ship that affected the public. There has
16 been 2 trillion tons of LNG shipped to the U.S., all
17 without any major accident that affects the public.
18 We use double-hulled ships; carriers to carry the LNG
19 in. The hull of the ship is about 6 feet thick.
20 The ships -- The carriers come with the latest in
21 navigational equipment onboard the ship, so they are
22 the latest and greatest things that really float on
23 the water.

24 The pipeline that comes out of the
25 facility, currently we're proposing both a 30- and a

1 36-inch -- not two pipelines -- one pipeline; a 36-
2 inch pipeline that comes out of the Bradwood facility
3 and a 30-inch pipeline that starts on the Oregon --
4 on the Washington side to tie into the 30- inch
5 Williams Pipeline.

6 I want to say something that I
7 forgot to say on the slide of the layout. And this
8 is something that's come up in the last few days, and
9 it's been announced in several papers, and it's a
10 wrong fact. There's a railroad that runs close to
11 our facility. We are not -- We are not tearing up
12 the railroad. What we're doing is, we are moving the
13 railroad slightly to the south to allow more room for
14 the LNG containment tanks, but the railroad will not
15 only be rebuilt, but it will be upgraded when we lay
16 it back down. So, I was asked by several people
17 tonight that we should clarify that. So I think
18 that's fairly clear. We're not tearing up the
19 railroad. It's going back into better shape that
20 it's in now.

21 A few things that we're doing on
22 the pipeline that add to pipeline safety are x-raying
23 the welds. We are required, depending on the zone
24 that the pipeline goes through, to x-ray somewhere
25 between 10 to 15 percent, and in some cases, 100

1 percent of the welds. We're proposing, however, to
2 x-ray -- regardless of the type of the zone that we
3 go through -- we are going to x-ray every weld that
4 gets made on the pipeline. Every joint that's welded
5 will be x-rayed for quality assurance. We are also
6 pointing to cathodic protection on the pipeline, which
7 allows us to prevent corrosion of the pipeline.

8 Some of the other things that we're
9 doing is the hydrostatic testing of the entire line.
10 We are required to test 125 percent of maximum
11 pressure of the pipeline. We're committing to test
12 to 150 percent of the maximum operational pressure.
13 We're using "Smart Pigs" -- I don't know who came up
14 with that term -- but we're using Smart Pigs, which
15 are basically mechanical devices that crawl through
16 the pipeline and do an inspection using some very
17 slick technology that lets us know the shape of that
18 pipeline on the inside, so that we know if there's
19 corrosion taking place and we know if there's any
20 problems with the pipeline at all, and of course, our
21 regular walkovers and flyovers of the pipeline area.

22 On the environment, we are, like I
23 said, meeting or exceeding all of the environmental
24 standards. We will be required, and we are also
25 proposing to mitigate the issues that are on site,

1 and we're also going to enhance a lot of the area on
2 the site that currently needs enhancement in order for
3 salmon to spawn there and other species to exist.

4 We are also working very closely
5 with numerous agencies on the dredging issue. I know
6 that's been brought up by a lot of people. Extensive
7 studies are being done on the dredging that we're
8 doing and where we will put that dredging and what
9 the impact of that dredging will be. We've also
10 worked closely with the river pilots and the bar
11 pilots to make sure that we have minimal river
12 impacts. We've worked closely with the commercial
13 fishermen, with the gillnetters, with the recreational
14 river users. And we're paying special consideration
15 to the Buoy 10 fisheries that occur in, I think,
16 August and September months here.

17 The economic benefits -- I've talked
18 about this a little bit. 500 union construction
19 jobs, about 45 direct full-time permanent jobs on the
20 site, average salary of about \$60,000 each. Indirect
21 jobs in the neighborhood of 75 to 100, all hopefully
22 hired here locally. And like I say, most of that
23 will be in addition to the taxes that we pay and the
24 fees that we pay to the local area.

25 Also, in response to some of the

1 questions about, well, what happens because -- and
2 this is coming mainly from Wahkiakum County -- What
3 happens if we don't have the specific emergency
4 response assets that we need in place? And I'm
5 fairly certain that the Coast Guard and the FERC will
6 make us pay or make us contribute whatever we need to
7 do to close the gaps in the emergency response
8 systems. So we will be required to make sure that
9 the emergency response assets along the river and
10 along the facility are met.

11 Where are we at right now? We're
12 in the prefiling process with FERC. We are the only
13 project in the Northwest so far to move forward. I
14 know there's four or five other facilities that have
15 been talked about and proposed, but we're the only
16 ones that have filed with the FERC. And we plan on
17 filing our final application early next year, probably
18 in January. The prefiling has already started. We
19 filed the necessary 13 resource reports with the FERC,
20 and those are posted on the FERC's Web site.

21 Construction is going to begin
22 sometime in 2007, and we hope to be operational and
23 flowing clean, inexpensive energy in 2010.

24 And in closing, I would like to
25 introduce a few people. We, at Northern Star Natural

1 Gas, are really concerned about what the public has
2 to say, and we do listen. And that's evident by the
3 number of people that we have here. Si Garrett, our
4 CEO, is here today. Si, if you could stand up. We
5 will be here as late as you want to talk to us. I
6 will give you my card. Si will give you his card.
7 Dave Glessner, who is our vice president of
8 engineering, is here. We'll give you our cards with
9 our direct numbers. You can call us anytime or send
10 comments to us; whatever it is that you want.

11 We also have a multitude of experts
12 that are here tonight. Look for somebody with a tag
13 on that has Northern Star Natural Gas, or Northwest
14 Natural is here, and they're helping us with the
15 pipeline. And we've also got AMEC that's here that's
16 our environmental consultants. And we even have
17 attorneys floating around here that can answer some
18 legal questions. So we are committed to listening to
19 you. We'd like to listen to you, and we want to
20 hear your concerns. Thank you very much.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
22 Coppedge. I'd like to point out that this proposal
23 -- or this project is proposed by Northern Star. The
24 FERC is not a project proponent nor are we an
25 advocate for this project. We are an independent

1 governmental reviewing agency. Let me try and explain
2 about the way in which we conduct our review.

3 First slide. The Federal Energy
4 Regulatory Commission was originally created in 1920
5 to regulate hydropower and electricity. It was known
6 for many years as the Federal Power Commission. In
7 1977, President Carter's administration reorganized us,
8 and we became an independent agency within the U.S.
9 Department of Energy. Our agency is directed by five
10 commissioners, who were appointed by the President of
11 the United States and confirmed by Congress. The
12 Natural Gas Act of 1938 gave the Commission authority
13 to regulate the interstate transmission of natural
14 gas. The FERC staff are civil servants. We do not
15 make decisions. The five commissioners are the
16 decision-makers. However, FERC staff makes
17 recommendations to the commissioners.

18 Next slide, please. Section 3 of
19 the Natural Gas Act covers the importation of
20 liquefied natural gas or LNG. Section 7 of the
21 Natural Gas Act covers the sendout pipeline for the
22 interstate transportation of natural gas. The Energy
23 Policy Act of 2005 clarifies that FERC has exclusive
24 authority to approve or deny applications for the
25 siting of any onshore LNG import terminals in the

1 United States. The Energy Policy Act also requires
2 the use of our prefiling environmental review process
3 for all proposals for LNG import terminals.

4 On February 23rd, 2005, Northern
5 Star submitted a request to use our prefiling process,
6 and we accepted that request on March 7th, 2005. On
7 March 18th, 2005, we issued a public notice saying
8 that this project was now in the prefiling review
9 process. Beginning on September 2nd, 2005, Northern
10 Star began filing its preliminary draft resource
11 reports outlining details of its proposals. On
12 September 13th, 2005, the FERC issued a Notice of
13 Intent to prepare an EIS for the Bradwood Landing LNG
14 Project. In the Notice of Intent, we announced this
15 meeting, indicated we would do a site visit earlier
16 today, and requested that other agencies with
17 permitting authority or special expertise assist us in
18 the preparation of the EIS as its cooperating parties.

19 Our environmental team will produce
20 an EIS in accordance with the regulations of the
21 Council of Environmental Quality at Title 40 Code of
22 Federal Regulations, Parts 1500-1508, to satisfy
23 requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act
24 of 1969, better known as NEPA. The EIS will contain
25 the staff's recommendations to the commissioners. The

1 commissioners would decide whether or not to authorize
2 this project. The order the commissioners issue may
3 contain environmental conditions recommended by staff.

4 Under the NEPA, the FERC has
5 responsibility to consider, as part of its decision-
6 making process, the potential environmental impacts
7 associated with the project. We are now at the
8 beginning of the environmental review process,
9 including gathering data and obtaining public input.

10 Next slide. We are currently
11 conducting the pre-filing environmental review. The
12 FERC staff has met with federal, state, and local
13 agencies, including representatives of the Coast Guard,
14 the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
15 Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S.
16 Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of
17 Transportation, Oregon Department of Energy, Oregon
18 Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of
19 Land Conservation, Oregon Department of Geology, Oregon
20 Department of State Lands, Oregon Department of
21 Environmental Quality, Oregon Public Utilities
22 Commission, Oregon Department of Transportation,
23 Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington
24 Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department
25 of Natural Resources, Washington Utilities Commission,

1 Clatsop County, Cowlitz County in Oregon, Cowlitz and
2 Wahkiakum County in Washington. Notes from our
3 previously held interagency meetings have been placed
4 in the public record for this proceeding.

5 On May 19th, 2005, FERC staff did
6 a site visit and attended a public meeting hosted by
7 the Oregon Department of Energy. Some of you have
8 seen me at that meeting, where I said I'd be back in
9 September. So, I kept my word.

10 Sometime in the future, probably
11 after the first of the year, Northern Star will
12 officially file its application with the FERC. The
13 FERC will then issue a Notice of Application. At
14 that time, you can request to be an intervener in the
15 proceeding. You may not request intervener status
16 prior to an application being filed. After the
17 application is filed, we will produce our draft EIS.
18 The public would have 45 days to comment on the draft
19 after it is issued and will issue a Notice of
20 Issuance. At about the same time, the FERC will hold
21 another public meeting here in the project area to
22 take oral comments on the draft EIS. We would
23 address any comments on the draft in the final EIS.

24 Next slide. Our NOI was sent to
25 federal, state, and local governmental agencies, local

1 newspapers and libraries, regional Indian tribes and
2 Native American organizations, interested citizens and
3 environmental groups and affected nearby landowners.
4 We will use the responses to the NOI and comments at
5 this scoping meeting to identify environmental issues
6 of interest to the public and other regulatory
7 agencies, which will be addressed in the EIS.
8 Although the NOI indicated a deadline of October 17th,
9 2005, for comments, in fact, we will take written
10 comments anytime during prefilings, including after the
11 October 17th date. So that date is not hard and
12 fast.

13 Next slide. Cooperating agencies
14 get to review administrative drafts of the EIS and
15 suggest text changes or additions. Some agencies have
16 responsibilities whether or not they commit to being a
17 cooperative agency. For example, the U.S. Fish and
18 Wildlife Service needs to make a determination on the
19 effects of the project on threatened or endangered
20 species under the Endangered Species Act. The Oregon
21 Department of Land Conservation would make a
22 consistency determination under the Coastal Zone
23 Management Act. The Oregon Department of
24 Environmental Quality and the Washington Department of
25 Ecology would make determinations under the Clean

1 Water Act and the Clean Air Act. Cowlitz County is
2 going to be the coordinator under the Washington State
3 Environmental Policy Act.

4 Next slide. As I previously
5 stated, during prefiling, Northern Star would file its
6 preliminary first draft Environmental Resource reports.
7 The FERC staff and NRG will review those reports and
8 issue a data request to Northern Star to fill in data
9 gaps in the drafts. Our data request would be
10 informed by agency comments, public comments at this
11 meeting, and written comments sent to the FERC.
12 Northern Star would file its final complete set of
13 resource reports with its application. Just so the
14 public knows, all reports that are filed except for
15 those that are confidential, are available to the
16 public through our Web site electronically.

17 Next slide. These are the 13
18 resource reports and the general outline of what they
19 contain.

20 Next slide. If you wish to
21 intervene in the proceeding, you should do so in
22 response to the Notice of Application. That Notice
23 won't be issued until Northern Star files its formal
24 Application. You do not need to be an intervener to
25 have your comments on environmental issues taken into

1 consideration by staff.

2 After an Application is filed, the
3 FERC ex-parte rules will apply and there would be no
4 off- the-record discussion between FERC staff and
5 interested parties regarding the merits of this case.
6 All correspondence after that time must be in writing.

7 Together with our third-party
8 contractor, NRG, we would be producing an EIS. That
9 environmental document will offer our independent
10 analysis of the potential environmental impacts of
11 Northern Star's proposal and alternatives. Generally,
12 the EIS will discuss the current environment, outline
13 potential project-related impacts on specific resources
14 and present proposed mitigation measures. In the EIS,
15 we will be assessing the project's effects among other
16 things, water bodies and wetlands, vegetation and
17 wildlife, endangered species, cultural resources, soils,
18 landuse, air quality, noise, and safety. A draft of
19 the EIS will be sent out to all interested parties
20 and those on environmental mailing lists. If you
21 want to be on our environmental mailing list, you can
22 go to Kim in the back of the room, and she has a
23 mailing list form that you can fill out.

24 Next slide. Next slide. Later
25 today, the Coast Guard will talk about marine safety

1 issues.

2 While the FERC environmental staff
3 is working on the environmental document, other FERC
4 staff members will be analyzing the nonenvironmental
5 aspects of Northern Star's proposal. This includes
6 project need, market issues, and rates for interstate
7 transportation on the pipeline.

8 The EIS will not be a final
9 decision document. It would be prepared to advise
10 the Commission and to disclose to the public the
11 environmental impact of constructing and operating the
12 project. When it is finished, our analysis will be
13 combined with other staff's materials on the
14 nonenvironmental aspects of the proposal, and the
15 total package will then be sent to the commissioners
16 who will make the final decision.

17 Only after the entire process is
18 complete and the Commission is able to consider both
19 the environmental and economic impacts of the project,
20 will the commissioners make their decision. That
21 final decision would be issued as an Order. The
22 Commission has the option of accepting Northern Star's
23 proposal in whole or in part, approving it subject to
24 conditions, or denying the Application. All
25 interveners in the proceeding have the right to appeal

1 a Commission decision and to request a rehearing.

2 If the Commission decides to approve
3 the proposal, FERC staff will then monitor all
4 construction of the project and restoration of the
5 right-of-way for the pipeline. We will be performing
6 on-site inspections for compliance with the
7 environmental issues outlined in the conditions of the
8 Order.

9 You should know that the FERC Order
10 issuing a certificate of convenience and necessity for
11 the pipeline would carry with it the power of eminent
12 domain as transferred to Northern Star under Section
13 7H of the Natural Gas Act. That means that Northern
14 Star would be able to get access to all lands along
15 the pipeline route. We encourage Northern Star to
16 negotiate with and obtain right-of-way agreements
17 with property owners prior to the issuance of a FERC
18 certificate.

19 Let me emphasize that this meeting
20 is not a hearing on the merits of Northern Star's
21 proposal. Other Commission staff will consider the
22 economic needs for this project and the rates to be
23 charged for service. As I said earlier, the purpose
24 of this meeting tonight is to give you, the public,
25 an opportunity to comment on the type of environmental

1 issues that you wish to see, as covered in the EIS.

2 The Coast Guard will now discuss
3 its review of marine safety and security issues for
4 the project. Captain Gerrity will make that
5 presentation. Again, I request that you hold all
6 questions. So you're not supposed to ask those
7 questions at this time. And I also request all
8 cameras be kept behind the first row of seats and on
9 the sides beyond the three-point line. Thanks.

10 CAPTAIN GERRITY: Thanks, Paul.
11 We've got a little housekeeping to do first. Hang
12 on, please.

13 Good evening. I'm Captain Pat
14 Gerrity. I'm a commanding officer of the United
15 States Coast Guard sector in Portland, Oregon. I'm
16 the captain of the port in this area; federal
17 maritime security coordinator. I'm happy to be here
18 tonight to talk to you about the Coast Guard and what
19 we're going to do in this process. I don't have any
20 prepared notes. I've got some slides to look at.
21 We're going to talk informally. You're going to hear
22 about the process the Coast Guard does.

23 Next slide, please. This is what
24 we know as sector of Portland Oregon. The sector of
25 Portland, Oregon, as you know, doesn't just cover

1 Portland. It covers that whole swath; almost all of
2 Idaho, the entire coast of Oregon, half the coast of
3 Washington state, the entire Columbia River. We've
4 got about 250 full-time and part-time people who work
5 in the Coast Guard down in Portland. We're very
6 interested in this project that we're here to talk
7 about tonight, as far as what we do.

8 Our missions are pretty complicated
9 and pretty well known by most of the people in this
10 room. We're involved in search and rescue. We're
11 involved in environmental protection. We're involved
12 in commercial vessel safety. We're involved in
13 homeland security.

14 Next slide. Some local flavor in
15 this shot some of you probably know. You probably
16 are very familiar by now of the Coast Guard's
17 well-known search and rescue capabilities. Recently,
18 our folks down in New Orleans worked very hard during
19 the Katrina efforts. But those of you from this area
20 know how hard our folks work off the coast of Oregon
21 doing search and rescue, and on the Columbia River
22 and off the coast of Washington. It's a very noble
23 mission.

24 Next slide, please. One of the
25 things that I want to make sure you all understand,

1 though, is where -- It's very easy to know our
2 response mission. A lot of what we do is
3 preventative. A prevention mission avoids the kind of
4 shots you just saw on the last slide. We're very
5 interested in preventing things from happening before
6 they happen. And this kind of rolls into what we
7 call our "Marine Safety Mission," where the big
8 vessels that you see coming into the Columbia River;
9 we get about 2,000 arrivals a year. We will check
10 those vessels. We have an international inspection
11 program. We also have a commercial inspection program
12 for our domestic vessels here. We're very involved
13 in contingency planning. We will, if we need to, put
14 safety zones and security zones around those areas
15 that are of concern. So marine safety preventing
16 accidents from happening is very, very important to
17 the Coast Guard.

18 Next slide, please. Sometimes
19 things do occur. This is our marine environmental
20 protection commission. Some of you may remember the
21 New Carrisa incident that occurred. The office that
22 I work in was responsible for responding to that
23 particular event. Throughout the Coast Guard, we're
24 responsible for marine environmental protection.
25 Generally, we want to get to the point of making sure

1 it doesn't happen. We're not real happy when we have
2 to go out and oversee an oil spill. It's very, very
3 difficult work. It's very challenging work. So we
4 spend a lot of time in the preventative world on oil
5 spill and response, contingency planning, and drills.
6 Again, most of you probably know that.

7 Next slide, please. One of the
8 missions that some may or may not know about, we call
9 "waterways management." It's a pretty normal term
10 within the Coast Guard. But for you folks, basically
11 that means that the Congress -- that you folks, as
12 American taxpayers that place the responsibility of
13 managing the navigable waterways of the United States
14 on the backs of the Coast Guard. And this is a
15 mission we take very, very seriously. Some of the
16 more traditional measures that you possibly see in the
17 waterways management world are our aids navigation
18 that you would probably use if you're on the
19 waterways. We place and maintain those aids -- those
20 federal aids, anyhow. We're also involved in
21 designating federal anchorages, so when the when the
22 vessels come in and there's no place for them to go,
23 they have a safe place to anchor in the Columbia
24 River or any other navigable water, for that matter.
25 And I dare you to say navigable three times fast, by

1 the way.

2 We're also involved in what we call
3 a marine event permitting. We get a lot of firework
4 shows, a lot of bravados, a lot of sailing vessels
5 that come in through the ports. We've got large
6 ships operating out there. If we just let everybody
7 do what they wanted to, you can imagine the mess we'd
8 have. So anytime somebody wants to hold some sort of
9 event on the Columbia River, or for that matter, any
10 other navigable waterway, we get involved in
11 permitting that and making sure it's done safely.

12 Next slide, please. We're also
13 involved in the mission that's gotten a lot of
14 visibility since 9/11, and that's securing the
15 homeland; another mission that we spend an inordinate
16 amount of time on. "Securing the homeland" means a
17 lot of things to a lot of people. But what I want
18 to speak about, particularly tonight, is how we deal
19 with it as far as it applies to international
20 shipping. In the international shipping world, there
21 are protocols that I'm not going to get into here,
22 that basically define how shipping is going to be
23 regulated and how it's going to be secure. Let me
24 assure you, though, it starts with the fact that we
25 have personnel in the Coast Guard who are actually

1 assigned overseas that look at, inspect, and monitor
2 oversees ports to make sure that they are operating
3 within international protocols of safety. If they're
4 not, we make note of it and we handle it accordingly.
5 Secondary, once a vessel leaves a port and decides to
6 head towards the United States, they have to give 96
7 hours of notice to the United States Coast Guard so
8 that we can screen that vessel; screen the crew,
9 screen the cargo, find out where it's going to --
10 run, basically, our detail check on it. After that's
11 done, we have the opportunity, depending on what we're
12 dealing with, of boarding the vessel and what we call
13 positively controlling it all the way to the dock.
14 That means putting Coast Guard personnel onboard that
15 vessel to make sure that it gets to where it's
16 supposed to get to safely. In conjunction with that,
17 it's very possible that the Coast Guard would have
18 escort vessels assisting that vessel, keeping people
19 away from it, keeping other boats away from it so
20 that nothing could happen to the vessel. We've got
21 people onboard so they can't hurt us, and we keep
22 people around it so that nothing can hurt the vessel.
23 And finally, it's very possible, depending on the
24 cargo, depending on the circumstances, that we could
25 put a security zone or safety zone around the vessel.

1 It's a pretty good network as far as safety is
2 concerned.

3 Okay. So, next slide. So, that's
4 what we do. Now, what the heck are we doing here as
5 far as LNG, which is what most of you are concerned
6 about, I'm sure. I stated earlier that I was a
7 captain of the port. It's a neat title. It doesn't
8 mean much to most people, but it covers a lot of
9 regulatory authority that we're not also going to get
10 into here. But in essence, it gives me the authority
11 to decide that we can do any -- that we keep a safe
12 and secure environment in our waterway, whether it's
13 building a new bridge, building a gondola, building a
14 tunnel, or bringing a new facility into the river.
15 It's our responsibility under that authority to make
16 sure it's done safely and securely.

17 A secondary title that we earned
18 after 9/11 is the federal maritime security
19 coordinator, which is basically a parallel title to
20 the captain of the port. Again, it's a title that
21 essentially says that, if we feel in Portland -- that
22 somebody is doing something that puts a security risk
23 in the waterway, we have to mitigate that risk. And
24 if we can't mitigate it, we just can't let it happen.
25 That's how it's said, very simply.

1 Are we energy experts? No, we're
2 not. We're not energy experts. Are we safety and
3 security experts? I don't think we'd want to call
4 ourselves experts, but we know a lot about safety and
5 security in our organization. We know a little about
6 that after over 220 years of doing it. And I'd say
7 that as far as the Columbia River issues, I'm here
8 tonight to listen to what they are from your
9 standpoint. We are very concerned about the Columbia
10 River and safety and security out here.

11 Next slide, please. This has
12 previously been talked about from the responsibility
13 of FERC. Our responsibility is to assist FERC as far
14 as doing a waterways suitability assessment. And
15 that's done by the applicant. The applicant has two
16 bites of the apple. The first preliminary study the
17 applicant provides -- the LNG applicant -- is he or
18 she will let us know what they believe the impact of
19 the facility is in the waterway. They can look at
20 it, review it, give that individual some comments,
21 tell them what we think is missing or what they need
22 to add. They get a second shot to provide a
23 secondary waterway suitability assessment. And then
24 we'll give a recommendation to FERC after review and
25 validate that.

1 Next slide, please. How do we get
2 to the recommendation? It's pretty simple. There's
3 a lot of really technical ways we get here, but I
4 want to just keep it simple. Public input. You
5 don't want to hear me talk tonight. I want to hear
6 you talk tonight. I want to hear what your concerns
7 are, what your thoughts are. As Mr. Friedman said,
8 what you say goes on the record. We'll be using
9 that in the waterway suitability assessment. If you
10 have a concern, if you have an interest or worry, let
11 us know. That's why we're here. That's what we
12 brought four other Coast Guard folks down here to
13 hear about. And I'm sure that the applicant wants to
14 hear this, too.

15 We also don't view ourselves as the
16 experts on all aspects -- I guess I'm going to try
17 this -- in and out -- We're not the experts on all
18 aspects of all industries and all user groups on the
19 waterway. So we use a couple of standing committees.
20 We use one primary committee for security we call the
21 Area Maritime Security Committee. It's mandated by
22 Congress. We meet quarterly, sometimes more than
23 that. These folks understand marine transportation.
24 They understand, in some cases, marine landuse.
25 They're very aware of shipping. They're very aware

1 of transportation. They have knowledge of the area,
2 and we consult them for issues of security. For
3 safety, we use something called the Ports of Waterway
4 Safety Committee. These people are very, very
5 invaluable to somebody like me. We want to know what
6 their thoughts are. We would use them, a neutral
7 party, to validate the waterway suitability assessment.

8 And finally, the most exciting thing
9 we use is called NVIC 05-05. And I assure you it's
10 not very exciting, but I think it's important that
11 you know what tool we use in order to access LNG
12 facilities. And I believe we have this on the back
13 table. If anybody really, really wants to read what
14 we have, it's available via the Internet. I
15 encourage you to look at it and find out the kind of
16 tools that we use to value the LNG. We also
17 provided a phone number if you have any questions,
18 and some information on the comments that I'll get to
19 here in a second.

20 Next slide, please. Okay, folks.
21 Here's our bottom-line concern. We live here. I've
22 got people who work for me who live in this area.
23 And I assure you the only thing we're interested in
24 knowing about is: Is this facility suitable for the
25 Columbia River? That's all we want to know. Is it

1 safe? Can we make it safe? Is it secure? Can we
2 make it secure? What's the impact on everybody else?
3 We need to know that. It's a process we go through.
4 It's not -- We haven't made any decisions up or down.
5 I assure you that.

6 Next slide, please. So tonight,
7 this is your night. It's not my night; it's your
8 night. I really want to hear what you have to say,
9 because what you say matters. It's on the record.
10 It's important you know it's on the record. For
11 those of you who are shy -- and I would understand
12 it's difficult to get up here and speak to a bunch
13 of people about something like this -- you have an
14 opportunity to provide written comment by October 6th.
15 And I think that would be a good thing to do. If
16 you hear something tonight and want to go back and
17 add comments to it up or down, you can provide
18 written comment to our office by October 6.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: October 6th?

20 CAPTAIN GERRITY: October 6th.

21 October 6th.

22 At the end of the day, we'll make
23 an unbiased decision. We're public servants. We
24 serve everybody in this room equally.

25 And I want to let you know that,

1 before I forget, I brought some friends with me from
2 the Coast Guard. I'd like you guys to see stand.
3 I'm going to call your name. Shad Scheirman is one
4 of my project officers from my office in Portland.
5 Xochiti Castaneda is from Portland, also. Commander
6 Moriarty is from Seattle. He's in charge of aids and
7 navigation. He's back here. We've got a very
8 important guy at the front desk; Petty Officer
9 Hatfield, who I believe hails from Oregon. Right,
10 Petty Officer Hatfield? So that's my team tonight.
11 Oh, I can't forget Mike Block. Michael Block, are
12 you back here somewhere? Mr. Block deals with the
13 press, so he's here for me tonight, too.

14 I'll have an opportunity to see
15 you. Please give us your input. We really want to
16 hear it. Thank you for your time. Thanks.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Captain
18 Gerrity.

19 I want to make a note on a
20 different subject. Kirsten Lee told me that she
21 found out that the ferry running to Puget Island will
22 run tonight until 11:15 p.m. Hopefully -- got my
23 fingers crossed -- we'll be done before then.

24 Before we take public comments, I
25 would like to take a five-minute break. This will

1 allow people who have not yet signed our speaker's
2 list to go over to Kim in the back and sign up.
3 For those of you who need to go to the rest room, to
4 use it. And we'll start again in five minutes.

5 (Whereupon, a short break was
6 taken.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: The one thing I'm
8 going to ask is that each speaker may only speak for
9 a maximum of five minutes. I will be sticking very
10 strictly to that rule because of the number of people
11 who have indicated they want the opportunity to speak
12 and present their comments. So it's a courtesy to
13 everyone in this room that you summarize what you
14 have to say very briefly in five minutes. If you
15 have a lot of detailed comments, please send them to
16 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in writing on
17 the record, all right? We will take written comments
18 in detail for all issues pertaining to this project.

19 I ask that each speaker clearly
20 state their name, spell it for our court reporter,
21 identify if they represent an organization or if
22 they're a landowner along the pipeline or if they are
23 just speaking for themselves.

24 At this time, I would like to call
25 up Cathy Van Horn, from the Oregon Department of

1 Energy.

2 MS. Van HORN: Hi. My name is
3 Cathy Van Horn, and that's spelled C-A-T-H-Y V-A-N --
4 space -- H-O-R-N. I'm here tonight on behalf of the
5 Oregon Department of Energy to comment on the federal
6 process.

7 I'd like to thank you for holding
8 this meeting in Knappa and asking the people of
9 Oregon and Washington for their questions and concerns
10 on the proposed Bradwood Landing project. Both FERC
11 and the Coast Guard have worked closely with the
12 Department of Energy throughout the federal review
13 process so far, and we appreciate that effort. We
14 look forward to continuing these relationships with
15 both agencies as a key stakeholder thoroughly involved
16 in the federal review. Our hope and expectation is
17 that the federal process will aim for as much
18 openness and public discussion as is possible under
19 federal law.

20 I'd rather defer to the many folks
21 gathered here tonight than take up too much time with
22 the Department of Energy's comments. I would just
23 like to quickly mention that the Department will
24 submit to the Coast Guard and to FERC all of the
25 public comments we have received on the proposed

1 Bradwood Landing project; the bulk of those we've
2 received on the project proposal, which we call the
3 Notice of Intent thus far, and those we've received
4 during the Department's incomplete rulemaking process
5 on LNG. I appreciate that both agencies have said
6 that they were happy to accept and review those
7 comments.

8 Again, thank you for this meeting.
9 My hope is that tonight's meeting will offer you
10 local knowledge and other valuable comments for the
11 serious consideration of both FERC and the Coast Guard
12 as they continue their reviews. Thank you.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: First speaker on the
14 Coast Guard list is George Exum. And, also, if I
15 mispronounce your name, please correct me.

16 MR. EXUM: My name is George Exum;
17 E-X-U- M. I'm a resident of Puget Island. I want
18 to start off saying I found it interesting that
19 Northern Star got 20 minutes and 25 seconds, and we
20 get five minutes.

21 I'm here tonight because the lower
22 Columbia is under attack. Corporate and government
23 forces are working mightily to destroy the
24 environment, natural beauty, security, safety, and the
25 way of life for the people that live and work in the

1 lower Columbia River. With FERC, this is
2 understandable, since they have never seen an energy
3 project they did not like. Bureaucrats in Washington
4 D.C. have little concern for the effects energy
5 projects have on the citizens of the many areas in
6 the United States that LNG is being proposed. How
7 many of these plants aren't enough? Sempra Energy,
8 the leading U.S. company in the LNG and natural gas
9 field, has recently completed an assessment of what it
10 believes the U.S. needs in terms of LNG import
11 facilities. Darcel Hulse, president of Sempra,
12 declared that for the foreseeable future, 12 would be
13 sufficient to fulfill the U.S. natural gas needs.
14 There is no national plan to determine this number,
15 just the big "Yes to All" stamp that is being used
16 as quickly as possible.

17 I find the process that FERC uses
18 to improve energy projects interesting. If I, as a
19 private citizen, wished to develop my waterfront
20 property for a dock or whatever, I need to go through
21 an elaborate permit process; local, state, and
22 federal. I need to write or hire someone to write
23 an Environmental Impact Statement. With this process,
24 FERC writes the EIS, then it evaluates what it wrote
25 and then it approves it. Is there something strange

1 with this process, or is it just me? Then this --
2 The current political leadership put FERC on the top
3 of the heap and gave the energy -- the agency the
4 jurisdiction to coordinate with other federal agencies
5 to streamline this process for industry.

6 This new process of FERC and their
7 coordinating agencies seems to start the evaluator
8 process with the assumption that the agencies will
9 make this happen unless someone can stop it. I
10 applaud the agencies that said "no" to the request of
11 the cooperating agencies. All government agencies;
12 local, state, and federal, have a mandate to review
13 and analyze all projects and data objectively. How
14 is this accomplished when you start with the process
15 -- Excuse me. How is this accomplished when you
16 start the process with the conclusion first? I hope
17 that the Portland sector of the U.S. Coast Guard has
18 not started with the conclusion first.

19 In my 36 years of working in the
20 maritime industry, I've interacted with the Coast
21 Guard on many occasions; licensing, inspections,
22 regulatory items, search and rescue. All of these,
23 I've been in contact with. I have great respect and
24 admiration for the professionalism and dedication of
25 the U.S. Coast Guard personnel that I've dealt with

1 in the past.

2 On June 14th, the Navigation and
3 Vessel Inspection Circular 05-05 was written. In
4 Section IV it states that this circular was developed
5 to meet an urgent need for a national policy
6 regarding risks and risk management. Unfortunately,
7 this circular does not fulfill this purpose. In
8 section 5J, it's interesting that the Coast Guard
9 feels that the general public does not understand LNG
10 and that the issue could be controversial. But at
11 least it then goes on to declare that the Sandia Lab
12 Report provides an accurate and objective information
13 regarding safety.

14 I hope that the local U.S. Coast
15 Guard decision-makers will use the Sandia Report for
16 their decisions regarding safety security zones, risk
17 management, vessel traffic, and personal safety and
18 not be influenced by corporate wishes.

19 Section 131 of the Sandia Report
20 says risk management strategies for LNG operations
21 should address both vapor dispersion and fire hazards.
22 Therefore, the most rigorous deterring measures, such
23 as vessel security zones, waterway traffic management
24 and the establishment of positive control over vessels
25 is essential in the management process.

1 Both the Coast Guard and Sandia
2 have sections dealing with Zones 1, 2, and 3 of
3 involvement. With the distances mentioned in both
4 documents, how is the U.S. Coast Guard going to
5 provide security during vessel transit on shore when
6 the vessel is closer than the recommended distances?
7 Who pays for the cost of shore-based security? Who
8 will be the shore-based security personnel? We have
9 a shipping channel on the Columbia of 600 feet. In
10 Astoria, Skamokawa, and Puget Island, LNG tankers will
11 be closer than the distance listed in Zone 1. What's
12 the solution for this scenario? Northern Star has
13 told anyone who would listen that LNG tankers will
14 not affect their businesses. They won't disrupt
15 upriver, shipping, and ports of traffic. They won't
16 affect sports and commercial fishing. They won't
17 affect recreational boaters. They won't bother
18 waterfront businesses in Astoria. How can they make
19 these claims? Has the Coast Guard already made a
20 decision regarding exclusion zones?

21 Then we get to the safety aspects
22 of transiting the Columbia River bar and the Columbia
23 River. The Columbia River bar pilots do an excellent
24 job of navigating ships across the treacherous river
25 bar and sometimes foggy, windy, busy river. Asking

1 the pilots if they feel that there is a problem,
2 bring an LNG ship tanker up, is not really an
3 accurate way to determine the issue. Number one,
4 that's their job. Number two, captains have never
5 been known for their humility.

6 Each year, ships do go aground in
7 the Columbia, either by human error or mechanical
8 malfunction. After many years of working in the
9 maritime industry, I do know that stuff happens.

10 For the last few days, the fog on
11 the Columbia River was so thick that on the bridge, a
12 1,000-foot LNG tanker would not be able to see the
13 bow. What do escort vessels do in these situations?
14 What about helicopters?

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Exum, I'm going
16 to ask you to wrap it up now, and you can, of
17 course, submit detailed written comments.

18 MR. EXUM: Okay. I'll just give
19 my last closing paragraph.

20 On closing, my time is up. I ask
21 the Coast Guard to look at the responsibility to
22 protect the lives of the people affected by this
23 project as their first priority. Corporate interest
24 should be a secondary. Large exclusion zones, one-way
25 river traffic are imperative. If LNG is essential to

1 the Pacific Northwest, then the upriver ports, tugboat
2 operators, fishermen and other users will want to do
3 their part to help Northern Star.

4 If you try to appease both
5 corporate interest and public safety, obviously safety
6 will lose out, and we know that the Coast Guard will
7 have succumb to political pressure. The citizens of
8 the lower Columbia are not acceptable to LNG risks.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Exum.
10 The next speaker on the list is Ted Messing.

11 MR. MESSING: My name is Ted
12 Messing, from Brownsmead, Oregon. Messing is spelled
13 M-E-S-S-I-N- G.

14 Less than a year ago, few of us
15 knew what LNG is or its impact on our lives. We
16 were overwhelmed by four proposed sites on our river,
17 but citizens responded by organizing and educating
18 themselves and our neighbors on what the potential
19 impacts would be on our lives and our river. We
20 came to the conclusion that this type of heavy
21 industry is not appropriate for the lower Columbia.

22 We brought Dr. Jerry Havens here to
23 help us see through the lies of the industry and
24 about the safety of LNG. We worked at our kitchen
25 tables. We held meetings at our homes. We paid for

1 signs. We printed education material out of our own
2 pockets.

3 Now it comes down to, we're allowed
4 five minutes to try and convince you that the costs
5 far outweigh the benefits of citing these things on
6 the record. This is an insult to the citizens of
7 this area. I don't understand what is the rush. It
8 seems obvious that this proposal is on a fast track,
9 and this meeting is little more than a token; a means
10 so you can check the box that says you held a public
11 meeting.

12 This LNG terminal will change
13 forever our river and our quality of life. The major
14 dredging that will be required will destroy that part
15 of the estuary and will negatively affect the
16 downstream fragile islands that are wildlife refuges.
17 It will be one more nail in the salmon's coffin. It
18 will be destructive to gillnet fishermen and will
19 destroy several drifts.

20 An LNG terminal will destroy
21 property values of anyone who lives within a few
22 miles of the river, and in particular, within sight
23 of the terminal. Who wants to look at a tank farm?
24 It will set a dangerous precedent of heavy industrial
25 development that will eventually turn our river into

1 an industrial ditch with tank farms along its banks.

2 It is naive to think that you can
3 bring massive tankers over the Columbia River bar and
4 up the narrow ship channel for the next 40 years
5 without some kind of an accident. There have been
6 six barge and ship drownings in this year alone. In
7 1975, as a commercial fisherman, I witnessed an
8 inbound ship lose steering and nearly hit the Astoria
9 Bridge. If this had happened with an LNG ship and
10 it did hit, it would have been catastrophic.

11 I recently watched a special program
12 on CNN titled "Is America Prepared for the Next
13 Disaster?" One statement showed an LNG tanker moving
14 through Boston Harbor where they closed the bridge and
15 had a thousand-yard exclusion zone. The mayor of
16 Boston holds his breath each time a ship comes in.
17 He said, "It's like a bomb ready to set off." He
18 explained that they would have maybe a few minutes
19 warning. And he estimates 100,000 people will die,
20 and there's nothing he can do about it. In the same
21 program, the Coast Guard captain said, "It is very,
22 very unlikely that anything will happen." Well, you
23 can put as many "very, verys" in front of "unlikely,"
24 and it still does not add up to a hundred percent.

25 Dr. Haven's research shows that the

1 zone of destruction that goes with the ships is one
2 mile, with second-degree burns up to three miles. I
3 would like to point out that the ships pass a hundred
4 yards off the Astoria waterfront.

5 I mean no disrespect to the Coast
6 Guard, but you guys cannot possibly control every
7 aspect of moving these massive tankers. You cannot
8 guarantee a hundred percent that there will not be an
9 accident or a terrorist attack in the future. The
10 consequences are huge, but I guess we are just an
11 accepted risk.

12 Once these tankers arrive at
13 Bradwood, they must be turned around and hooked up to
14 the terminal safely and unloaded right at one of the
15 most dangerous curves on the river.

16 I have a fisheries biologist friend
17 who works on the river and has witnessed a small
18 freighter outbound on a strong ebb get spun around
19 there at Bradwood and have to go back up to Longview
20 and turn around and make another run at it. What
21 would be the result if this had happened while an LNG
22 tanker was unloading and there was a collision? This
23 all happens less than 800 yards from the residents of
24 Puget Island. I wonder if you would locate Coast
25 Guard housing there and consider your people

1 acceptable risks.

2 I hope you will review Dr. Havens'
3 conclusions, and then you will understand that
4 Columbia River, with its dangerous bar and narrow,
5 busy ship channel, is no place for these LNG tankers,
6 and Bradwood is not a safe place to site an LNG
7 refinery.

8 The people of Boston are stuck with
9 their situation. Please don't stick it to us. We
10 are not acceptable risks and neither is our river.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
13 Messing. Next speaker on the Coast Guard Commission
14 list is Rob Lowtrip. Is Mr. Lowtrip here?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: No? Then I'll go
17 to the next speaker, who is Dianne Knudsen.

18 MS. KNUDSEN: Good evening. To
19 FERC and the Coast Guard, as well interested parties,
20 I come to you this evening as a Native American and
21 a concerned citizen against the encroachment of our
22 federally protected areas by developers and LNG
23 facilities.

24 This area is irreplaceable. It's
25 an essential habitat for fish and wildlife. In 1972,

1 5,000 acres of pastures, forested tidala and swamps,
2 brush and woodlands, estuaries, marshes and slews both
3 in Oregon and Washington were bought, and eminent
4 domain was used to create what is known as the Lewis
5 and Clark National Game Refuge and the Julia Butler
6 Hansen National Wildlife Refuge. Both of these
7 refuges are considered Habitat I's and have a total
8 of 11 islands within their borders. The Lewis and
9 Clark National Wildlife Refuge is the site of at
10 least two Lewis and Clark historic sites and are
11 recorded as national historic sites. They are
12 protected under the federal laws.

13 One such protection law which states
14 -- and I quote -- "The Department shall apt to
15 protect Category I Habitats to see that no loss of
16 either the habitat quantity or quality and that no
17 authorization of proposed development action will be
18 given." This is Habitat I property. Out of the 11
19 islands, the Tenasillahe Island is the largest and
20 closest to the proposed facility site, where you see
21 it lies well within the smallest of your exclusion
22 zones permitted.

23 How dare you even think about using
24 our national wildlife refuges in arm's way just for
25 the profit of large corporations making billions of

1 dollars for personal greed. Some of our people have
2 already lost their homes and have already -- have
3 been used as property.

4 The federal government, under
5 eminent domain for these national game refuges -- and
6 now you want to jeopardize our endangered species that
7 live on these game reserves. The animals that
8 inhabit these game reserves are Roosevelt elk, otters,
9 various reptiles, painted turtles, (inaudible), blue
10 herons, hawks, and especially our nesting bald eagles
11 and approximately 300 of endangered species Columbian
12 white-tailed deer. During high tide, there's a
13 definite separation of these islands, but at low tide,
14 the sandbars appear. Large ships have run aground
15 along these islands. And we are also concerned for
16 the plant life that exists that the various animals
17 survive on that. And what will all the dredging do
18 to these various habitats? With the vastness of
19 these LNG ships, they will be surrounded by Coast
20 Guard boats, helicopters in the air, and tugboats.
21 All of this noise, especially overhead and et cetera,
22 will endanger the well being of our animals that live
23 in our protected areas. The dredging of Clifton
24 Channel will have severe effects on the estuary,
25 habitat, and wetlands that are part of the protected

1 area.

2 Besides the erosions of the islands,
3 will be double-fold by just the sheer weight
4 displacement of these huge ships. We are losing our
5 shores daily now by the ships that use the Columbia.
6 What about the added churning of the water from the
7 tugboats, the Coast Guard and et cetera? We cannot
8 allow this to happen to our protected national
9 wildlife refuges.

10 I was taught at an early age that
11 we lived on this earth to take care of it and in
12 harmony with it; not to destroy it. Since the white
13 man took our land, we have resigned ourselves to look
14 at national wildlife refuges as something that is
15 supposed to be valued, understood and protected from
16 any harm that might delete the well being of the
17 earth and the animals that are protected on it.

18 So these are my concerns about the
19 LNG facility proposed. Erosion to the federally
20 protected islands and the national refuges, noise
21 pollution from the helicopters, tugs, ships, and
22 facility itself endangering our wildlife and the
23 protected areas, lights at night so close to the
24 national wildlife refuges, dredge spoils to endanger
25 the habitat at the national wildlife refuges,

1 emissions from the proposed facility that could
2 endanger or inhibit the natural order of life, and
3 the tribal fishing rights. And probably the most
4 important, the safety of all of us, including our
5 national wildlife reserves.

6 It's up to all the agencies and
7 commissions to protect them, for it's the lessons of
8 the land and the wildlife that teaches all of us how
9 did to be human beings. You can't take that away
10 from the lower Columbia. I demand you build this
11 offshore.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Ms.
13 Knudsen. The next person on the speaker's list is
14 Barbara Begleries. Is Barbara here? (No response.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: No? All right.
16 Irene Martin? Is Irene here?

17 MS. MARTIN: Good evening. My
18 name is Irene Martin; I-R-E-N-E M-A-R-T-I-N. I am a
19 historian, a writer and Episcopal priest. And I've
20 done -- written several books on the history of the
21 lower Columbia region. I have a number of issues of
22 concern that I've written about, and I do have
23 written testimony that I'll pass in. I want to hit
24 a couple of the highlights, however, based on
25 tonight's presentations and also on a couple of

1 concerns that have arisen for me.

2 In particular, I'm most interested
3 in fisheries. And what has prompted me to focus on
4 that tonight is that I read the Draft Resource Report
5 No. 5 on Socioeconomics from September 2nd, 2005, and
6 noticed some glaring errors and omissions regarding
7 fisheries. On page 4 of that report, for example,
8 the misunderstanding regarding the role of the SAFE
9 areas fisheries needs to be corrected. These
10 fisheries are carried on in the locales mentioned in
11 the report, but they are in addition to the gillnet
12 fishery that occurs in the mainstem Columbia River.
13 The SAFE areas are only part of the fisheries of the
14 Columbia River. And part of the reason I'm bringing
15 this up is that I really have some concern about this
16 because there have been several meetings with
17 fishermen. I have passed in information. I took a
18 tour; led a tour with the Oregon Department of
19 Energy. There has been ample opportunity to find out
20 what the fisheries of this area are, and I'm really
21 quite amazed the only one that appeared in there was
22 the SAFE areas and there was nothing on the mainstem.

23 So what I did was, bring in a map
24 with me. And there's a copy for the Coast Guard and
25 a copy for the FERC of the direct gillnet areas, as

1 published by CREST some years ago, so I have copies
2 for you of that.

3 The other thing I wanted to mention
4 to you is that there will be an economic study on
5 the Columbia River fisheries by Dr. Hans Radtke and
6 Shannon Davis of The Research Group. And that study
7 is currently in process with a target date of
8 completion for December 31st. I would urge Northern
9 Star to consult those figures when available, and
10 also, the material that I provided the Oregon
11 Department of Energy in May, to redraft this portion
12 of the Socioeconomic Report.

13 The LNG site is adjacent to Clifton
14 Channel and the main channel, which have traditional
15 fishing grounds and drift rights associated with them.
16 Please note, by the way, regarding the map that I
17 mentioned, that several drift right areas actually do
18 not appear on that map, including the ones from
19 Clifton Channel. And those will need to be
20 specifically addressed by the applicant.

21 There are commercial salmon
22 fisheries with their associated drift rights carried
23 out adjacent to the entire navigation channel along
24 which the LNG ships will be traveling. For further
25 information on drift rights, I do have a book called

1 "Legacy and Testament," which I wrote on the story of
2 Columbia River gillnetters. I am leaving a copy with
3 you. The Oregon Department of Energy also has a
4 copy.

5 Consideration of the impact of LNG
6 vessel traffic on commercial fisheries and development
7 of a plan as to how such fisheries will operate will
8 be needed, and I would strongly recommend you do some
9 background reading on this.

10 There are several ESA listed stocks
11 of salmonids that pass through the river and Clifton
12 Channel annually, both in their adult upstream
13 migration and in their juvenile migration downstream.
14 Water temperature fluctuations, either heating or
15 cooling, due to the LNG plant which alter water
16 temperatures outside of the range in which fish can
17 live, will have an adverse impact on these stocks.
18 In addition, Bugby Hole, which is a well-known
19 sturgeon area and a spawning area for smelt, is
20 upstream of the site, and will be subject to any
21 changes in the water caused by the plant due to the
22 daily tidal effect. I would strongly urge an
23 assessment of thermal and water quality and other
24 potential impacts on fish and fisheries. That's my
25 fish part.

1 And since I have a little more
2 time, I'm going to hit a couple of other highlights.
3 In particular, I am concerned about the earthquake
4 issues. And so, what I brought with me are a couple
5 of studies by Mr. Earthquake himself, Brian Atwater.
6 One of which was done on Hunting Island, which is
7 within two miles of the site which basically studies
8 the great Cascadia earthquakes, the last of which hit
9 the area in 1700. They usually arrive in periods of
10 three- to five-hundred years. So, it could be
11 anytime; it could be a couple hundred years away.

12 I have brought the studies with me.
13 I'm not going to bore you with the gory details of
14 this, but I do think that these should be required
15 reading. And some addressing of the issues of the
16 geological and earthquake issues should be looked at
17 by the applicant.

18 Those are my main issues. There
19 is one other geological issue. In 1965, cliff
20 failure on property near the proposed site created a
21 landslide that went into the Columbia River and
22 resulted in a tsunami on adjacent Puget Island in
23 which at least one person lost his life and property
24 damage occurred.

25 Again, I would look to the

1 historical record. I've referenced a newspaper
2 article on this tsunami that you might want to take a
3 look at to get an idea of some of the other hazards
4 for the area.

5 In closing, I'd like to thank you
6 for coming here tonight for this hearing. I think
7 that there is ample material out there of historical
8 and scientific interest, which should be referred to
9 by the applicant. I've done my bit to provide you
10 with some of it, but there's a fair amount out there
11 as well. I urge you to consult the bibliographies
12 and the various materials that I'm passing you, and
13 take a look through some of these materials that are
14 there. Because, as the reports exist, now that I
15 have read, they need a tremendous amount of upgrading.
16 Thank you very much.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Ms.
18 Martin. Then next speaker is Ms. Sandra Davis. Is
19 Ms. Davis here?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: No? Garland Budd.
22 Is Mr. Budd here? Yes, he is.

23 MR. BUDD: My name is Garland
24 Budd. That's B-U-D-D, is the last name. And I'm a
25 resident of Puget Island, right across from the

1 proposed site, at Broadway.

2 I appreciate all of the people that
3 came here tonight to take your busy time off. It
4 looks like there's at least over 400 people here.
5 And I'm addressing the security issue.

6 Suicidal terrorists exist all over
7 the world. Thousands of attacks occur every year in
8 Iraq, Afghanistan, and Palestine. Some of the later
9 attacks have been in peaceful countries, such as
10 Holland, Spain, and England. In the past few years,
11 we have been hit twice at the World Trade Center and
12 once at the Pentagon. One other attempt, which
13 resulted in a downed commercial airline, and one
14 home-grown terrorist who blew up the Federal Building
15 in Oklahoma. Terrorists who are willing to strap it
16 on and blow themselves up can be civilians and
17 citizens of those countries or infiltrators from
18 fanatical areas.

19 The United States borders are not
20 well protected or guarded. A recent Oregonian
21 newspaper article states there is an increase of
22 illegal immigrants this year. There are now more
23 illegal than legal immigrants coming in to the United
24 States. It has been documents that known terrorist
25 collaborators are helping move unknown persons from

1 suspect countries across the United States' border
2 from Mexico. We do not know who, where, or how many
3 potential terrorists there are in America.

4 There are many boats on the
5 Columbia River that can go 50 to 60 miles an hour
6 and a few that can even go faster. What chance does
7 the Coast Guard or anyone else have of stopping an
8 explosive laden boat? Imagine fifty caliber and 20
9 mm cannons firing toward Puget Island if a speeding
10 boat turned toward an LNG ship. Also, a small plane
11 from any one of numerous private runways could find
12 its way to an LNG target. That's two similar, simple
13 scenarios, but here is one that's even simpler: What
14 would prevent a terrorist from being dropped off on
15 the Dike Road of West Puget Island across from
16 Bradwood site where the trees and brush are thick and
17 opening up with a rifle or rocket- propelled grenade
18 launcher? And this time, if Northern Star succeeds,
19 Ben Laden and the boys won't have to bring fuel.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Budd.
21 The next on the list is W.G. Dragish. Is Mr.
22 Dragish here?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: No? All right.
25 Next is Carol Carver.

1 MS. CARVER: My name is Carol
2 Carver; C-A- R -- V as in Victor -- E-R. I will
3 direct the first part of my remarks to FERC and the
4 second part to the Coast Guard.

5 My husband and I moved to the west
6 end of Puget Island 28 years ago drawn by the beauty,
7 the quite, the garden-friendly climate and the intense
8 stars at night. We've raised all of our own
9 vegetables and fruits since we moved there. We
10 believe in what is now called "community-supported
11 agriculture," buying our eggs and chicken or turkey,
12 lamb, and Columbia River salmon from local farmers and
13 fishermen. Our children grew up playing on the beach
14 in front of our house. We made sacrifices to live
15 on Puget Island. My husband worked away from home
16 six months a year, as do many in the County and
17 around here in maritime and fishing industries. Our
18 home and property did not appreciate for 18 years.
19 And we haven't wanted to live anywhere else. We've
20 been looking forward to grandchildren playing on our
21 beach. And when I think of these grandchildren
22 playing downwind to Bradwood exposed to the
23 possibility of flame thermal radiation burns as
24 described in the DEGADIS model of the LNG CFR, unable
25 to have time to seek protection inside from the heat,

1 it makes me sick to my stomach.

2 The proposal for an LNG terminal at
3 Bradwood absolutely threatens the lifestyle that we
4 had hoped to soon share with grandchildren. If
5 you've never lived around the water, you may be
6 unaware the water seems to amplify and easily transmit
7 noise. The noise of construction, the warning of
8 vessels, of tugs, of all the Coast Guard security
9 boats and possibly helicopters that will be needed, an
10 operation of the terminal itself will shatter the
11 peace in Puget Island. The noise will be further
12 amplified and focused on Puget Island by land
13 formations that cup Bradwood on three Oregon sides of
14 the site, opening up directly to Puget Island.
15 Northern Star refers to this land feature in the
16 Report No. 10 to curb as, quote, "Natural visual
17 screen, preventing Oregon residents from seeing a
18 proposed terminal."

19 When asked about lights at a
20 Cathlamet meeting, a Northern Star representative
21 regretfully admitted that we would lose the night sky
22 because the facility would need to be brightly lit
23 24/7. This facility belongs offshore for both safety
24 and lifestyle reasons, or as a last resort, an
25 industrial park also completely remote by miles from

1 any residents.

2 Northern Star's report to FERC, No.
3 5, Socioeconomic Report, also states that the
4 estimated population within a one-mile radius of the
5 terminal property boundary is less than 20, based on
6 eight homes they identify from what must have been a
7 very old aerial photograph. There are actually 26
8 homes and two apartments within a mile of Bradwood at
9 the end of Puget Island, four lots that have been
10 sold and had building plans and more lots for sale.
11 The report also states that the property values have
12 already been impacted by a nearby industrial site
13 failing to mention that there's been no heavy
14 industrial activity at Bradwood since 1962.

15 If Bradwood is approved as an LNG
16 terminal, other heavy industry will be clamoring to
17 site nearby. Wahkiakum County's comprehensive plan
18 calls for preserving the world scenic character in the
19 estuary. An LNG terminal at Bradwood clearly does
20 not fit that plan.

21 By way of this comment, I'm
22 specifically asking that FERC staff fully evaluate an
23 offshore site in this region as an alternative in the
24 EIS.

25 Speaking out at the Coast Guard,

1 the main river channel between Puget Island and
2 Bradwood is narrow. It is the site of a lot of
3 river activity; wave runners, speedboats, sailboats,
4 kayaks, commercial ship traffic that often has to be
5 pretty insistent to move the smaller vessels out of
6 the way and commercial fishermen. Most of the
7 forementioned 28 residents are right on the river
8 within a half a mile to three-quarters of a mile from
9 Bradwood with the homes right on the end of the
10 island less than a half a mile from the proposed
11 site.

12 When an LNG ship is in the narrow
13 channel, that will place Puget Island residents in
14 Zone 1 of the Sandia Report zones of concern that the
15 guidance on assessing the suitability of a waterway
16 for LNG marine traffic says you should base your
17 decisions upon.

18 How are you going to be able to
19 square your mandate in a waterway assessment with
20 Northern Star's boats that Bradwood will not impinge
21 on commercial ship traffic and other river uses? LNG
22 ships are planned to come and go twice weekly.

23 If we must suffer this menace as a
24 neighbor, we demand the same exclusion zones that
25 Sandia Zone 1 commands in other areas, and that will

1 impact other commercial and recreational users.

2 The waterway assessment guide
3 _____ on page 13, for members of the general
4 public to be included in the Coast Guard Captains of
5 Port/Federal Maritime Security Coordinator's group.

6 I am specifically asking in this
7 comment that the Coast Guard follow through with this
8 and place local citizens knowledgeable about commercial
9 fishing and ship traffic on the river in this group.
10 And by this, I do not need a politician or an
11 appointed bureaucrat. The Coast Guard is charged on
12 page 18 of the guidance circular with asking
13 themselves what can go wrong. And some answers are
14 terrorism, including hijacking of vessels, small boat
15 attack, as happened with the Cole, rocket- propelled
16 grenade launchers, which have already been mentioned,
17 which can be launched from anywhere along the 38
18 miles the vessel will need to travel and that cannot
19 possibly be diligently patrolled.

20 Aircraft attack, underwater attack
21 at the dock, sabotage, human navigation error,
22 earthquakes, tsunamis, collisions, grounding; any of
23 which could lead to a pool fire from a spill near an
24 ignition source or a vapor cloud flash fire.

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Ms. Carver, your

1 time is up.

2 MS. CARVER: Two sentences. --
3 that could reach the less than three miles from
4 Bradwood to Wahkiakum schools and the St. James Family
5 Center and Preschool, where together, nearly all the
6 children of Wahkiakum County are located during the
7 day. Our children are not an LNG acceptable risk.

8 Thank you for this opportunity to
9 comment. And I will submit my comments in writing.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Ms.
11 Carver. Next speaker is Frans Eykel.

12 MR. EYKEL: Good evening. My name
13 is Frans Eykel. Frans with an S, last name
14 E-Y-K-E-L.

15 My main concern is safety of the
16 vessels negotiating the Columbia River. And in my
17 opinion, this is an accident waiting to happen, due
18 to the nature of the cargo and the area of operation.
19 If security zones and thermal radiation zones are set
20 unrealistically, there will be no place in the
21 Columbia for LNG carriers. What will be the thermal
22 radiation zone of a vessel in transit? What are the
23 security zones for the receiving thermal? What about
24 enroute obstacles like a bridge; the Astoria bridge,
25 the Astoria waterfront? How can you guarantee the

1 safety of the people and their properties? What
2 about the residents of Puget Island and Cathlamet, as
3 these are -- Are these people an acceptable risk?
4 Some residents are within half a mile from the
5 proposed site. With the prevailing westerly wind we
6 have during the summer months, exposure during an
7 event is inevitable for people and property on Puget
8 Island and Cathlamet.

9 Why is there not a national
10 standard for exclusion zones? They could be -- They
11 could be created -- Excuse me. Could it be that the
12 U.S. Coast Guard creates the rules to accommodate the
13 corporate need rather than the safety of citizens and
14 properties?

15 My next concern is the environment.
16 The proposed site and its surroundings is located in
17 a pristine area of recreational use; pleasure crafts,
18 kayaking, marine camping, sport fishing. Across from
19 the Clifton Channel is Tenasillahe Island National
20 Wildlife Refuge, which is habitat to Columbia
21 white-tailed deer, eagle, and since last year, the
22 Caspian tern. Ospreys are quite common around there,
23 too, as you read in the resource draft from the
24 Northern Star.

25 When a receiving dock is in place

1 with an LNG carrier transferring product to the
2 facilities, half of the channel will be occupied by
3 the dock and the ship. With a greater need of
4 natural gas, the ship -- the facility will expand to
5 a 3-tank farm, ships will be larger and more
6 frequent. With current ships laid up of over 1,200
7 feet and 50 meters on the beam, which is 165 feet,
8 that will totally close off the Clifton Channel for
9 any other use but LNG.

10 As far as the future, my hope is
11 that one's good sense prevails and we pass the
12 pristine area to our next generation. Thank you.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
14 Eykel. Garlon Bride. Mr. Bride?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Mike
17 Walker.

18 CAPTAIN WALKER: Good evening. My
19 name is Mike Walker, and I'm port captain for Foss
20 Maritime Company here in the Columbia River region.

21 I'm speaking in support of a
22 proposed Bradwood Landing LNG receiving and storage
23 facility. Let me begin by saying that the maritime
24 industry and the tug companies in particulars have in
25 place the experience, the expertise and equipment to

1 safely handle the LNG vessels that would call up the
2 proposed Bradwood location.

3 Speaking in particular for Foss
4 Maritime Company; my company has over 150 years
5 experience escorting and assisting ships in highly
6 environmentally-sensitive areas. These areas include
7 the Alaskan waters, the straights of Juan de Fuca,
8 both northern and southern Puget Sound, San Francisco,
9 the L.A. Long Beach Harbors, the Columbia and the
10 Willamette Rivers as well as the Columbia and
11 Willamette Rivers as well the Columbia and the
12 Caribbean waters. We have, also, a long history of
13 working with the federal and state governments and the
14 U.S. Coast Guard to ensure that the equipment being
15 used meets or exceeds the regulations put forth by
16 our governmental agencies and international maritime
17 organizations.

18 I feel it's important that the
19 people understand there are federal, state, and local
20 government regulations in place that provide the
21 maritime industry with the guidelines to ensure the
22 best achievable protection and technologies are used
23 to help protect the safety of the people and the
24 environment.

25 The people working in the maritime

1 industry understand that safety and environmental
2 issues with the LNG are extremely important. From
3 the maritime perspective, I want you to know that we
4 can and will do everything in our expertise to ensure
5 a safe passage for these LNG vessels. Thank you.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
7 Walker. Next on the list, Richard Beck. Mr. Beck
8 here?

9 MR. BECK: Yep. Richard Beck;
10 B-E-C-K.

11 I'll try to be brief. I am a
12 resident of Puget Island. I have a bachelor of
13 science from Evergreen State College. More
14 importantly, I grew up in Camas. I attended high
15 school in Cathlamet. I currently reside on Puget
16 Island with my family, and I more or less consider
17 myself a part of the Columbia River.

18 At 10:54 a.m. on February 28th,
19 2001, an earthquake of magnitude 6.8 occurred beneath
20 the Nisqually River delta in southern Puget Sound. I
21 happened to be shopping at a Home Depot about five
22 miles from the epicenter at that moment -- which was
23 always kind a nightmare of mine, and it's funny what
24 goes through you mind when the building you're in
25 starts bouncing up and down. Fortunately, we all got

1 out safely; though the damage to the area was quite
2 extensive. My wife and 5-year-old daughter were at
3 our home on Puget Island during that quake. They
4 made the decision to ride it out outside on the lawn.
5 Although quite far from the epicenter, Puget Island
6 was dramatically affected by the Nisqually quake, due
7 to the tendency of sediments to magnify seismic waves.
8 My wife reported the ground rolled like being on the
9 ocean. Our hedge undulated like a snake. In the
10 house, dishes clattered in the cupboard and
11 bookshelves on the top floor collapsed.

12 Had the earthquake been an order of
13 magnitude larger, shaking of the sediments might well
14 have resulted in waterspouts shooting up in our yard,
15 as well as fissures opening up, perhaps even with
16 structures dropping into them; all well- documented
17 phenomena in quakes of that size. But even these
18 might pale beside what may potentially be in store
19 for us in the near future.

20 Our region sits atop a zone of
21 convergence known as the Cascadia subduction zone,
22 where the Juan de Fuca plate is constantly being
23 pushed underneath the North America plate upon which
24 we live. This subduction is not always a smooth
25 process. The two plates tend to get caught on each

1 other, and pressure builds until finally they break
2 free with an accompanying release of energy in the
3 form of a huge earthquake, possible accompanied by
4 tsunamis.

5 The paper I have submitted with my
6 remarks provides evidence such pressure is currently
7 reaching high levels directly beneath us. The shock
8 wave which accompanies the release of these plates has
9 been demonstrated to have been over magnitude 9 in
10 earthquakes which occurred prior to the arrival of
11 western civilization here; the most recent one being
12 in January of 1700. The frequency of these large
13 subduction zones around here averages one every 3 to
14 600 years. So by this measure, we are also due for
15 another one.

16 What might we expect to happen in
17 an earthquake of this magnitude? I've already
18 mentioned the liquefaction of sediments such as those
19 around the LNG storage facility and terminal. Equally
20 possible is the collapse of cliffs along the river,
21 including the one directly upriver from Bradwood,
22 which has collapsed in the recent past. The
23 subduction geology of our region is also responsible
24 for another unique situation; the Columbia River is
25 constrained by mountains which are uplifting around it

1 at a rate of roughly 1/2 inch per year. This
2 results in the river flowing more forcefully through
3 this area than it would, were it free to meander in
4 a wide floodplain in the normal fashion of rivers
5 near their outlet. Any number of effects of a
6 magnitude 8.5 or 9 earthquake, such as slides into
7 the river upstream or the collapse or spillage of
8 water from dams could result in a tremendous and
9 sudden additional increase in the river's flow. The
10 cliffs at Bradwood are already a site where the river
11 slams into the bank on the Oregon side with
12 tremendous force. In a great earthquake, it is quite
13 conceivable that the river could end up cutting a new
14 channel straight through the Bradwood site as it seeks
15 a more direct route to its mouth.

16 Geologically and hydrologically,
17 the facility proposed at Bradwood could hardly be in
18 a more dangerous place on the entire river, although
19 none of the sites under consideration are free from
20 at least some of the same types of danger. If an
21 LNG terminal is determined to be necessary for this
22 region, consideration should probably be given to an
23 offshore facility, where the risk to human life,
24 commerce, and the environment could be minimized.

25 The Indonesian tsunami of December

1 26 as well as the recent hurricanes on the Gulf Coast
2 demonstrate how powerless we can be before natural
3 phenomena. We should feel fortunate that we have had
4 these lessons before we committed to an inadvisable,
5 hard-to-reverse course of action, such as being
6 considered here.

7 Speaking for my family, who could
8 lose everything, including our lives in an LNG
9 catastrophe, I urge you not to allow this facility
10 here. Remember that in the long run, there is no
11 such thing as being lucky.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Beck.
13 Next on the list is Ben Bartlett. Mr. Bartlett?

14 MR. BARTLETT: Good evening. Thank
15 you for this opportunity. My name is Ben Bartlett,
16 and that's spelled B-A-R-T-L-E-T-T.

17 I've lived here all my life, and
18 then I married. I have friends on both sides of
19 this issue. I'm a school board member and I sit on
20 a law enforcement board, been a volunteer fireman for
21 over 20 years. But I'm speaking on my own and not
22 for any board members.

23 I believe you make the best
24 decisions when you use the best information available.
25 Some of my friends are full of fear about this issue.

1 Some of my friends get this information from those
2 who oppose this project. I would be fearful if I
3 only relied on opposition for information. Last May,
4 I made a trip through Warrenton and saw, firsthand,
5 my first group of protesters on the LNG. A man was
6 dressed there in a lifejacket, he had a hard hat on,
7 and he had a sign saying "Entering blast zone."
8 Later on, our local newspaper did an article and had
9 a picture of the same situation. In that, there's a
10 quote from one of the protesters. "It's like four
11 atomic bombs on your front porch." This bothers me,
12 that I have friends that are full of fear. I
13 question: What is this blast zone? Who said it?
14 What are they talking about? I determined I needed
15 to know more about this LNG.

16 To become better informed, I
17 obtained a copy of "FERC's Guide to LNG: What All
18 Citizens Should Know." Before you form an opinion on
19 this, I think you should review this document.

20 Concerning LNG and its safety -- or
21 -- LNG, it asks a question: "Is LNG explosive?"
22 Their response: "LNS is not at all explosive or
23 flammable in its liquid state." Concerning the safety
24 record, it states, "LNG has been delivered across the
25 oceans for more than 45 years without major accidents

1 or safety problems. No serious accidents involving an
2 LNG terminal facility in the U.S. has happened in
3 over 45 years." Concerning shipping safety, it
4 states, "During more than 33,000 voyages complete
5 since the inception of LNG maritime transportation in
6 1959, there have been only eight significant incidents
7 involving LNG ships, none of which resulted in a
8 spill from cargo tank ruptures."

9 I have one request of the Coast
10 Guard. If at all possible, if the deliveries of LNG
11 could be done at night, it would be less disruptive
12 to the people; the users of the Columbia River. And
13 it's my understanding that an empty ship does not
14 need this exclusion zones or these concerns so they
15 could exit just like any other ship.

16 And today, I met up with another
17 friend. He's a commercial fisherman, and he's the
18 closest Oregon resident to the Bradwood site. I
19 asked how he felt about the siting of an LNG terminal
20 at Bradwood, and he said, "I hope they let them build
21 it. I agree with this neighbor to the Bradwood
22 site."

23 And I want you to do your
24 homework, and I have confidence in you to make it
25 safe, and let them deal with it. Thank you.

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Thank
2 you, Mr. Bartlett. Next on the speaker's list is
3 Robert Pyle.

4 MR. PYLE: Captain Gerrity, and
5 colleagues. I'm Robert M. Pyle, a biologist and a
6 writer -- P-Y-L-E -- of Grays River, Wahkiakum County,
7 speaking as a private citizen and I'm also speaking
8 for my wife, Tia, who's a botanist.

9 Thank you for the opportunity to be
10 heard. Other speakers will, and have, addressed
11 important aspects of this proposal, including security
12 and terrorism threats, the economics, the fallacy of
13 significant job creation, particularly in Washington,
14 and disruption of river traffic for fishers,
15 recreationists, and others.

16 I wish to address three particular
17 environmental points: 1) The profound nature of
18 change that LNG would bring; 2) The threat to the
19 human community; and 3) The threat to the biological
20 community.

21 First, the nature of change. Let
22 us make no mistake and have no illusions. If this
23 LNG facility goes ahead, the rural and natural setting
24 of the lower Columbia will be changed radically and
25 for all practical purposes, forever.

1 Last weekend I took the Lewis and
2 Clark Explorer Train all along the affected shoreline,
3 including the Bradwood site itself. All the way from
4 Tongue Point to the Wauna Mill, the shoreline and
5 near-shore environment is one of rural beauty and
6 natural diversity and agricultural that works, still,
7 to some extent. This goes for the opposite shore in
8 Washington as well. The years of construction noise,
9 dust, light, truck traffic, and general disruption
10 followed by a perpetuity of industrial activity and
11 24-hour high-intensity lighting and noise would utterly
12 alter the nature of the place and the way of life
13 for miles around. Soon, the pressure would intensify
14 to concentrate additional heavy industry in the
15 corridor. If people want this magnificent shoreline
16 to resemble Longview as seen from Rainier, rather than
17 the rural, agricultural, and aquatic wonderland it now
18 is, then they should support LNG at Bradwood.
19 Acceptance of this plan would change everything for
20 the worse and for the rest of our lives and those of
21 our children and theirs.

22 Second, the threat to the human
23 community. We've all heard the figures for the zone
24 of incineration and for secondary burns from Dr.
25 Havens and others. But many people assume that an

1 LNG explosion would never happen. The likelihood can
2 be debated, but the possibility remains. And one big
3 word I did not hear uttered from the people telling
4 us about the project at the beginning tonight was the
5 very large word "yet" Y-E-T.

6 The company will buy out or buy
7 off anyone, any interest, any objection they can.
8 But what of those who remain? How can the perpetual
9 stress of living with the threat of instant holocaust
10 be mollified or fixed? It cannot. The people of
11 Bellingham, Washington, thought they were perfectly
12 safe from accidents along the Olympic Pipeline. But
13 when the pipe ruptured and a bombing wall of gas
14 spewed down the streambed of Whatcom Creek and then
15 ignited, three boys were burned to death, and an
16 entire ecosystem was baked beyond function. Any
17 advocates of an LNG terminal at Bradwood should be
18 required to study the tragedy of Whatcom Creek in all
19 its grim detail, for an accident here would be vastly
20 greater in magnitude and tragic outcome.

21 With accidental ignition of LNG on
22 the Columbia -- and it does ignite under certain
23 circumstances; we do know that in the altered state
24 that liquid and gas frequently exchanges -- the deaths
25 and dire burns would be many more than those three

1 unutterably unlucky lads in Bellingham.

2 Third, and finally, the threat to
3 the rest of the biological community. The Bradwood
4 terminal site lies adjacent to sensitive wetlands
5 still graced with abundant stands of Wapato, one of
6 the Chinooks' primary food sources and an indicator of
7 intact riparian conditions. The construction could
8 not be conducted without extreme damage to these
9 wetlands. Any attempt at mitigation would likely
10 result in a watery wasteland dominated by reed canary
11 grass and purple loosestrife, both of which
12 (inaudible) and invasive plants are encouraged by such
13 disturbance. More important, the site lies in close
14 proximity to two major national wildlife refuges; the
15 Lewis and Clark and the Julia Butler Hansen Refuge
16 for the Columbia white-tailed deer. As a biologist
17 familiar with these refuges, I believe that the
18 construction, operation, and servicing of the Bradwood
19 LNG terminal would certainly impact these refuges and
20 their residents to their detriment. River otters and
21 many other Columbia creatures are already seriously
22 stressed by pollutants, and this major new facility
23 would be bound to exacerbate their plight.

24 A nature conservancy reserve
25 currently protects an important riparian remnant at

1 the tip of Puget Island immediately opposite Bradwood.
2 Heavy industrial activity across the narrow channel
3 cannot help but impair this preserve and its function.
4 The 24-hour high intensity lighting at the terminal,
5 aside from ruining the night sky for the residents of
6 Puget Island, would have negative impacts on bats,
7 moths, and migratory birds, and very likely on the
8 circadian activities of other wildlife as well. And,
9 of course, an explosive incident at the terminal would
10 devastate all the area's wildlife resources.

11 As citizens of the lower Columbia
12 who care about our human neighbors, and as biologists
13 for the deep concern for the animals and plants of
14 the estuary, we urge those responsible to reject this
15 terribly dangerous and spectacularly inappropriate
16 proposal, with all our hearts. Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pyle.
18 Next is Phil Massey. Phil Massey?

19 CAPTAIN MASSEY: Thank you for the
20 opportunity to speak tonight. I'm Captain Phillip
21 Massey; M-A-S-S-E-Y, and that's spelled with two l's.

22 I'm with the Columbia River Pilot's
23 Association based out of Portland. And our group has
24 no position on anything other than -- at this point
25 in time -- anything other than the safe navigation of

1 these vessels going to this site or some other site.

2 With that being said, though, I
3 would like harken back to a comment made by an
4 earlier speaker about the humility -- or I think it
5 was lack thereof -- of pilots. I think he was
6 talking specifically about bar pilots. And while I,
7 understandably, can't comment on that, my group
8 consists of 45 of the best-trained, most-experienced,
9 finest ship handlers in the world. And every single
10 one of them are humble.

11 With that being said, in all
12 actuality, as we've mentioned time and time again --
13 and a lot of you are familiar faces -- for the past
14 12 or 15 years we've been anticipating channel
15 deepening. And we pointed out that our safety record
16 is one of the finest in the world. And the ships
17 that Northern Star is talking about do not intimidate
18 us in the least. For many years, particularly when
19 we had the largest dry dock in the world in Portland,
20 we handled many ships; longer, wider, and much less
21 manageable than the ones that Northern Star are
22 talking about.

23 I know you guys have all done your
24 homework, so I'm not going to try and tell you that
25 piloting is perfect. You won't be able to quote me

1 chapter and verse about the incidences that we've had
2 over the decades. But I can stand here and tell you
3 in all honesty that we have never had -- never had
4 an instance with any ship that would have endangered
5 the cargo of the ships that Northern Star is talking
6 about. We've never had an incident that would've
7 even gotten to the inner hull.

8 For our purposes, a ship is a
9 ship. We take the same care with a ship loaded with
10 soybeans as we would take with a ship loaded with
11 LNG. We see, as a very definite plus, the support
12 vessels and the huge tugs by weight. We do our work
13 now with tugs that are literally 30 percent of the
14 horsepower that's being talked about to berth and
15 unberth these ships and escort them.

16 And talking about humility, my
17 friend previously spoke about -- from Foss -- spoke
18 about the good equipment that Foss and the other
19 companies have. They also have some of the finest,
20 if not the finest, tugboat operators in the world.
21 The people around here are just expert. And many of
22 them come out -- you know this, because they come
23 from your communities; Astoria, Clatskanie, Rainier,
24 Longview. And we have fantastic talent in this area
25 in handling ships.

1 The ships can make this transit
2 safely, and that's our position. We have no position
3 on the routing of the pipeline, the security of the
4 operation, the site and so on. Our understanding is
5 is that the actual layout of the dock; the transit to
6 and from the dock is still being discussed. We have
7 no doubt that these ships can be put in to and taken
8 away from this dock safely.

9 I would like to put to rest -- and
10 I know I won't be able to -- But for the time being,
11 I would like to put to rest the concern that these
12 ships are an accident looking for a place to happen.
13 They aren't. They are far better than anything that
14 we've known in the past. My personal position has
15 been with channel deepening as it is with LNG is, I
16 support any industry that invites a better class of
17 ships. And the economy is supported by state-of-
18 the-art ships, and the environment is protected by
19 state-of-the-art ships. Thank you very much.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Next on
21 the list is Dan Serres.

22 MR. SERRES: I'll start with FERC.
23 A couple comments. First (inaudible) is not for the
24 general purpose of gathering comments on the general
25 benefits or costs of this project. And you'd have to

1 get a copy of the whole start of the meeting to do
2 that. So, respectfully, I disagree with you just
3 based on what's happened so far.

4 I would encourage the FERC to
5 consider undertaking programmatic EIS, based on --
6 based on many of the reasons that, actually, Mr.
7 Coppedge talked about regarding some of the regional
8 and national energy issues. There's been a lot of
9 debate about those things. I noticed Mr. Coppedge
10 quoted a lot of, you know, regional and national
11 figures. And if we're going to talk about the need
12 for LNG on a regional and national scale, we need to
13 analyze alternatives on that scale as well. And I
14 think through the programmatic EIS is possibly a way
15 to do that, and I would encourage for them to take
16 that seriously.

17 I'll address the rest of this to
18 the Coast Guard. I went through the circular that
19 you've referenced in your talk, Captain Gerrity. And
20 there's a couple things that concern me. First, the
21 timing of your process is going to be important. The
22 Coast Guard should not issue a suitability letter of
23 recommendation until it's completed to the satisfaction
24 of this community and emergency response plan. The
25 circular talks in a lot of detail about having

1 experts who have navigational expertise. And it's
2 important, also, to have people who have expertise in
3 the consequences of a possible accident. And I
4 encourage you to look at that seriously and have that
5 in place before a letter of recommendation is issued.
6 Otherwise, it might be putting the cart before the
7 horse, and it could be very difficult for any of the
8 public to have confidence in emergency response
9 capabilities that weren't specifically outlined.

10 Furthermore, I think that people in
11 this room, many from over in (inaudible), many from
12 Puget Island, should be participants in that process
13 because they're going to have to be stakeholders.
14 Well, they are stakeholders and they're going to have
15 to be participants in any emergency response. So
16 they have a need to understand how those things,
17 however unlikely they unfold. So I would encourage
18 the Coast Guard to identify stakeholders and identify
19 them broadly, including many property owners nearby.
20 Obviously, neighbors should be included.

21 In general, I think it's important
22 for the Coast Guard to accurately assess the
23 consequences of a possible accident and you should
24 use, as your basis, the Sandia Report, which, you
25 know, sort of immediately contravenes the spirit of

1 the, quote, "LNG is nonexplosive and nonflammable in
2 its liquid state." That's true, but it's diesel
3 fuel, right? And it's the vapors that burn. And
4 there's no reason they would have written a huge
5 report like the Sandia 2004 Report if LNG posed no
6 safety risk whatsoever. It's misleading and it's
7 disingenuous for the FERC to produce documents like
8 that. And I would encourage the Coast Guard to take
9 a different tactic in how they assess this.

10 Let's see. What else do we have?
11 I think that by assessing those consequences directly,
12 you're going to see that -- a diminishment of
13 economic, environmental, and the public safety
14 integrity of the area. And I would encourage the
15 Coast Guard to find the waterway emphatically
16 unsuitable.

17 Lastly, I would point to one thing
18 in the circular that I saw that kind of concerned me.
19 You said that you're not an expert in the LNG
20 industry or in the energy and all things regarding
21 energy. And I commend you for having that honesty.
22 That's good. And many of us aren't. However, the
23 circular also included at the end -- and I think it
24 was an enclosure -- I don't know what page -- a
25 statement that was -- I'll just quote it. It said,

1 "This is a possible record decision statement." This
2 is sort of an example of something you could say.
3 In this case, my preferred alternative is to find the
4 waterway suitable. This is necessitated by the
5 nation's need for energy, which propels me to choose
6 an alternative other than the environmental
7 (inaudible.) And the nation's need for energy has no
8 bearing on -- in my opinion, on the Coast Guard's
9 determination of whether these ships can navigate the
10 channel safely or not. And so, I would encourage you
11 not to include any of that information or any of that
12 in your decision. I don't think it has a place
13 there. I think that you've accurately stated that
14 your position is one of assessing safety and security.
15 And I encourage you to do that and to leave the
16 larger scale energy questions to a programmatic EIS
17 done by the FERC, which is obviously necessary.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Next on
20 the list is Karin Temple. Karin Temple.

21 MS. TEMPLE: My name is Karin
22 Temple; that's K-A-R-I-N. And you have asked for
23 comments from the public or from stakeholders, and I
24 consider myself a stakeholder in this area as a
25 resident of 31 years; 35 of them in (inaudible) and

1 six in Astoria, presently. I'm one of many who have
2 researched these issues and I am convinced that the
3 LNG on this river cannot be considered safe; not safe
4 for communities, not safe for the salmon. We're
5 trying to protect. Not safe for the environment, not
6 safe for other maritime traveling, commercial or
7 recreational, not safe for visitors, et cetera, et
8 cetera, et cetera.

9 Even if we are spared a disaster;
10 nature- made disaster, we are not an area not prone
11 to possible disaster, like earthquake, tsunami, the
12 ever dangerous bar and river conditions or man-made
13 disasters by whom human failure or human mischief.
14 Even if we never experience any disaster of that
15 kind, we don't want to live with such fear. And
16 particularly, we don't want to live along a
17 militarized and patrolled river.

18 You've asked for comment, and
19 nothing I've said or others have said tonight can
20 possibly be new or surprising to you, however
21 passionately the river may be.

22 I want to reverse the request for
23 comment. You tell us how this siting process could
24 get this far without any definitive statement on the
25 impact of our river from the Coast Guard. Which

1 exclusion zones is the Coast Guard planning to apply
2 here? Why so secretive? Are those going to be the
3 exclusion zones from Boston or those from Puerto Rico?
4 How expendable is the population of this local area?
5 And why not request right off the bat an offshore
6 location, if we must have LNG, instead of renewable
7 energy sources?

8 If you put in an offshore facility,
9 we'd all go home and wear our T-shirts for gardening
10 or as nightshirts.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Ms.
12 Temple. Next on my list is Karen Cressa.

13 MS. CRESSA: Good evening. My
14 name is Karen Cressa; spelled C-R-E-S-S-A, and I
15 represent myself.

16 There are many people here tonight
17 with different concerns, both for and against the
18 proposed Bradwood LNG siting. But the issue which
19 should override all of that is public safety. We've
20 been assured by Northern Star that this cargo is safe
21 onboard their tankers, but let's examine its nature.
22 This is a gas that's been artificially cooled down to
23 minus 260 in order to transport it here in a liquid
24 state in a ship that's like the thermos bottle;
25 insulated with very flammable polystyrene. We put a

1 genie in the bottle, but it is dying to go back to
2 its natural state as a gas and release all of its
3 potential energy. Potential energy that may be stored
4 at the Bradwood facility along with an LNG tanker
5 dock there is the equal to 2.9 megatons of TNT.
6 That is 213 Hiroshima atom bombs.

7 We control how it comes out of the
8 bottle in the regasification process. But what if we
9 couldn't? What if another ship steering off course
10 collided with an LNG tanker at Bradwood's dock and
11 ripped a huge hole in her side puncturing the double
12 hull, causing the spill of the contents of one tank
13 after another? What if a terrorist used a weapon
14 powerful enough to penetrate one huge LNG tank aboard
15 ship; LNG spilled out into the ship and its coldness
16 made the hull brittle, causing it to crack and take
17 in water? What about the ensuing result when
18 rapid-phase transition occurs when LNG hits the water?
19 What if an LNG ship lost steering power and drifted
20 aimlessly during a storm, as happened just a year ago
21 off the coast of Norway near Fedje, where 800 people
22 live. In this case, fortunately the ship was finally
23 saved, but only 30 yards from breaking up on the
24 island. In each of these cases, of course, LNG would
25 spill out, but what would happen in such a chain

1 reaction? It's been given a mild feel-good name;
2 "Cascading Events." The essential question that no
3 study seems to answer is: How large an area could
4 be affected by a catastrophic failure of an LNG
5 tanker? How far do people have to be to be safe
6 from being burned? In the Sandia Lab's report are
7 four different studies of various scenarios done by
8 different groups of scientists that try to answer
9 questions like these. When I studied them, I found
10 terms like "Hopefully" and "Cookbook Approach";
11 unscientific language, which seemed to say, "Hey, we
12 don't really know. This is just guesswork; more art
13 than science. Don't quote us out of context." I
14 suspect that some of the report may be classified.

15 We are being asked to trust the
16 government when we cannot verify all the evidence.
17 That makes me uneasy with the whole process of
18 government regulation of the energy industry. The
19 public really needs all the other agencies with the
20 power to shape decisions about LNG. And that is
21 where the Coast Guard enters the picture. They are
22 taking on the most important decisions regarding
23 security and public safety; the very heart of the
24 matter. The studies they use based on computer
25 modeling may not predict all the actual ramifications

1 of an LNG spill, especially in cascading events.
2 Which study will they use to prove safety, and will
3 they make a fool-proof choice?

4 I'm asking you, Coast Guard, to
5 give us a comfort zone, not an exposure zone. Apply
6 the precautionary principal. If there are reasonable
7 grounds for concern, then do not go forward with any
8 plan that will put people at risk. We must keep the
9 genie in the bottle and site it away from populated
10 areas and busy waterways, not at Bradwood. Give us
11 real security by giving us peace of mind. Thank you.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mrs.
13 Cressa. Someone suggested to me that I should call
14 not only the person speaking next, but the person who
15 is speaking after that, so that we have some advance
16 notice to be ready.

17 So, the next person on the list is
18 Jerry Cressa, and the person after that is Earl
19 Dawley.

20 MR. CRESSA: My name is Jerry
21 Cressa; spelled C-R-E-S-S-A, and I'm speaking for
22 myself.

23 I'm basically listening tonight and
24 listening to all positions here tonight, but the key
25 one I'll address to the Coast Guard. My wife and I

1 have spent a lot of time looking at documents; the
2 Sandia Report, calling reporters around the country,
3 trying to get to the real truth. The key issue here
4 -- Before all the economic issues, before even the
5 environmental issue is safety.

6 Captain, I'm addressing this to you.
7 I remember -- I guess it's in the NVIC 05-05 --
8 reality check. I've spent all my life in the
9 maritime industry; just a brief period of a couple
10 years in my government service in an area of security
11 and of potential energy levels. I -- Like my wife
12 stated, how many of you can put a gallon of LNG in
13 your trunk and feel safe? You can't. It's not in a
14 natural state. It has a hunger to get back to what
15 it was; natural gas. And it will take all the
16 energy it can from the surroundings. The Sandia
17 Report and all the studies that came before are
18 basically all modeling. They were controlled tests.
19 The couple of tests they did were monitored tests;
20 even the Shell Test that was the largest test showing
21 pools -- circular pools just poured out of a pipe.

22 You're in the industry. There
23 are people, who in the maritime industry, talk.
24 We're invalid. We're not perfect. We make mistakes
25 all the time. You know it. Your people make

1 mistakes. We're all human beings. We can't make a
2 perfect system. When I was in the service -- You
3 mentioned security. You have 250 men to do an
4 enormous area. That facility -- basic physics taught
5 to me by the government -- has the potential of 2.9
6 megatons. 213 Hiroshimas. You have 250 men. I had
7 less. I had -- Not that I had less; I had the
8 option of over 2,000 Nato troops to watch, and still
9 we couldn't handle it. They're giving you a task --
10 I wouldn't want to be in your shoes.

11 My wife mentioned "cascading
12 events." I think all of you here should understand,
13 the World Trade Center did not come down from an
14 airliner hitting it. It was a cascading event. The
15 airliner dropped its fuel, melted the beams; heat
16 being used in one cascading event. Force -- The
17 energy of all the upper floors ran those buildings
18 into the ground. That's what we worry about. There
19 has not been one test.

20 I ask you: FERC, why? This has
21 been going on now for years on the East Coast, the
22 Gulf states. Why don't you just drag an old tanker
23 out someplace? Get it from India. There's plenty
24 being scrapped there. Get an old -- build an old
25 LNG tanker. Get a million gallons of LNG. Let it

1 -- You don't even have to ignite it. Start a
2 cascading event. Breach a tank. Watch it go into
3 rapid-phase transition. Watch it brew. Get real
4 data, then give it to Sandia; our old weapons labs.
5 Isn't it interesting the study is done at our old
6 weapons labs? That shows you how benign a commodity
7 this is. It has to go to a weapons lab to be
8 tested. Do we have it in unabridged volumes? No,
9 we don't. And I don't expect them to be released,
10 because that's good security.

11 Now, speaking to the river itself,
12 just from a terrorist threat, how do you protect?
13 How do you protect? Every ship coming in and going
14 out has a chance to change personnel. A container
15 ship coming into Portland, are you going to check the
16 crews? Are you going to check that longshoremen
17 don't work with them and bring some weapon on? Every
18 time a ship passes -- don't just worry about the LNG
19 ship. But every ship that passes that channel is a
20 potential weapons flag. Somebody with an ultra light;
21 do you have air cover for that?

22 The thing here is not to detonate
23 the commodity, it's to breach the chain and let
24 physics take its chance. And it will do it. Now,
25 I'd love to be disproved. Do a test. We're talking

1 about an industry that's worth trillions if you take
2 all the energy companies in. Why don't they do a
3 test? Then, all the questions are over. I don't
4 know why they don't do a test. This was proposed by
5 the governor of Alabama last fall. And when that
6 issue comes out, the companies pull out. Maybe they
7 know the answer already. Maybe they know it's too
8 dangerous. I don't know. But gee, look out at
9 these people. Look at those faces and remember it.
10 That decision you're making is protecting them. It's
11 not just protecting capital venture. That's a tough
12 responsibility, and I'm glad I don't have it.
13 Because with the scientific evidence that's there now,
14 there's no way you can consider this river suitable.
15 Offshore, you have your buffer areas. When in doubt
16 --

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Cressa, five
18 minutes.

19 MR. CRESSA: Okay. I'll end it
20 here, because I can go on forever and go into
21 particulars. And I'd like to have a question and
22 answer period where I could be more specific. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Earl Dawley. Earl
25 Dawley?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Decline.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. The
3 next two people on the list are Glenn Vanselow and
4 Bill Coons. So, Mr. Vanselow?

5 MR. VANSELOW: Mr. Friedman, Captain
6 Gerrity, my name's Glenn Vanselow. I'm the executive
7 director for Pacific Northwest Waterways Association.
8 We represent public ports, grain growers, and forest
9 products manufacturers that use the river to ship
10 cargo, towboat companies and the steamship operators
11 that move that cargo. And we also have in our
12 membership, electric utilities, electrical co-ops, and
13 another energy interests, including Northern Star, who
14 work to provide energy for this region. We also have
15 others from both public and private sectors in Oregon,
16 Washington, and Idaho. Collectively, we work toward
17 creating a vibrant economy and healthy ecosystems for
18 the Pacific Northwest.

19 Although we have concerns that we
20 want to see addressed, we support the development of
21 the LNG facilities to help meet the needs of Pacific
22 Northwest businesses and households for a reliable
23 energy supply at the lowest possible cost. We do
24 want to see these facilities developed in an efficient
25 and timely manner. We want to ensure that navigation

1 safety is maximized for these vessels with minimal
2 impact of movement of other ships and barges in the
3 river.

4 We want to ensure that precautions
5 are taken to ensure the security and safety of
6 neighbors in Oregon and Washington. We stand ready
7 to work with the Coast Guard and FERC to accomplish
8 these goals.

9 Thank you for the opportunity to
10 testify. And I would, if I may, thank the audience
11 for the courtesy that they've extended tonight to
12 every speaker and everybody that has appeared here
13 tonight. Thank you.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
15 Vanselow. We have Bill Coons next. Is Mr. Coons
16 here? And then after Mr. Coons we have Fred Harding.
17 And after Mr. Harding, we'll take a little short
18 break.

19 MR. COONS: Good evening. My name
20 is Bill Coons; C-O-O-N-S. I live on Puget Island and
21 I'm representing myself. And I wanted to thank the
22 gentleman from FERC for putting me in-between the
23 audience and a break, as if I wasn't nervous enough.
24 But here we go.

25 I want to first address my comments

1 to the Coast Guard's unenviable task of assuring our
2 security and minimizing the impact on the user groups.
3 I'll take Captain Massey's word for it that the
4 transit of these vessels will be safe under normal
5 circumstances. But as Dr. Havens pointed out, things
6 changed with September 11th. And what was once safe
7 is now suspect to a whole variety of calamities
8 caused by people purposely trying to cause harm.

9 I was on a walk this morning
10 within a half a mile of the site. I would have been
11 incinerated if a terrorist attack had occurred and the
12 site had been there. But, you know, I'm a single
13 man, and as I've said in this room before, I figure
14 it would be a demonstration of a level of risk if
15 Northern Star would just take out a casualty policy
16 on my life at the value of \$5 million, and it would
17 demonstrate that this is perfectly an acceptable risk.

18 What I'm worried about is, how in
19 the world you guys in the Coast Guard are going to
20 ensure security. And I can't even conceive of your
21 task to protect against land-based attacks and air-
22 based attacks. So I just -- the -- on-the-water
23 attacks. I mean, you can take positive control. You
24 can have all sorts of pilots and tugs and
25 redundancies. But what will prevent an attack? I

1 mean, an exclusion zone, limiting departures from
2 adjacent marinas prevent in order to prevent cold
3 (inaudible) attacks? Most of these measures will be
4 detrimental to other users.

5 I personally enjoy sailing, boating,
6 sport fishing. I've foolishly tried to make some
7 money from commercial fishing. I was paddling -- Not
8 only economic benefits from these activities, such as
9 fostering tourism enforce the shipping and freight, it
10 seems to me that if these tankers are unable to share
11 the river with other users, then you must determine
12 that this waterway is unsuitable for this use. I
13 just can't fathom how you're going to answer this
14 question.

15 If, through some miracle of
16 convincing that the September 11th did not happen or
17 we're not at risk here, then I would hope that you
18 would be able to schedule arrivals to coincide with
19 departures in order to minimize the disruption of
20 other river traffic and avoid critical times like
21 fishing openings.

22 I also wanted to ask that the
23 access to the Clifton Channel be maintained. I've
24 personally been out on a small vessel at a time when
25 the wind came up, and it was inadvisable to continue

1 on down the main channel. I had to detour through
2 the backwaters to come to a closer channel to back to
3 where I came from. And if that were cut off, then I
4 guess I would just have to call an SOS. You don't
5 want that.

6 But to address some concerns for
7 FERC, I just -- It seems like a no-brainer that a
8 floating offshore facility is the obvious alternative.
9 There's no impact to people other than the coastwise
10 navigation. I believe that the (inaudible) proudly
11 reported that a facility survived direct transit by
12 hurricane Rita. I wonder if that was a floating
13 facility. And if so, I consider my case to be made.

14 The culture around here is based on
15 water-based activities, commercial and recreational
16 activities. And again, I just hope that the Coast
17 Guard is able to find a way to either have the
18 tanker traffic coexist or be moved offshore, because
19 we really need to be able to use the river in the
20 manner that we've all grown accustomed. Otherwise,
21 Northern Star might as well just buy us out.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Coons, can you
23 wrap it up?

24 MR. COONS: I'm done.

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much.

1 Now, I'm going to have one more speaker, and after
2 Mr. Harding, we'll take a brief five-minute break.

3 MR. HARDING: My name is Fred
4 Harding; H- A-R-D-I-N-G. I work for Shaver
5 Transportation, which operates tugboats on the Columbia
6 River. We've been doing this since the 1880s and
7 pioneering tug services for the maritime industry.
8 And we feel that if an LNG plant were to be placed
9 on the Columbia River, that we could provide safe
10 escort for the ship. And I think that everyone
11 sitting up here has a tremendous job. I'm glad I'm
12 not sitting there, because I have no idea how to make
13 that decision the really ought to be made. Thank
14 you. That's all I got.

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much.
16 I think it's ten minutes until ten. Let's take five
17 minutes and be back here and address the rest of the
18 public speakers at five until ten.

19 (Whereupon, a short break was
20 taken.)

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Dines?

22 MR. DINES: My name is Phil Dines;
23 D-I-N- E-S. I represent the Longview/Kelso of
24 Building and Construction Trades Council.

25 I came here tonight to, one,

1 commend Northern Star and Northwest Natural Gas on
2 their commitment for the safety for the pipeline. My
3 background: I'm a journeyman steamfitter. I have
4 been for over 17 years. I've worked various
5 industrial sites. I've worked on Alaska Pipeline from
6 Prudhoe Bay all the way down to Valdez at different
7 times and locations. The proposed route - - I
8 answered a lot questions for -- A lot of the property
9 owners had concerns. They asked me if I could talk
10 tonight, so I agreed.

11 When they put in a pipeline,
12 there's a sequence of events that takes place. Now,
13 the proposed line -- That's not a definite at this
14 time. I mean, you still have a series of permits
15 that has to be done, there has to be a geotech
16 survey done. They will come out on your property
17 site, do a survey. When the line goes in, there's a
18 50-foot right-of-way. The first step you'll have;
19 they'll come through and clear out trees, brush,
20 rocks, debris, anything of that nature. The line
21 generally goes in with a 6-foot deep ditch at the
22 bottom. I believe the minimum requirement for dirt
23 coverage is 30 inches; it generally goes deeper than
24 that, depending if you've got to go through water
25 right- of-ways, anything of that nature.

1 When the pipe is being welded, it's
2 a three-quarter inch carbon (inaudible.) The
3 Washington side, they're proposing a 30-inch line.
4 Now, don't hold me to this, but I believe the
5 (inaudible) strength on that is right at 3,870 pounds,
6 thereabouts. That is what it would take to actually
7 rupture that line. The Washington side would be
8 running about 900 pounds. When this line is
9 installed, it is generally tested at 1 1/2 times its
10 operating pressure. Every weld Northern Star has
11 created, as has Northwest Natural Gas, to test. Now,
12 in my experience, this has been unheard of.
13 Generally, you run by 20, 25 percent weld test. What
14 that means is, they'll come along and shoot one about
15 every five of the welds. If that weld passes, great,
16 they'll go shoot it -- and one out of the next five.
17 But if it fails, they'll go back and shoot all five.
18 And if another one fails, I mean, they're cut out,
19 repaired, redone. That welder is down the road.
20 That's his job.

21 I work with many a people, and I
22 feel that people that will be working on this line
23 are some of the best in the industry. That is their
24 livelihood; they have to be. Otherwise, they would
25 not be working.

1 I hope that concludes what my
2 working knowledge is on the pipeline. If anybody has
3 some questions, I can try to answer those at the
4 back, here, when I'm done speaking. Thank you.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
6 Dines. Next speaker is Bob Griffith. Is Mr.
7 Griffith here?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next on the list is
10 Bob Aeker. Is Mr. Aeker here?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next on the list is
13 Jim Kodama. Is Mr. Kodama here?

14 MR. KODAMA: Yes.

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: And after Mr.
16 Kodama, the next on the list is Ken Stroup.

17 MR. KODAMA: My name is James
18 Kodama. I reside in Kelso, Washington; 1015 Allen
19 Street.

20 I'd like to speak on three issues.
21 First, I'm a carpenter. And I want to thank Northern
22 Star for their commitment. They have chosen to pick
23 skilled and trained craftsmen to build this project.
24 I don't believe it's just a safety and the respect
25 for our training; I also believe it was because we

1 represent responsible tradesmen that works for living
2 wages for our community. We look at benefits that
3 supply our community. We have health care. We have
4 training for apprenticeship. We have pensions for
5 after we get done with a job. So all of that, to
6 me, tells me the developer has been responsible.

7 The second issue I'd like to speak
8 on is, in the community. I also belong to the
9 American Planning Association. On those lines, I look
10 at development. I've looked at current and past
11 development. I looked at double-digit growth in the
12 Clark County area. A lot of that contributed to
13 developers from Oregon that ran out of room in
14 Beaverton and Hillsboro area and are currently
15 developing the Clark County and now going to Cowlitz
16 County. Cowlitz County will be looking at double-
17 digit growth. What does that mean? That means,
18 ladies and gentlemen, that we are using our natural
19 resources. Some of those natural resources are
20 produced here in the Northwest. Natural gas is not
21 one of them. So that means that communities, present
22 and future, are going to count on the supply of
23 natural gas.

24 So what do we do? Do we just
25 raise the price of natural gas and force them to use

1 of the few marine industrial sites left on the
2 Columbia. What does that mean to me as a planner?
3 That means that that area has historically for, what,
4 150 years, been a marine industrial site. It was
5 intended for it, it was developed. The community
6 agreed to it and accepted it for exporting and
7 importing from the Columbia River. So that means
8 they use the Columbia River. That's their intentions.
9 And with the Coast Guard's help, they will hopefully
10 develop a safe means of unloading and loading whatever
11 they need to off of that marine industrial site.

12 The second thing is, I'm a father.
13 Last and least, I'm a father and a grandfather. And
14 while I'm a Native American -- And I would like to
15 speak on that -- I am saddened to disrupt your
16 environment by growth. I use glass products. I buy
17 pizzas. I use plastic products. How many here
18 don't? If you don't, then don't throw a stone. If
19 you do, then become educated. Go on the Web site.
20 Examine the fact that over 45 years of LNG's
21 existence of liquid gas, there has been no major
22 accident in shipping or in manufacture. These people
23 are trying to bring a product to us that is meant to
24 help our society, not to disrupt everything. So
25 become educated and bring issues to the Coast Guard

1 and to the federal government that can help in
2 securing the safe development of this product.

3 And with that, I'd like to end.

4 But I want to thank, again, Northern Star and the
5 federal government and the Coast Guard for having this
6 meeting so that we could voice our opinions. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
9 Kodama. The next speaker is Mr. Stroup. Is Mr.
10 Stroup here?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Is Mr.
13 Jones here?

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Gene Lawhorn. Is
16 Mr. Lawhorn here?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Ben Embree. Is Ben
19 Embree here?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Kevin Kilpatrick.
22 Is Mr. Kilpatrick here?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mike Kilpatrick. Is
25 Mike Kilpatrick here?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Kurt Whiting. Is
3 Kurt Whiting here?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Kirk Deal. Is Mr.
6 Deal here? After Mr. Deal, the next person on the
7 list is Jerry Hughes.

8 MR. DEAL: Good evening. My name
9 is Kirk Deal. You got the spelling up there. I
10 don't think I need to spell it again. Address is
11 2205 Lombard, Portland, Suite 102.

12 I'm with the Oregon Pile Drivers.
13 The Oregon Pile Drivers would want FERC to be fair
14 and evaluate Bradwood Landing LNG project. This
15 project appears perfectly (inaudible) with the proposed
16 site because of the site's history and industrial use.
17 The land has been idle for years, and the resource
18 could be of better use to the community.

19 The purpose of landuse planning and
20 permitting is not to stop development, but to apply
21 high standards for development. The fact that the
22 communities practiced landuse planning assumes that we
23 want a livable community, and it isn't much of a
24 community without a sustainable economy; that includes
25 local jobs and responsible energy projects. I'd like

1 to see the socioeconomic impact section of the report
2 include the benefits of local jobs and apprenticeship
3 opportunities. Others have described a peeked
4 employment of 500 in the construction phase and 50
5 long-term family-supporting jobs.

6 Apprenticeship requirements of 15
7 percent are in place for this project. The Columbia
8 Pacific Building Trades have planned to open up their
9 apprenticeship programs to local new apprentices.
10 Both these socioeconomic benefits will support a lot
11 of families and pay long-term dividends to the
12 community. The project is also is part of a
13 responsible long-term energy plan that uses clean
14 burning natural gas. Clatsop County should be part
15 of the new clean energy economy and receive the
16 benefits of the tax revenues due to it.

17 I close by speaking to another
18 tradition that is important to Oregonians. That is,
19 the needs requirements for energy projects. It's very
20 clear, from the 300 percent rise in cost of natural
21 gas in the past three or four years, that our
22 society's energy-dependent economy needs this project
23 for a stable supply of natural gas.

24 Please be objective in evaluating
25 the positive socioeconomic benefits and the definite

1 need for the project. Thank you.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Deal.

3 Next on the list is Jerry Hughes. Is Mr. Hughes
4 here?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: After that, it's
7 Peter Hackett. Is Mr. Hackett here?

8 (No response.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: After that, is Bruce
10 Dennis. Is Mr. Dennis here?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Jerry Auvil. Is
13 Mr. Auvil here?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Don Atwood. Is Mr.
16 Atwood here?

17 (No response.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Stephen Shepard. Is
19 Mr. Shepard here?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: I believe Ben
22 Bartlett already spoke; is that correct?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Is Daniel Bonham
25 here?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Bob Hansen?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Red Rehume?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Bill Walden?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Barry White? Is

9 Barry White here?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes? Good.

12 MR. WHITE: Thank you. My name is

13 Barry White. And, no, I can't sing.

14 I speak in favor of this project.

15 The last two guys that spoke up here, Jim Kodama and

16 Kirk Deal, are both constituents of mine in the

17 construction industry. I happen to be a millwright

18 business rep. I represent 400 members that cover

19 Oregon and southwest Washington. My members out of

20 Millwright Local 711 in Portland asked me to come

21 here and speak to you all so that we could try and

22 get this plant built.

23 The reason they wanted me to speak

24 was, they wanted you all to know that they normally

25 travel for construction. Oregon's economy,

1 construction-wise, is not as good as we would all
2 like it. This plant will give them a chance to have
3 their jobs right here in Oregon and do work at a
4 good family wage.

5 I'd like to see them build this
6 plant. I'd like to see you guys do all your
7 studying; make sure they build it safe. I believe
8 that's what can be done. Thank you.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
10 White. Next on the list is Jay Kiddle. Is Mr.
11 Kiddle here?

12 MR. KIDDLE: Hi. My name's Jay
13 Kiddle; K- I-D-D-L-E. Well, I didn't get off my
14 deathbed. It kind of sounds like it. But I'm here
15 to talk in opposition to the proposed plant. I'm a
16 sail boater. I play on the river as much as
17 possible. We float up and down. There's thousands
18 of boaters that use this Columbia River daily. We
19 spend our vacations on it. We spend our weekends on
20 it. If the restriction zones that are proposed or
21 that are on the East Coast are put in to position
22 here on the Columbia River, it will close the river
23 to all other uses for boaters.

24 The river isn't wide enough to get
25 out of the restriction zones when these ships come

1 in, so you're going to have to go into a secure
2 port, is my knowledge. Most sailboaters travel at 6
3 to 7 knots an hour, and that's when you're going with
4 the river. A friend, last year, spent six hours
5 going from Hammond to Astoria trying to fight the
6 tide. If this ship comes in and we get an hour's
7 notice to get out of the river, how are we going to
8 vacate the river when we only move at such slow
9 speeds?

10 I also want to talk about the
11 safety of our community. These ships are terrorist
12 targets, but they're also targets for just lunatics.
13 Since I've been a lifelong resident of Oregon, born
14 and raised, and I've been down in this area for
15 almost 20 years now -- Since I moved here, we've had
16 people taking potshots at the bridge. We've had
17 several people try to blow restaurants up. We've had
18 just all kinds of crazy things go on down here. All
19 it takes is one person with a gun to make a
20 statement down here.

21 I ask that you drive the channel
22 on both sides of the river and look how close you
23 can get to these ships coming through as they come
24 through. This is not a safe area for our neighbors
25 and our community.

1 And I've been through a natural gas
2 explosion. They say it doesn't explode. And I can
3 tell you it does. I've put people out that were a
4 ball of flames. I was in a building that had a leak
5 in it and it devastated the building. And I was the
6 only one in that building that walked out unhurt. It
7 wasn't my brothers or sisters or fathers or mothers
8 that I pulled out, but it's stayed with me for a
9 long, long time. And for them to come in here and
10 say that this stuff is not explosable, is a lie.

11 I ask you to do your research.
12 Check the ports up and down the Columbia River. See
13 what the boating community puts in to our economy.
14 If these boats come through, people will not travel
15 the river because they won't sit for three or four
16 hours waiting for these boats to come in.

17 Please do your research and find
18 out the negative harm this thing would do to our
19 communities. Thank you.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much,
21 Mr. Kiddle. Next on the list is Douglas Balcomb.

22
23 MR. BALCOMB: My name is Douglas
24 Balcomb; B-A-L-C-O-M-B, and I live in Astoria. I'm a
25 retired research fellow at the National Renewable

1 Energy Laboratory. I hold a Ph.D. in nuclear
2 engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of
3 Technology. I worked with cryogenics for several
4 years at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. I
5 represent myself.

6 I'd like to comment that, although
7 some speakers here have hit on the veracity of the
8 process, and some of the people who are carrying that
9 process out -- Don't count me among those. My father
10 was a civil servant. He took that job very
11 seriously. I trust that you will take this job very
12 seriously and carry it out with diligence according to
13 the law.

14 My review of the safety hazard
15 information on the transport of LNG over water
16 indicates to me that Astoria would be a sitting duck
17 for a terrorist attack on an LNG tanker on its way
18 to either of the proposed upstream terminal sites,
19 including Bradwood. There would be two prime
20 opportunities for terrorists with a medium-sized bomb
21 and the means of delivering it. One would be while
22 the ship is passing under the Astoria-Megler Bridge.
23 The second opportunity would be while the tanker is
24 in the shipping lane across -- alongside Astoria.
25 Such an attack would have the potential of releasing

1 5 million gallons of LNG out of the 30 million
2 gallons aboard the tanker according to the Sandia
3 Report.

4 In the case of a 5-million-gallon
5 LNG breach alongside Astoria, the liquefied gas would
6 quickly spread across the water forming a large
7 pancake about 3 feet thick. This would vaporize and
8 contact with the water forming a dense, thin layer of
9 methane gas at minus 160 degrees Fahrenheit, much
10 heavier than the air above it. The pancake would
11 spread underneath the pilings of all the buildings
12 along the Astoria waterfront filling up the whole
13 space with methane. At some point along the edge of
14 this pancake where the gas-air mixture is within the
15 flammability range, the cloud of gas would encounter a
16 spark or flame, such as a cigarette or pilot light in
17 a gas heater, and ignite. It probably would not
18 explode because it's not confined, as it would in a
19 building. But we don't know, because we're
20 extrapolating the fact that 3,000 (inaudible) only
21 experiment that's been done, and we really don't know.
22 While it might not explode, it would certainly burn.
23 The ensuing firestorm would create a huge vertical
24 pillar of flame, perhaps a thousand feet high with
25 two likely consequences. The first would be a

1 thermal radiation flash that would cause second-degree
2 burns on any exposed flesh of any person standing
3 outside within a one-half mile range. The second
4 likely consequence is that the edge of the gas fire
5 would ignite most of the buildings along the
6 waterfront. This could conceivably spread up the
7 entire Astoria hillside in a firestorm, destroying the
8 town.

9 As I mentioned, the other prime
10 opportunity for the terrorists would be an attack
11 while the ship is directly underneath the bridge. In
12 this case, the fire would cook the underside of the
13 bridge and all its steel support structure. Even if
14 the bridge did not fail, it would be so weakened that
15 it might have to be rebuilt.

16 In both cases, the initial
17 5-million- gallon fire might cause the release of the
18 remaining 25 million gallons of LNG resulting in an
19 even larger fire.

20 The results of such a fire are
21 hard to predict exactly because we have no experience
22 with anything anywhere near this size, but it is
23 probably devastating. No one thought that the burning
24 of the fuel load of a single airplane could bring
25 down one of the twin towers at the World Trade

1 Center. Only afterwards was it realized how a local
2 fire could create a change of events that would cause
3 the building to collapse vertically. The energy
4 content of an LNG tanker is hundreds of times greater
5 than a 747 airplane.

6 Now, it's the terrorist threat that
7 changes this equation. I have no doubt that the bar
8 pilots can handle the boat. I have no doubt that
9 the tugs can do their job adequately. I have no
10 doubt that the Coast Guard can do their job
11 adequately. But there are many people -- and I have
12 no doubt that the engineering of the -- being carried
13 out by Northern Star Natural Gas will be superb. But
14 it's the terrorist threat that changes that. We may
15 have 45 years experience with the (inaudible) of LNG
16 over the water, but we don't have much experience in
17 this post-9/11 world in which people do things in a
18 completely different way; in organized ways with lots
19 of preplanning. There are many plausible scenarios
20 for a land or water-based terrorist attack against a
21 huge, slow-moving target on the river. There just
22 isn't any reasonable way to guard against them all.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Dr. Balcomb, can you
24 wrap it up, please?

25 MR. BALCOMB: One more sentence.

1 It is difficult for me to believe
2 that a permit would be granted for either of the
3 proposed upstream terminal sites, both of which would
4 require tankers to pass under the bridge and next to
5 Astoria, especially when there are other options that
6 are so readily available. Thank you for your
7 attention.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Sam
9 Ruda?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Doyle Petersen.

12 MR. PETERSEN: My name is Doyle
13 Petersen; P-E-T-E-R-S-E-N. I'm representing myself and
14 the American taxpayers.

15 I would just like to say that we
16 don't have to make this mistake. We've done it in
17 the past. The last energy crisis, we decided we had
18 to do something immediately. And last time it was
19 nuclear energy. In Eureka, California, they built a
20 beautiful plant. They went through all the siting,
21 all the engineering. Everyone testified. Millions
22 were spent. Beautiful (inaudible) were going up.
23 And then someone pointed out that underneath it,
24 before it started operating, there were three fault
25 lines. We had the same problem locally, here, with

1 Rainier Plant, where they had problems. Three Mile
2 Island; all sorts of things. There is nothing wrong
3 with nuclear energy, but they made a lot of mistakes
4 at first before they figured out how to harness it
5 and where to put it.

6 We have the same problems, I think,
7 with LNG. Ten years from now, one or two things
8 will happen. One, we'll have, within that time,
9 perhaps something of a catastrophe of one sort or
10 another and everyone will point fingers and everyone
11 will ask, "How was it permitted?" Or, number two,
12 the use of the river will be so curtailed, the
13 economic damage will make the economic advantages pay
14 off. So you'll end up with a government buyout of
15 Northern Gas, and the American taxpayer ends up
16 picking up the tab on the thing. Because it's at
17 that point, the people will be howling that they want
18 to have their river back.

19 So we can look at history and we
20 can figure out we really don't have to make the
21 mistake twice. We don't have to site it here.
22 Eventually they will site these things off -- off in
23 the ocean. It will be safe. We'll use the energy.
24 But we don't have to make mistakes. It's already
25 been done in the past. Thank you.

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.

2 Petersen. Tammy Maygra?

3 MS. MAYGRA: Maygra.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Maygra? Is Tammy
5 here?

6 MS. MAYGRA: My name is Tammy
7 Maygra; M-A- Y-G-R-A. And I'll send you my written
8 comments. I just want to do a short one.

9 The fact that Northern Star did a
10 propaganda presentation only reinforces just how the
11 deck is stacked against the common citizen who opposes
12 LNG. Northern Star's use of hurricane disasters to
13 promote their agenda is repulsive and despicable, and
14 it truly shows their colors.

15 I want to just briefly touch on
16 Richard Clarke, counter terrorism expert. He writes
17 that a terrorist attack on an LNG tanker could lead
18 to mass casualties, to devastation to a community.
19 Weapons could be mounted on boats or from land along
20 the tankers route. Hijacked aircraft could blast
21 tankers from the sky, despite proposed security
22 measures. Clarke also states that enhanced security
23 measures would not significantly reduce risks;
24 Associated Press May of '05. The idea having a few
25 Coast Guard cutters and a helicopter may make people

1 think that there's a secure bubble, but it's only for
2 show, because you can go through a bubble.

3 I pity you guys. You don't know
4 if the Coast Guard does a good job on a river, but
5 this is something that is new. And I don't believe
6 you have the experience to handle it. Northern Star
7 also indicated at a previous meeting that I attended,
8 that the Columbia River bar pilots and river pilots
9 have participated in a practice of -- or simulations
10 of piloting LNG tankers in Louisiana. Facts
11 substantiate that Louisiana does not have the same bar
12 conditions and waterways that we have. And in my
13 opinion, the Louisiana simulation had no merit on our
14 situation of piloting an LNG tanker across the
15 Columbia River bar and transport up the Columbia
16 River.

17 I also have not heard any mention
18 of training involving the bar and river pilots in
19 anti- terrorism tactical training or LNG fire patrol.
20 But then to make the remark of LNG fire control
21 training is simply mute, since there is no way to put
22 out an LNG fire. In fact, the Coast Guard rules,
23 when there is an LNG problem back east, they
24 evacuate. So I don't really think that training
25 would probably do anybody much good here.

1 And one more item. I would like
2 to address the term that this government and many of
3 its agencies, including some members of Congress,
4 readily refer to for their justification in siting LNG
5 facilities in other places other than in their own
6 backyards. The term is "remote." If one would look
7 up the proper terminology of this word, one would
8 find that distant, isolated, inaccessible, far
9 (inaudible), far off, in the sticks, secluded, out of
10 the way. It so happens, it does not pertain to the
11 coastline of Oregon, its harbors or its rivers. The
12 very way that FERC and other government agencies have
13 freely used this term is an insult to the
14 intelligence of the population that lives and thrives
15 in these areas. The bureaucrats and government
16 agencies that reside in Washington, who unfortunately
17 make the decisions that will affect the very way we
18 live over 6,000 miles away, who do not understand
19 that the people of Oregon loves the wild and scenic
20 beauty that the lower Columbia has to offer the
21 nation. The lower Columbia has virtually been
22 untouched for hundreds of years, yet has always
23 provided a livelihood and vast recreation opportunity
24 for those who have chosen to live near its mighty
25 waters or for those who visit.

1 The United States government needs
2 to understand that we do not want the way of life
3 that we cherish to be changed forever by permitting
4 an LNG facility to contaminate the natural beauty and
5 economy of the area. We take pride in our state and
6 our river. We do not want the lower Columbia to
7 graduate to the degraded condition that has plagued
8 the East Coast for many years through its industrial
9 havoc. The siting of an LNG facility on the Columbia
10 River has nothing to do with the prospect that we
11 need energy in Oregon. It will be for one reason
12 and one reason only: A corporation has found, once
13 again, an easy way to make a huge profit at the
14 expense of the ordinary citizen and taxpayer,
15 regardless of who it endangers, displaces, or how much
16 degradation it brings to the area of the site.

17 If the federal government wants to
18 represent fairly the people who they were elected to
19 serve -- and I repeat -- elected to serve, then the
20 government would see to it that these LNG facilities
21 would be built offshore away from the general
22 populations, insuring the safety and the security of
23 its good citizens, such as their sister company,
24 Crystal Energy, that's built offshore at Ventura
25 County in California.

1 The only thing that stands in
2 building these facilities offshore is a corporation's
3 main goal, and that is profit, and how much more
4 profit that they can accumulate. Thank you.

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Ms.
6 Maygra. Next is Scott McMullen.

7 MR. McMULLEN: Thank you. Scott
8 McMullen; M-c-M-U-L-L-E-N. My name is Scott McMullen.
9 Until I returned from fishing a few years ago, I made
10 my living as owner and operator of a 60-foot troller
11 that fished for shrimp, bottom fish, and albacore
12 primarily out of the Port of Astoria. In my career,
13 I've logged over 1,500 transits across the Columbia
14 River bar. The commercial fishing industry is wide
15 open and a crucial part of the economy and way of
16 life in Clatsop County.

17 When the United States Coast Guard
18 develops a waterway suitability assessment for the
19 Northern Star Natural Gas facility proposed, I urge
20 you to keep in mind the needs of the commercial
21 fishing industry for uninterrupted access to transit
22 and fish in Columbia River and bar.

23 When a fisherman is on a trip in
24 the ocean, he tries to maximize his fishing time for
25 maximum efficiency. If he has an unloading

1 appointment at 6:00 a.m., he'll fish as long as he
2 can until he has to stop fishing and transit to the
3 Columbia River entrance and upriver to the fish plant.
4 If, when he arrived at the mouth of the Columbia
5 River and found that Coast Guard regulations prevented
6 him from transiting for an hour or an hour and a
7 half while an LNG ship was underway, the impact would
8 go beyond just that fishing boat. Dozens of fish
9 plant workers could be idled while the boat is
10 delayed going up river, and it could even be that
11 some of those fillets that could be produced wouldn't
12 make it on the flight. A lot of our fish is cut,
13 unloaded in the early morning, put on a truck to the
14 Portland airport and flown out to places around the
15 country midday, and on tables that evening. So a
16 delay could even interrupt the delivery of fish to
17 its destination.

18 Lieutenant Paul Jewell, who is the
19 captain of port for the Port of Portland spoke in a
20 meeting on commercial fisherman in Warrenton several
21 months ago. He stated that the United States Coast
22 Guard would treat an LNG ship in the same way that
23 it treats cruise ships that come into the Columbia
24 River. I printed the United States Coast Guard Local
25 Notice to Mariners which I received by e-mail two

1 days ago. This contains the current security zone
2 for cruise ships. It says, "The Coast Guard is
3 establishing a temporary relief security zone of 500
4 yards surrounding passenger cruise vessels only, while
5 on the waters of the Columbia River to the mouth of
6 the river at Clatsop Spit will be 14; upriver, 2, and
7 including Astoria. Special rules: All vessels within
8 500 yards of a passenger cruise vessel shall operate
9 at the minimum speed necessary to maintain a safe
10 course and shall proceed as directed by the official
11 patrol. No vessel or person is allowed within 100
12 yards of a large passenger cruise vessel that is
13 underway or anchored."

14 I got out my charts today, and I
15 looked at the chart 18521, which is the Columbia
16 River entrance to Harrington Point and the successive
17 upriver charts from there, and I didn't see anyplace
18 along the river where there wasn't at least a hundred
19 yards for a vessel to move out of the way to
20 transit. So I believe these rules work very well.

21 I'd like to urge the Coast Guard
22 to keep this security scheme. I'd like to see --
23 I'd also like to see a written agreement between the
24 fishing industry and Northern Star Natural Gas that
25 would obligate Northern Star Natural Gas to pay for

1 any security upgrades that the Coast Guard may at
2 some point require, such as AIS systems, to notify
3 other vessels where we're at. I think this would be
4 a fair and reasonable accommodation for fishing fleets
5 so the fishing fleet didn't suffer undue financial
6 burden while this process can proceed.

7 I think the fishing industry is a
8 very tight-knit community -- or actually, say,
9 communities. Within our separate fleets; crab fleet,
10 gillnet fleet, shrimp fleet, (inaudible) fleet. We
11 know everybody. We know each other's voices. And we
12 know if a vessel is not acting in the way that it
13 normally operates; if it's acting in a way that is a
14 significant anomaly from its normal operations.

15 I think the fishing industry can
16 act as your first line of defense. You need to keep
17 us on the river transiting, so that we could see if
18 anybody out of place is transiting. The river
19 pilots, bar pilots, the tugs, and the captains; all
20 of us can be the eyes and ears to be aware if
21 there's anything out of the ordinary taking place.

22 I'd just like to say, thank you
23 for the chance to speak, and I appreciate your time.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
25 McMullen. Next is Mr. Bock. And after Mr. Bock is

1 Rich Gray. So, Chris Bock? Is Chris here? Yes?

2 No?

3 (No response.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Rick

5 Gray. Is Rick Gray here? Yes? No?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: People have

7 to go to the ferry now.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: J. B. Bouchard?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bouchard.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Bouchard, are

11 you here?

12 MR. BOUCHARD: Good evening.

13 During this presentation, whenever I use the pronoun

14 "you," I'm referring to Northern Star and Natural Gas.

15 The great thing about keeping an open mind is I've

16 learned a whole lot more than I wanted to this

17 evening about how bad the situation would be if this

18 project goes through. The other downside to having

19 an open mind is, people throw a lot of junk at you.

20 So at this point, I'm going to close my mind and go

21 with my gut. And my gut tells me that LNG on the

22 Columbia River is a risk not worth taking and a

23 mistake that you should not be making.

24 Consider the environment's ecosystem.

25 Your attendance site impinges on the Hansen Wildlife

1 Refuge. Human industrial activity will degrade this
2 precious area. It's axiomatic that real property and
3 industrial developers see estuaries, wetlands, and
4 marginal and riparian acreage as something to be
5 filled in and built over. This LNG project
6 contributes to our shameful national history of
7 irreversible destruction of coastal and revering
8 wetlands that serve as tidal barriers protecting
9 adjacent land.

10 Coastal Louisiana is under water
11 because of decades of wetland destruction by its
12 petroleum extraction industry. Ironically, offshore
13 oil and gas terminals suffered little destruction.
14 LNG terminals belong offshore to be even marginally
15 safe and ecologically sound.

16 These are my fears regarding safety:
17 You cannot ever hope for this project to be
18 completely safe. This is the inherent nature of
19 dealing with mechanically-contained explosive forces on
20 the order of magnitude of nuclear weapons. Human
21 error is a certainty. So, too, is human
22 interference. The local and coastal Pacific Northwest
23 has an established and violent history of a
24 proenvironmental resistance through arson, sabotage and
25 malicious mischief. Even as we seek to dissuade you

1 today through the legal avenues of open meeting and
2 public comment, there are fanatics out there who
3 consider themselves to be patriots, who are watching
4 this closely, who will have private meetings and
5 illegal intent as they seek to thwart LNG on the
6 Columbia River.

7 Let us not overlook that one other
8 person against who we have no protection. This
9 individual is a sort for who routinely runs red
10 lights and stop signs, passes blinking school buses,
11 drinks beer while driving and shoots game out of
12 season from an open truck window. He's a dedicated
13 scofflaw, and he represents about ten percent of
14 population. When LNG transport shuts down significant
15 portions of an already highly-restricted fishing and
16 hunting season, it is only going to take one such
17 individual with a grudge and a hunting rifle with the
18 right ammunition anywhere at anytime on either bank of
19 the river to incinerate your plans to build on the
20 Columbia, whether we like it or not. That individual
21 will not consider themselves to be a terrorist or a
22 radical environmentalist, and that won't make any
23 difference to the tanker crew. Folks like these will
24 not be a problem if you build offshore facilities or
25 a significant exclusion and security zone is properly

1 maintained.

2 My community is in danger. The
3 wind blows west from my part of the river. My
4 family lives on Puget Island. And when, and not if,
5 an LNG disaster happens due to industrial mischance or
6 human mischief, we're going to burn because we live
7 on an island only half a mile down wind from the
8 epicenter of this impending extinction event.

9 If you don't care about this any
10 -- You don't care about this anymore than the
11 automobile company that approved the use of overly
12 explosive gas tanks because it was an accepted
13 actuarial risk for them, though not to their potential
14 victims. You represent the corporate morality that is
15 destroying this country and would destroy this river.
16 If anything goes serious wrong at such a facility, I
17 won't get a second bite of the apple.

18 Regarding alternate sites, go to
19 Cherry Point. Buy, lease, or build into the existing
20 petroleum products of the infrastructure that already
21 exists there. Use their existing pipelines
22 right-of-way. You and the corporate greed that you
23 bring you here are not welcome.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Mr.
25 Bouchard. Next on the list is Judy Bright. Is Judy

1 here?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: No? All right.

4 Craig Brown?

5 (No response.)

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Gary Soderstrom.

7 MR. SODERSTROM: My name is Gary
8 Soderstrom. I'm the president of Columbia River
9 Fishermen's Protective Union. I represent a good
10 majority of the fishermen on the river. I'm on the
11 Board of the Lower Columbia River Watershed Council.
12 I sit on quite a few different Boards for the Fish
13 and Wildlife Department.

14 I will give Northern Star credit.
15 I've been working with all these different groups and
16 on different projects they're trying to get going on
17 the Columbia River, and they seem to be receptive to
18 try to work with us fishermen. But we have a long
19 ways to go. We still have no idea before we can
20 say, "Hey, this is a good project," we got to know
21 what the consequences to our fisheries are going to
22 be. We can't just say, "Well, yeah, it sounds good."
23 If we don't have something in writing that we can
24 take it to the courtroom sooner than later if we have
25 to demand some compensation for things, we can't agree

1 to it. We're in a Catch-22 deal here.

2 You have to get the permits --

3 They have to get the permits before you can get the
4 plan -- the okay to the deal. And we have to know
5 in advance before we can give our okay. You know,
6 we're trying to work with them. We'll give them the
7 credit for making an honest attempt to work with the
8 fisheries.

9 We have a safety issue on the bar
10 that was -- One thing that got killed down in Eureka,
11 California, with Humboldt County Fishermens Associations
12 down there is the crossing of the smaller crab boats
13 and trollers and stuff; they have to come in on a
14 slack tide when the bar -- the Columbia River bar is
15 at its calmest. They get out there and they fish
16 for a couple days. There's a storm coming. They
17 have one tide to get across that bar. And if they
18 can't come across that bar on that slack water, they
19 may lose their lives out there because they can't
20 transit when they need to get across that bar. They
21 don't have an option. They can't -- The safety issue
22 for the fishing fleet is - - the smaller boats,
23 especially, is pretty critical and needs to be really
24 studied a lot more.

25 I have a family history of being

1 on the Columbia River since 1871. I'm a
2 fourth-generation commercial fisherman. I've watched
3 -- My family has watched this river degradate down
4 where it is now. We've watched the economy of the
5 Columbia grow with a deepening ship channel as our
6 fishing areas have been narrowed down. Now we work
7 with the river pilots. We fish -- A lot of our
8 fisheries are in the middle of the river channel. We
9 work with them now. We try to communicate with them
10 as much as we can. They give us their locations as
11 they pass up and down the river. We try to clear
12 the channel. I lose thousands and thousands of
13 dollars every year waiting for the tide. There's
14 certain tides we have to make when the fish move,
15 when we catch the maximum amount of fish. And we're
16 waiting for ships now. And we work with these guys.
17 We lay -- We pick out in front of them. We lay
18 across behind them. But if we get in a safety zone
19 where we've got to go clear away and lose an hour,
20 there's more time -- more money out of our pockets in
21 an industry that can't take any more hits. We're
22 micromanaged down to just small 12-hour openers,
23 6-hour openers. We miss the one critical tide; we
24 miss the whole opener. It's -- Our fishing grounds
25 on the sites, especially one area there in Clatskanie,

1 most of them have been filled in. The one
2 (inaudible) fishing area I have (inaudible) has a
3 proposed liquid natural gas dock to be put in right
4 in the middle. And so, I'm pretty concerned about
5 what's going on.

6 The Columbia River grew up. Our
7 industry started out being fishing and logging and
8 farming. It's advanced now to the major ports in
9 Portland and up and down the Columbia River, and it's
10 nice to watch. I'm not antibusiness. I just want
11 to see things done right. I want safety to be the
12 major concern here. I don't want to see the
13 livability of our area degraded to where, you know,
14 you can't bring people and say, "Hey, this is a nice
15 place, you know, but then you go -- Well, we can't
16 go over here because it's a safety issue."

17 I am extremely concerned about
18 terrorist acts. That's the one -- I mean, the river
19 pilots -- I've worked around these guys all the time.
20 Their safety record is great. The tugboaters are
21 great people to work around. But there's -- Like
22 they've talked about, there's that one element that we
23 can't control, and that's the terrorists. Anything
24 could -- Like the man just mentioned, it could be
25 drunken slob on the weekend and gets a bad attitude

1 and starts taking potshots at things.

2 The pipeline seems to be a problem
3 for a lot of my friends and neighbors. They're
4 taking property. And I've talked to a friend of mine
5 that they didn't want to go alongside an existing
6 right- of-way; they wanted to go 400 feet out into
7 his property further, which is causing him an
8 unbearable grief. You know, he's taking out some
9 standing timber that he's been saving. He's got
10 developable ground that it's going to have a pipeline
11 going over the top of this ridge instead of going
12 over where the other pipeline is. I mean it's got
13 -- You know, there's things you have to work on with
14 this pipeline. There's a long ways to go. There's
15 got to be compensations made for some of this.
16 You're going to take land out of, you know, the
17 housing development. People might want to build
18 houses in there and all the sudden there's a pipeline
19 in there, and that's all that's ever going to be
20 there.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Can you please wrap
22 up?

23 MR. SODERSTROM: Okay. And the
24 one point that I'd like to find out is the safety
25 issue of who pays for all this? It comes out of the

1 taxpayer's - - the local taxpayer's -- the state,
2 federal. That's -- We'd like to see -- maybe
3 Northern Star or whoever does this -- pay a good
4 share of the cost anyway for the safety -- the
5 protection for these things. Thank you.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
7 comment. Ted Hevenrich. Is Ted here?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's gone.

9
10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Peter -- Please help
11 me pronounce this -- Huhtala.

12 MR. HUHTALA: That's Peter Huhtala.
13 I'm from Astoria. And it's spelled H-U-H-T-A-L-A.

14 Thank you for the opportunity to
15 testify here this evening. Thank you for hanging in
16 there. Well, I guess you have to.

17 First off, the earlier speaker
18 talked about evaluating the need for this project and
19 evaluating the need for LNG nationwide and taking a
20 global look at the LNG. And I want to support Mr.
21 Serres' call for a programmatic EIS on the part of
22 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to back up
23 and take an overall look at this, rather than this
24 first-come-first-serve or come-all -- really, come-
25 all-and-get-your- permit-type of attitude. So I just

1 wanted to bring that back and see where it goes.

2 I would like to limit most of my
3 comments, though, to issues regarding LNG tankers,
4 security and public safety. The way I approach this
5 logically and the structure I'd encourage the Coast
6 Guard to consider is to separate the security and
7 safety analysis into three distinct areas. One,
8 potential consequences; two, the management of risk;
9 and three, the consequence of risk management. LNG
10 may not be, pound for pound, the most hazardous
11 material that can be transported on this river. It
12 is the astronomically large quantities at which it's
13 delivered that makes it a high-risk cargo. It's of
14 vital importance to understand the consequences of
15 credible accidents or delivered attacks involving LNG
16 tanker - independent of consideration of the needs to
17 mitigate those such events.

18 The best available science of the
19 consequences of an LNG spill from a tanker seem to
20 coalesce around studies by the ABS Group and the
21 Sandia National Laboratories, although they certainly
22 have some limitations as we've heard tonight. And
23 these studies are well summarized in the -- and
24 augmented by the expert testimony offered by Dr. Jerry
25 Havens in the Weavers Cove application process with

1 FERC, and also in his comments to the Coast Guard
2 regarding the Fall River petition to establish a
3 thermal and vapor cloud exclusion zone for LNG
4 tankers.

5 In essence, the science shows us
6 that a spill that involves about a tenth of tanker
7 load is credible and is likely to create a pool fire
8 up to a half-mile in diameter. Brief exposure to
9 such fire could cause second-degree burns to human
10 flesh at a minimum one-mile distance. Deaths, of
11 course, should be expected at closer proximities as
12 well as extensive property damage. Should the
13 cascading events -- which we also heard about tonight
14 -- or just -- which are described in the Sandia Lab
15 and in the testimonies of Dr. Havens that I mentioned
16 -- occur -- that further damage could be expected.

17 To quantify the consequences based
18 on the science, I basically use a ruler. A pool
19 fire could reach the shores of Hammond, Warrenton,
20 Astoria, Puget Island, and many other locations on the
21 river. Pick a spot, count the casualties.

22 Once we understand the consequences,
23 then we start looking at how to mitigate these
24 consequences. And that's a tough job that you have
25 to go through. Risk management can be applied to

1 attempt to reduce the likelihood of deliberate attacks
2 by domestic or foreign terrorists or malicious
3 hobbyists. However, we've heard that Mr. Clarke --
4 Richard Clarke, terrorism expert -- He's still an
5 expert, I think -- questions the ultimate
6 effectiveness of this tradition of a "halo of
7 security" system of escorting the tankers with Coast
8 Guard and law enforcement personnel on the water, in
9 the water, on the shore, and in the air.
10 Nonetheless, given the consequences of not attempting
11 to protect civilian lives, including fishermen, the
12 Coast Guard is compelled to create the most extensive
13 security plan possible to do your very best to
14 attempt to minimize these consequences.

15 Which brings me to the final
16 consideration; the consequences of risk management.
17 In my opinion, that social and economic costs
18 associated with securing these shipments -- and
19 remember, a well-respected counter terrorism expert
20 considers them ineffectual against a determined
21 terrorist anyway -- far outweigh any benefit of
22 delivery of LNG to the Columbia River system; every
23 other use of the Columbia River estuary subordinate to
24 this LNG shipment. I just, you know, I've got to
25 ask Captain Gerrity --

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Can you wrap this
2 up?

3 MR. HUHTALA: -- question -- I'll
4 wrap it up. But does the Coast Guard have the
5 courage and honor to do what's right for the people
6 of Oregon and Washington? I trust you'll conclude
7 that the common sense logic that this river system is
8 entirely unsuitable for LNG transport. Thank you.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
10 comment. Bill Castle? Is Bill Castle here?

11 MR. CASTLE: Bill Castle. I speak
12 for my wife and myself. My wife had to take her
13 mother home across the ferry. I speak for myself
14 with a couple questions.

15 And, one, I'd like to commend the
16 Coast Guard. I served time from '71 to '74, and --
17 as a second-class engineman, MK, on the Iris,
18 (inaudible) and the Tillamook Bay/Nehalem Bay. And
19 one comment I would like to make that -- I hope that
20 our government -- and I know that we don't have, in
21 this room, a lot of control over this -- but I
22 remember times when we only had to deal with the Cold
23 War and the Russians off our shores around here and
24 on the cutter Iris, which could only do 12 knots, had
25 to swim in and out of those Russian boats. It was a

1 very uncomfortable feeling. Only to have Congress at
2 that time -- for two years, as I remember it --
3 slash the budget to that organization nine hundred
4 million dollars for two years in a row, as I remember
5 it. I would like to think that if this (inaudible)
6 were given and empowered to you to protect this, that
7 our government would not short side the funds needed
8 to protect and do what's right and give you the
9 resources to do that job correctly.

10 On a different note, we are
11 directly -- my wife and I are directly impacted with
12 this pipeline. We live at Mill Creek and we live
13 about 450 feet above the Columbia River. And as it
14 sits right now with the map, we -- at the present
15 time -- look like were sited for the program on five
16 acres. That impacts us pretty directly.

17 Northern Star Natural Gas -- I
18 would like to make one comment here that has been an
19 observation in two meetings. And it's been stated -
20 - I don't know if I can quote this properly --
21 "There's a greater chance of being hit by a meteor
22 than an LNG pipeline explosion." I would like to
23 remind -- in this formal forum that we have here --
24 that in our area in Washington state, we've had two
25 gas line explosions. And I'm not referring to

1 Bellingham; Kalama, and Castle Rock, but we've had no
2 hits by meteors.

3 What is the environmental impact of
4 an explosion? I can remember on the freeway on I-5
5 witnessing an explosion going into the air of Kalama.
6 And even today, the ground is still very searal. It
7 blew a hole in the ground. I don't have the
8 measurements. I've been told that it was an old
9 line, still possibly used. I don't know for a fact.
10 But when is this line going to become old? That
11 happened several years ago, so I don't know the
12 length of the line at that time. It is a concern.

13 To FERC, I would ask this question:
14 I'm not sure if you're responsible for this, but what
15 are the safety escape routes of Highway 4 on the
16 Washington side and Highway 30 on the Oregon side?
17 Some areas of those highways, we only have one way in
18 and out. And I'm not talking our own personal
19 driveways, but the highway system that the State
20 maintains. What do we have for safety there to deal
21 with that, if something were to occur?

22 And on final, I would like to know
23 where possibly are the Oregon and Washington
24 representatives, whether FEMA or otherwise, for the
25 safety? We don't have any representatives here that

1 I believe that have been introduced tonight. Do we
2 have our local state Washington representative for
3 that issue? Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
5 comments. Next, George -- Please correct my
6 pronunciation -- Poysky. Is George here?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: No? Scott Jerger?
9 Is Scott here?

10 MR. JERGER: Good evening. Scott
11 Jerger; J-E-R-G-E-R. I'm here as a Columbia
12 Riverkeeper, a nonprofit group that works to protect
13 the Columbia River and its environment.

14 I appreciate the opportunity to
15 provide input on the proposed EIS, being prepared for
16 the planned LNG facility at the Bradwood site. And I
17 have a number of specific impacts and issues that I
18 believe should be carefully evaluated in the EIS.

19 As an initial point, however, the
20 decision by FERC to initiate the EIS process before a
21 formal application for the project has ever been
22 submitted, it seems to be putting the cart before the
23 horse. Without a formal process that the public can
24 read, understand and assess, it's impossible to
25 provide informed suggestions about what issues EIS

1 should consider and evaluate. It's similarly
2 impossible to provide reasonable suggestions for
3 alternatives that the EIS should consider. We believe
4 that the FERC should suspend the current scoping
5 process until after a formal proposal has been
6 submitted, then provide the public with an opportunity
7 to provide scoping comments when we can do so in a
8 fully informed and intelligent manner.

9 Despite ambiguities about the
10 specifics of the project, it is clear that its size,
11 scale, nature and location would result in many
12 significant impacts and threats to the environment, to
13 the public, to the economy, and to the social fabric
14 of this community. Under NEPA and its implementing
15 regulations, the direct, indirect and cumulative
16 impacts of this project needs to be fully considered
17 and assessed. Among other impacts we will be
18 describing in our written testimony, the EIS should
19 fully consider the effect of a release and ignition
20 scenario on the public. While evaluating a 3 million
21 gallon partial release and ignition is helpful, there
22 is a real likelihood that a partial release of LNG
23 and ignition would trigger a full release, which could
24 have radically larger impacts than a 3 million gallon
25 release which could represent less than 10 percent of

1 gas on the 50 million gallon capacity tanker.

2 The effects of a full release and
3 ignition on humans living near the facility and within
4 the area of risk around the shipping tankers needs to
5 be fully considered and described.

6 The EIS should also specifically
7 provide maps that contain a clear graphical depiction
8 of the area that would be impacted by a full LNG
9 release, either from tankers or land and ignition that
10 includes a description of the type of arms to humans
11 that would occur at specific distances from the point
12 of release and ignition.

13 While the FERC EIS notice stated
14 that it would be evaluating ships with storage
15 capacity of 200,000 cubic meters, the ships that are
16 being designed today can carry up to 7 million
17 gallons of LNG, and FERC needs to consider not just
18 the effects of the ships that exist today, but also
19 the effects of ships that would be operating 10, 20,
20 and even 30 years from now.

21 Additionally, all EIS documents
22 should include not only metric units, which can mean
23 little to most average Americans, but also include
24 English units, such as gallons, when describing LNG
25 container sizes and capacities. This is key to

1 making sure the public can easily understand the EIS.

2 The cumulative effects of multiple
3 facilities being built on the Columbia and the risks
4 of multiple tankers and storage facilities experiencing
5 releases at the same time also needs to be
6 considered.

7 And just to add what a couple of
8 other folks have said, we strongly believe FERC should
9 consider a programmatic EIS for this project, since
10 this decision might effectively foreclose other
11 alternative regional energy options. And,
12 alternatively, a programmatic EIS is needed to address
13 the four regional intertwined proposed LNG terminals
14 that are also proposed in the lower Columbia River.

15 The effects of multiple LNG plants
16 on the economy of Astoria at Bradwood and surrounding
17 community needs to be considered, and specifically,
18 the loss of tourism-related business. The decision by
19 companies not to locate in Astoria because of safety
20 concerns about LNG, the loss of home and property
21 values because of LNG, and the economic effects on
22 barge traffic, fishing vessels and other river users
23 resulting from river exclusions that would result
24 while tankers are in the river, needs to be
25 considered.

1 The impacts; environmental, social,
2 and aesthetic, of industrial development that would be
3 built as a result of building the LNG facilities
4 needs to be considered. And the EIS should also
5 specifically consider alternatives that would reduce
6 the impacts of the planned LNG facilities. Among
7 alternatives that should be considered include: The
8 placement of subsurface on-site storage tanks to
9 decrease the risks of an on-site spill; the location
10 of LNG facilities at other locations that are not in
11 close proximity to homes or houses.

12 Additionally, the EIS will need to
13 spend significant energy addressing the environmental
14 effects, including but not limited to the effects on
15 water quality, salmon and other aquatic species,
16 riparian habitat, air quality, wetlands and aesthetic
17 values that would indirectly, directly and cumulatively
18 result from the planned LNG facilities.

19 The impacts of pipeline
20 construction, road construction, and all other
21 facilities connected or related to the planned LNG
22 facilities must be closely considered.

23 We will be providing more extensive
24 written comments. But again, we ask that FERC stop
25 the current EIS process until such time as Northern

1 Star has actually submitted formal application so that
2 we can provide a reliable reference point for
3 beginning the NEPA process. Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
5 comments. Nicki Thomas. Is Nicki here?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Doug Sheresh. Is
8 Doug here?

9 MR. SHERESH: My name is Doug
10 Sheresh, spelled; SHERESH.

11 Many have spoken well, factually,
12 and passionately about the environmental, safety, and
13 security problems with this LNG facility and related
14 tanker traffic. There is something in this LNG
15 proposal that makes no sense. Why put this LNG
16 facility on the Columbia River? Is it cheaper or
17 more convenient than placing it offshore? Somehow, I
18 suspect it is so.

19 Earlier tonight, the representative
20 from Northern Star cited the survival of an LNG
21 facility to the hurricanes in the Gulf. This was an
22 offshore facility. Did the onshore gas facilities
23 fare as well? Somehow, I don't think so.

24 Northern Star, you claim a number
25 of things that makes no sense to me. You claim that

1 your LNG activities, with 125 ships per year, won't
2 impact the use of the river for fishing, recreation,
3 tourism, or commercial traffic. Somehow, I just don't
4 think it's so.

5 The exclusion zones required around
6 your ships will block the use of the Columbia River
7 for everyone except for you. You say that the U.S.
8 needs this natural gas. Maybe so, but not on the
9 Columbia River. You say that the best choice to
10 build the need for energy is natural gas. Maybe so,
11 but not on the Columbia River. You claim that this
12 LNG is safe to pipe through our neighborhoods.
13 Somehow, I just don't think this is so. And we
14 don't need to risk the people and the environment of
15 the Columbia River for the profits of a few. You
16 claim that the Coast Guard can protect LNG ships
17 against accidents and terrorism. Maybe so. God, I
18 hope so. But we don't need to risk the people and
19 the environment of the Columbia River. You say that
20 the transportation of LNG is safe from spills and
21 accidents. Somehow, I just don't think that is so.
22 But let's not find out on the Columbia River.

23 This LNG facility would impose risks
24 and limitations on the Columbia River and the people
25 who live here. This is not an acceptable industry.

1 This is not an acceptable risk. And this does belong
2 on the Columbia River. If you have to build it,
3 build it offshore. Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
5 comments. Next on the list is Paul Burkey. Is Paul
6 here?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: No? Beth Sheresh.

9 MS. SHERESH: Hi. My name is Beth
10 Sheresh; S-H-E-R-E-S-H, and I'm here representing
11 myself.

12 I wasn't going to speak tonight.
13 I actually came here to listen. I might have a red
14 shirt on, and it looks like I have an opinion, but I
15 came here to listen. I'm in the offshore crowd. I
16 just had a talk with a guy who works on the
17 pipeline, before the meeting. And he was not being
18 able to answer my questions. He kept telling me he
19 didn't bring his calculator. And then he said that
20 it was okay because he lived on the pipeline. And I
21 said, "Great. Show me where you live." And he
22 said, "Well, I would, but I don't." So if somebody
23 has a house that's going to be condemned on the
24 pipeline, call the pipeline company. Apparently,
25 somebody there wants to buy.

1 I've listened to many people
2 speaking and I've noticed something striking.
3 Everybody who is in favor of this, with possibly one
4 exception, is here representing a group that's going
5 to make money. The people who are opposed to it are
6 here because they live in one of those zones that
7 Jerry Havens reports, defines as a -- I'm paraphrasing
8 here -- in a very bad place, I think.

9 The study talks about circles. And
10 everybody keeps saying, "It's a circle." It's not a
11 circle. Half of that circle is a cliff that's 500,
12 600 feet tall. What happens to all the LNG on
13 Oregon's side of that circle? It seems nobody has
14 imagined this yet. Nobody has bothered to close
15 their eyes and say, "Well, if you have a wall and we
16 have an exclusion zone and all of the LNG that should
17 be going to the Oregon side, if something bad
18 happens, goes to the Washington side, how much does
19 that extend that circle of bad news?" Does that
20 mean Cathlamet gets wiped out? Does that stem all
21 the way across the Astoria Bridge to the Washington
22 side? It seems that nobody's bothered to imagine
23 this. And yet, the people of Puget Island imagine
24 this. They imagine this every night. Carol Carver
25 spoke of imagining her grandchildren on that beach.

1 I know Carol. I know her kids. I don't want to
2 imagine her grandchildren there. And yet it seems to
3 be part of the problem, is the lack of imagination.

4 I've heard this. I've heard, "We
5 couldn't imagine that the levies would be breached."
6 And yet, those levies were breached and over a
7 thousand people died. We don't know how many yet
8 because they still haven't pulled all the bodies out.
9 They said, "We never imagined that somebody would use
10 planes as missiles and toss them at one of our
11 buildings." And yet, they did and over 3,000 people
12 died. How many people in Wahkiakum County have to
13 die because yet another government agency has failed
14 to imagine?

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
16 comment. Patrick Cunningham. Is Patrick here? Is
17 Patrick not here?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: In that case, that
20 was the last person on the list. On behalf of the
21 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Coast
22 Guard, I want to thank you all for coming here
23 tonight to help us hold this environmental review
24 process on those issues of concern to you. Let the
25 record show that this meeting concluded at --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Question.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want one
5 question.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right.

7 MR. MESSING: This was -- This
8 meeting's idea was so that people would be able to
9 express their concerns and then there would be a
10 question and answer time. You've crammed the two
11 things together. Your -- FERC's concern and Coast
12 Guard's concerns, and then it drug on and drug on
13 until finally most of the people went home. I think
14 this is a real insult that we are not even able to
15 ask questions because we're so tired -- You guys are
16 tired of listening. I know I am. Anyway, I'm just
17 really insulted with the whole way this thing was set
18 up. Thank you. My name is Ted Messing. You can
19 write that down. M-E-S-S-I-N-G.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
21 comment, Ted. The notice didn't say that we would
22 have a question and answer comment. The notice said
23 we would take comments from the public, which we
24 have. So --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You and I

1 spoke on the phone and you said that there would be
2 a time for questions.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Cheryl, I said, if
4 there was time. And I --

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So, if
6 anybody wants to say, "I have questions," is that
7 okay?

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll tell you what.
9 I'll tell you what. I will allow -- I will allow
10 ten minutes of questions; only FERC and only on
11 process.

12 We are on the record. So anyone
13 who wants to ask a question, please stand up and
14 raise your hand, and we'll do this for ten minutes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know
16 exactly what you mean by "the process." but I'll ask
17 one to FERC. Since you're the ultimate authority
18 here, are there any plans, as national policy, to do
19 a full-scale test on the effects of a breaching LNG
20 tanker? And if not, why not?

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't know the
22 answer to that question. I'm not aware of any plans
23 for tests, and I don't know why. So I don't have
24 the answer. I can only answer questions, you know,
25 that I --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's an
2 answer that I expected, but it really makes me feel
3 secure.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Are there other
5 questions?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a
7 question.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Terry,
9 can -- Terry, first?

10 MS. MAYGRA: Tammy Maygra.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Tammy? All right.

12 MS. MAYGRA: My question is on
13 this question and answer thing. Why did we have to
14 sit and listen to Northern Star do a repeat
15 performance from every meeting that we've ever had,
16 even the last one -- the same crap -- that we have
17 to watch, and that cut in an hour of a lot of
18 people's time that had to go and catch the ferry.
19 And I think -- I agree with Mr. Messing, that I
20 think it's a sham. And that's my verbal comment.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Are
22 there questions? Yes, sir, come on up. Oh, wait.
23 Cheryl, you had a question?

24 MS. JOHNSON: I had signed up
25 earlier to speak and crossed my name off. Cheryl

1 Johnson. I'm sorry.

2 And I don't have a question on the
3 process. I have a comment on the process. It was
4 very nice to meet the Coast Guard people tonight.
5 Thank you. I look forward to working with you.

6 I don't know if your intent was to
7 shut down this process, but you drug it out so that
8 -- I would guess 30 percent of the people left before
9 they had the opportunity to speak. I don't know
10 you're -- if the process was to eliminate the
11 questions, but you very effectively did that. I find
12 this whole process rude and disrespectful. I don't
13 know if you haven't ever conducted public meetings
14 before or that was part of the process. The standard
15 operating procedure -- that you have one person, here,
16 speaking and the next one lined up and you go fast.
17 It would not have been possible to have drug this out
18 longer. We could have started at 4:00. We could
19 have started at 5:00. We could have started at 6:00.
20 We could have done this over a two-day time period.
21 This was incredibly rude and disrespectful.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: I didn't believe
23 that that was a question. So I'm going to tell
24 anyone else who has a question to either ask a
25 question and not make a comment. If I get another

1 statement that's a statement and not a question, we're
2 going to end this meeting now.

3 Sir, do you have a question?

4 MR. PYLE: I do. Thank you.

5 Since it seems to be -- My name -- I'm sorry. My
6 name is Robert Pyle, from Grays River; P-Y-L-E.

7 My question is, I think, in terms
8 of process. Since it seems to be a factor that most
9 speakers are concerned about, and also a factor that
10 would take away much of the problem in this -- of
11 the process -- Sorry, it's too late to speak, here -
12 - I'm wondering if offshore siting will be an option
13 considered in the EIS?

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Since it was raised
15 as an issue tonight by numerous speakers, I will
16 guess that the Environmental Impact Statement will be
17 studying offshore as an alternative.

18 MR. PYLE: Thank you.

19 MR. KILPATRICK: Kevin Kilpatrick.
20 Why in the world are terrorists planning to target
21 this place out here in the middle of nowhere?

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: That's obviously a
23 question I don't have the question to. One last
24 person here? All right. This is your last question,
25 and then we're done.

1 MS. SHERESH: I'm Beth Sheresh.

2 Quick question: Are you willing to have another one
3 of these meetings on the Washington side of the river
4 so that everybody who wants to come and talk --
5 because most of the people who are impacted are
6 actually in Washington -- so that we can all actually
7 come and talk and have enough time and not have to
8 run and meet ferries? Can we have another meeting?

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: The answer is that
10 I had planned on that before tonight, or before this
11 trip. It's something that I'll talk to the people
12 back in Washington and we'll discuss it. So I won't
13 say "yes" and I won't say "no." I'll say, "I don't
14 know."

15 MS. SHERESH: Okay. Thanks.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: So, once again, I'm
17 going to close the meeting. Thank you for coming out
18 and being patient.

19 And let the record show that the
20 meeting ended at 11:25 P.M. Thank you.

21 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded
22 at 11:25 P.M.)

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE

I, Marta J. Charles, do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 9th day of October, 2005.

Signature Expiration Date