

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

BRADWOOD LANDING LNG PROJECT
FERC DOCKET NUMBERS CP06-365 and 366

PUBLIC MEETING
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

* * *

Wednesday, November 7, 2007

6:30 p.m.

Cowlitz County Expo and Conference Center
1900 7th Avenue
Longview, Washington

* * *

BEFORE: Mr. Paul D. Friedman
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Office of Energy Projects

* * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

MR. FRIEDMAN: My name is Paul Friedman.

I work for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in Washington, D.C., where I am an environmental project manager. One of the projects I manage is what's called the Bradwood Landing Liquefied natural gas project, or LNG.

What I'm going to say right now is that kind of stuff is not going to be tolerated. All right? We have some rules of decorum that Janelle has for you, and I'll go briefly over it right now from the beginning. All right?

We want to show respect for each other. We want to be civil. We do not want people speaking from the floor, interrupting other speakers. I'd ask you to please respect those rules. Otherwise, I'll ask you to leave the room.

This is the fourth or fifth meeting we've had so far, and we've had great participation, and we've had nothing but civil behavior, respectful behavior, and I really appreciate that. Have had a lot of good comments from the public that the FERC is going to take into

1 18:38:21 consideration. That's what this meeting is all
2 about, is for me to hear what you have to say.
3 But in order for us to do that, we need to not
4 be rude and to be respectful to each other.

5 18:38:34 I'd like to welcome you all here. This is
6 a public meeting to take comments on the draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement issued by the
8 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC,
9 also known as the Commission, for the Bradwood
10 18:38:50 Landing liquefied natural gas, or LNG project.

11 Let the record show that this meeting was
12 called to order at about 6:37 p.m. on
13 Wednesday, November 7th, 2007, at the Cowlitz
14 County Expo and Conference Center, 1900 7th
15 18:39:12 Avenue, Longview Washington 98632.

16 As I said, my name's Paul Friedman. I'm
17 the environmental project manager for this
18 project. And on behalf of the FERC, I'd like
19 to welcome you all here tonight.

20 18:39:28 You may have noticed that a court reporter
21 is transcribing this meeting. This is so that
22 we can have an accurate record of tonight's
23 comments. Within a few weeks the transcript
24 will be placed in the public record for this
25 18:39:41 proceeding and will be available through the

1 18:39:43 Internet via the FERC's Web site.

2 The FERC is an independent agency within
3 the U.S. Department of Energy. We regulate the
4 interstate transportation of electricity,

5 18:39:56 hydropower, and natural gas. The Commission is
6 directed by five Commissioners who are
7 appointed by the President of the United States
8 and are approved by the U.S. Congress. FERC
9 staff, like myself, are civil servants.

10 18:40:12 On June 5th, 2006, Bradwood Landing LLC
11 filed an application with the FERC requesting
12 permission to construct and operate an LNG
13 import terminal under Section 3 of the Natural
14 Gas Act, or NGA, in docket number CP06-365, and

15 18:40:30 NorthernStar Energy LLC filed an application
16 for an associated natural gas sendout pipeline
17 under Section 7 of the NGA in docket number
18 CP06-366. Hereafter I will refer to both

19 Bradwood Landing LLC and NorthernStar Energy

20 18:40:47 LLC collectively as just NorthernStar, since
21 they are two subsidiaries of the same company.

22 Those of you who have been through some of
23 the other meetings that we've held, I'm sorry
24 that this speech is so redundant, but I tend to

25 18:41:02 give the same speech at every meeting so that

1 18:41:05 there's consistency between the meetings and so
2 the court reporter has an accurate record of
3 what I have to say.

4 The FERC is the lead federal agency for
5 18:41:16 this project, and we took the lead in producing
6 the EIS in order to comply with the National
7 Environmental Policy Act of 1969, better known
8 as NEPA. Our EIS also summarizes activities
9 related to compliance with other federal laws,
10 18:41:34 such as the Endangered Species Act, the
11 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and
12 Management Act, the Marine Mammal Protection
13 Act, the National Historical Preservation Act,
14 the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and the
15 18:41:46 Coastal Zone Management Act.

16 As part of its decision-making process,
17 the FERC will consider the environmental impact
18 of the project as disclosed in the EIS. The
19 production of the DEIS was a collaborative
20 18:41:59 effort involving the FERC staff and a
21 third-party contractor known as Natural
22 Resources Group, or NRG, and cooperating
23 agencies.

24 Let me introduce some of the people who
25 18:42:09 are here tonight who helped write the DEIS. In

1 18:42:12 the back, taking your names for the speakers
2 list, is Janelle Rieland. Janelle is the
3 project biologist. And up here in the front
4 running the slide show is Patricia Terhaar.

5 18:42:27 Patricia is NRG's project manager for this
6 project. We consider our third-party
7 contractor to be an extension of the FERC
8 staff.

9 The federal agencies that cooperated in
10 18:42:37 the production of the DEIS include the U.S.
11 Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard,
12 and the U.S. Department of Transportation. A
13 cooperating agency has jurisdiction by law or
14 special expertise related to project-specific
15 18:42:50 environmental impacts, and those agencies may
16 adopt the EIS to meet their own obligations for
17 compliance with the NEPA.

18 We issued a notice of availability, or
19 NOA, for the DEIS on August 17th, 2007, which
20 18:43:06 gave a closing date for comments as December
21 24th, 2007. The U.S. Environmental Protection
22 Agency noticed the issuance of our DEIS in the
23 Federal Register on August 24th, 2007.

24 We mailed almost 1300 copies of the DEIS
25 18:43:24 to various elected officials, federal, state,

1 18:43:26 and local government agencies, landowners, and
2 interested members of the public. In addition,
3 copies were sent to local newspapers and
4 libraries. Copies of the DEIS are also
5 18:43:37 available at the FERC's public reference room
6 in Washington, D.C. and may be viewed
7 electronically on the FERC's Internet Web site
8 under our eLibrary link.

9 If you need copies, NRG has additional
10 18:43:52 hard copies, and if you give Janelle a name and
11 address, NRG will send you a copy.

12 The DEIS described proposed action as
13 written out by NorthernStar. The purpose of
14 the project is to provide a new source of
15 18:44:09 natural gas to the Pacific Northwest by
16 importing LNG. LNG is natural gas that has
17 been cooled to about minus 260 degrees
18 Fahrenheit for shipment and storage as a
19 liquid. It can be transported in specially
20 18:44:25 designed ships across oceans from its point of
21 origin.

22 That's a picture of a liquefaction,
23 facility in Alaska. That's where methane gas
24 or natural gas is super cooled and turned into
25 18:44:41 a liquid and then exported. So the U.S. is

1 18:44:44 both an exporting-LNG country and an
2 importing-LNG country.

3 That's a picture of an LNG ship. Those
4 kind of ships if this project were authorized,
5 18:44:54 would be traveling up the Columbia River to
6 Bradwood Landing.

7 In summary, the Bradwood Landing LNG
8 project would consist of the following key
9 elements: An LNG import, storage,
10 18:45:08 vaporization, and sendoff facility located at
11 Bradwood Landing in Clatsop County, Oregon,
12 about 28 miles up the Columbia River from its
13 mouth. The terminal would include a dredged
14 58-acre maneuvering area adjacent to the
15 18:45:22 existing Columbia River navigation channel and
16 a single berth capable of handling ships up to
17 200,000 cubic meters in capacity.

18 The waterway for LNG marine traffic would
19 extend 12 nautical miles off the Oregon coast
20 18:45:36 up the Columbia River up to Bradwood Landing.
21 The upland portion of the terminal would
22 include two full containment LNG storage tanks
23 with a capacity of 160,000 cubic meters each.

24 A nonjurisdictional 1.5-mile-long,
25 18:45:52 115-kilovolt power line would be built,

1 18:45:55 operated, and maintained by Pacific Corp and
2 would be extended from the existing Bonneville
3 Power Administration system to the Bradwood
4 Landing LNG terminal. The LNG terminal would
5 18:46:04 have a maximum sendout capacity of 1.3 billion
6 cubic feet per day of natural gas.

7 A 36.3-mile-long natural gas sendout
8 pipeline would extend from the Bradwood Landing
9 LNG terminal to an interconnection with the
10 18:46:22 existing Williams Northwest Pipeline, their
11 existing interstate natural gas system near
12 Kelso, Washington. This would include 18.9
13 miles of 30-inch -- 36-inch-diameter pipeline
14 across portions of the Clatsop and Columbia
15 18:46:40 counties, Oregon, and 17.4 miles of 30-inch-
16 diameter pipeline in Cowlitz County,
17 Washington.

18 Associated with the pipeline would be a
19 sendout meter station located within the LNG
20 18:46:51 terminal tract, four delivery meter stations
21 and interconnections with the Georgia-Pacific
22 Wauna mill at pipeline milepost, or MP, 3.7,
23 with Northwest Natural's existing pipeline
24 system at MP 11.4, with the existing PGE Beaver
25 18:47:09 power plant at milepost 18.9, and with Williams

1 18:47:13 Northwest Pipeline at milepost 36.3.

2 There would be six main line block valves
3 located along the pipeline. There would be pig
4 launchers at the terminal and at the Beaver
5 18:47:26 meter station and pig receivers at Beaver and
6 Northwest meter stations.

7 Short, nonjurisdictional pipeline laterals
8 would be built, operated, and maintained by the
9 gas customers to interconnect with
10 18:47:40 NorthernStar's pipeline at Wauna mill,
11 Northwest Natural, and PGE Beaver. I want to
12 clarify that the Federal Energy Regulatory
13 Commission is not a sponsor of this project.

14 This project is proposed by NorthernStar. The
15 18:47:57 FERC is a licensing and regulatory agency, and
16 we take no position on this project until after
17 we have completed a full review of
18 NorthernStar's applications.

19 Before the FERC makes a decision about the
20 18:48:15 project, there are several steps that must be
21 completed, including public input. First we
22 will consider comments from the public on the
23 DEIS. Because the Commission has the
24 responsibility to treat all parties to a
25 18:48:29 proceeding equally, we must make certain that

1 18:48:31 our process is open and public.

2 For this reason, we are constrained by our
3 own internal ex parte rules. This means there
4 can be no off-the-record discussions or

5 18:48:42 correspondence between the FERC staff and
6 interested members of the public regarding the
7 merits of this case. Therefore, I urge you to
8 either speak tonight on the record or to send
9 us your comments in writing. If there are

10 18:48:55 conversations related to NEPA, there is an
11 exemption to the ex parte rules, which means
12 the FERC staff must issue a public notice and
13 put notes of those meetings into the file.

14 You can use the Internet through the FERC
15 18:49:15 Web page at www.ferc.gov to have access to
16 public records in this proceeding and to post
17 your comments. You may follow filings in this
18 proceeding through the FERC's eSubscription
19 service. You may view all filed documents in

20 18:49:31 the public record through our eLibrary link,
21 and you may send comments in electronically via
22 our eFiling link, or you can send written
23 comments the old-fashioned way through the
24 United States mail. Written comments should be

25 18:49:46 addressed to:

1 18: 49: 46 Kimberly D. Bose, secretary.
2 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
3 888 1st Street, Northeast, Room 1A.
4 Washington, D.C. 20426.

5 18: 49: 56 You must reference docket number CP06-365
6 and docket number CP06-366. You should send in
7 one original and two copies of all written
8 comments. You must label one copy for the
9 attention of the FERC Office of Energy
10 18: 50: 11 Projects, Division of Gas-Environment and
11 Engineering, Gas Branch 3, PJ11.3, which is my
12 office's mail stop internally.

13 The FERC will address all comments on the
14 DEIS in a final EIS, or FEIS. Copies of the
15 18: 50: 31 FEIS will be sent to parties on our mailing
16 list. After we have issued the FEIS, the FERC
17 staff will analyze both the environmental
18 impacts of the proposed project and
19 nonenvironmental issues such as markets and
20 18: 50: 44 rates. The FERC staff will then make
21 recommendations about the project to the five
22 Commissioners who are our decision-makers who
23 head our agency. It is those five
24 Commissioners who will make the final decision
25 18: 50: 55 about whether or not to authorize this project.

1 18:51:00 If the FERC decides to approve the
2 project, the commissioners would issue an order
3 to NorthernStar. If the Commission issues a
4 Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity
5 18:51:11 for the pipeline, under Section 7h of the
6 Natural Gas Act, that certificate would convey
7 to NorthernStar the power of eminent domain for
8 nonfederal and nontribal lands along the
9 pipeline route.

10 18:51:23 If NorthernStar is unable to negotiate an
11 easement agreement with property owners, it may
12 acquire its right-of-way easement through the
13 local courts. We urge NorthernStar to
14 negotiate in good faith with all landowners.

15 18:51:38 The LNG terminal would be under Section 3 of
16 the NGA, which does not convey the power of
17 eminent domain.

18 It is likely that a Commission order
19 authorizing the project would include our
20 18:51:51 recommended environmental conditions. You'll
21 find those conditions in the back of the DEIS.
22 There are something like 98 of them. One of
23 the conditions in the DEIS was that
24 NorthernStar should develop and fund a
25 18:52:05 third-party environmental monitoring program to

1 18:52:08 be implemented during construction.

2 In addition, the FERC staff will monitor
3 the project through construction and
4 restoration, performing on-site inspections for
5 18:52:18 compliance with the environmental conditions of
6 the order. The U.S. Department of
7 Transportation would also monitor project
8 design and construction.

9 Other agencies must also issue various
10 18:52:30 permits before the project could go forward to
11 construction. The Coast Guard would issue a
12 letter of recommendation indicating if the
13 waterway is suitable for LNG marine traffic.
14 The Corps of Engineers would issue a permit
15 18:52:43 under the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section
16 404 of the Clean Water Act. The Washington
17 Department of Ecology and Oregon Department
18 of State Lands and Oregon Department of
19 Environmental Quality would issue federally
20 18:52:55 delegated permits under Section 401 of the
21 Clean Water Act.

22 The Oregon Department of Environmental
23 Quality would also issue a federally delegated
24 permit under the Clean Air Act, and the Oregon
25 18:53:05 Department of Land Conservation and Development

1 18:53:08 would make a determination whether or not this
2 project is consistent with the Coastal Zone
3 Management Act.

4 Let me emphasize that this meeting is not
5 18:53:18 a hearing on the merits of NorthernStar's
6 proposal. As I said earlier, the purpose of
7 this meeting tonight is to give you an
8 opportunity to comment on the DEIS. While you
9 may want to declare that you are for or against
10 18:53:30 this project, those kinds of subjective
11 statements are not particularly useful to the
12 FERC staff when we formulate our environmental
13 analysis for the final environmental impact
14 statement.

15 18:53:41 The types of comments that we do find
16 constructive and useful are those that address
17 data gaps in the DEIS, or point out factual
18 errors that need to be corrected. That's why
19 it's called a draft, so that we can correct our
20 18:53:55 mistakes in the final.

21 These are the rules of decorum. I want
22 you to show respect for all speakers, not
23 interrupt or yell from the audience. Please
24 don't clap, applaud, yell, whatever. Let's
25 18:54:13 treat everyone in a neutral manner with

1 18:54:15 respect, and let's wait patiently for your turn
2 to speak. I will call up speakers in the order
3 in which they signed in. I will call several
4 people at a time, so we may go faster, if
5 18:54:26 possible.

6 Each speaker will be limited to three
7 minutes. If you have spoken at a previous
8 meeting, you will go last, and people who have
9 not yet had an opportunity to speak will go
10 18:54:37 first. Would like to -- let's see. If you
11 have comments that take more than three minutes
12 to express, please summarize your main points
13 tonight and write detailed letters to the FERC.

14 This is a meeting for you, the public, to
15 18:54:52 comment on the DEIS. It is not a question-and-
16 answer forum. Because many of your concerns
17 are complex, the FERC staff would need to do
18 some additional research before addressing
19 those issues in the FEIS. Therefore, I
20 18:55:05 probably would not be able to give accurate or
21 complete responses tonight. For those
22 questions where I do know an answer, I'll
23 provide it, and I may be able to answer some
24 questions having to do with administrative or
25 18:55:15 process issues.

1 18:55:17 Before we start hearing from speakers
2 tonight, I suggest we take a very short break
3 of a couple of minutes. This will give anyone
4 an opportunity who has not signed up to speak
5 18:55:25 an opportunity to go back to Janelle and sign
6 our speakers' list. So let's do that right
7 now, and I'll reconvene in about three minutes.

8 (Recess.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Castle? Is Bill Castle
10 18:58:12 here? Did you speak at an earlier meeting?

11 MR. BILL CASTLE: I spoke at the first one
12 in Clatskanie, yes.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

14 Because this is not an overwhelming list,
15 18:58:29 we're going to just call up one person at a
16 time. It's a small enough room and a small
17 enough audience, and I think we can do that and
18 still move the meeting along.

19 So the first person on here -- oh, by the
20 18:58:40 way, if I -- I often mess up people's names and
21 pronunciations. So please correct me when I
22 mispronounce your name.

23 We're now going to open the floor to
24 individual comments. I ask that each person
25 18:58:54 come up to the microphone here. These are

1 18:58:57 working much better than some of our other
2 microphones at other venues. You all can hear
3 me clearly. Correct? And I believe if you
4 speak up in this microphone, that you will also
5 18:59:09 be heard clearly by everyone in the back of the
6 room.

7 I want to you state your name for the
8 record and spell your last name for the court
9 reporter, identify any organization you may
10 18:59:19 represent. If you are a landowner along the
11 pipeline route and you know where your property
12 is located according to mile marks, please tell
13 us. If you don't know where your property is
14 located according to mile marks, there are some
15 18:59:30 representatives of NorthernStar here, and they
16 might be able to help you figure out what
17 milepost your property is located at.

18 The first speaker I have on the list
19 tonight is Charlotte Persons.

20 18:59:48 MS. CHARLOTTE PERSONS: Hi. I'm actually
21 Charlotte Persons, P-E-R-S-O-N-S. I live in
22 Kelso. I do not live anywhere near a pipeline.
23 I am here to represent Willapa Hills Audubon
24 Society, and we are mostly concerned with
25 19:00:00 environmental issues. One of them is carbon

1 19:00:06 di oxide emi ssi ons.

2 Page 4-382 states, to date, NorthernStar

3 has not indicated whether they intend to

4 voluntarily comply with the ODET requirements

5 19:00:16 for control of gases contributing to global

6 warming. FERC, as the U.S. entity with the

7 most direct effect on government policy

8 regarding global warming impacts of new energy

9 facilities, should take responsibility for

10 19:00:31 requiring new facilities to comply with limits

11 on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.

12 We ask that FERC use its ability -- its

13 authority to do so in this case.

14 Furthermore, carbon dioxide emissions are

15 19:00:48 a part of this kind of facility, partly because

16 of transportation of the LNG from far

17 distances -- other countries, Alaska -- partly

18 from the burning of natural gas by customers

19 who are end customers. We ask that FERC

20 19:01:06 encourage other forms of energy -- solar, wind,

21 tidal, and the like -- rather than going ahead

22 and approving LNG facilities.

23 There are also some other specific things

24 that we have problems with in terms of

25 19:01:26 mitigation. One is eagle habitat. While no

1 19:01:29 longer listed as an endangered species, eagles
2 are still protected under a variety of acts. A
3 failure of the DEIS is that the impact study
4 makes no mention of the specific needs of
5 19:01:40 individual eagles that currently use the area
6 in and near the Bradwood site.

7 The Peterson Point area proposed to
8 mitigate for 30 acres of forested land
9 destruction on the site, page 4-156, is already
10 19:01:54 being preserved by Duck Hunters Unlimited.
11 There is no plan mentioned to identify the
12 current population of eagles and then to
13 monitor from Peterson Point to see if those
14 eagles currently using this area actually --
15 19:02:11 actually move to the new area.

16 In fact, they may not do so as there are
17 already eagles nesting in that area, and eagles
18 do not share nesting territory. There should
19 also be a backup plan for other forested
20 19:02:26 mitigation areas to be created if the current
21 plan is not successful.

22 Another habitat mitigation problem that we
23 notice is the Hunt Creek/Clifton Channel
24 mitigation site. Section 4.5.2.1, page 4-152,
25 19:02:43 states: There is no plan to monitor the

1 19:02:45 success of the site as the only upkeep will be
2 the removal of noxious weeds. We ask that this
3 site be monitored to see if it is indeed acting
4 as a mitigation site, especially for federally
5 19:02:57 listed salmon and starry flounder habitat use.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
8 comments.

9 Next on the list is Laurie Caplan.

10 19:03:17 MS. LAURIE CAPLAN: My name is Laurie
11 Caplan. I'm from Astoria. I'm speaking for
12 myself, but I'm also a member of RiverVision
13 and Columbia Riverkeeper.

14 People in Clatsop County frequently ask me
15 19:03:34 why -- why oppose this project, and I tell them
16 there are hundreds of economic, safety, and
17 quality-of-life reasons to oppose this, but of
18 course tonight we're talking about

19 environmental reasons. So I would like to
20 19:03:48 raise three environmental questions and one
21 process one.

22 First, I'm all for international
23 cooperation. I'm very concerned, however, that
24 cooperation in this field means that we are
25 19:04:07 relying or would be relying on importing LNG

1 19:04:12 from countries that are not only authoritarian,
2 but are openly hostile to the United States,
3 including Iran, Russia, and Qatar. Also, just
4 the pollution and environmental degradation
5 19:04:33 that comes from extracting, processing, and
6 shipping this material from all over the globe
7 creates its own separate set of problems
8 related to pollution and further environmental
9 degradation.

10 19:04:48 So what I'm wondering is: Why would the
11 federal government support a project that makes
12 this country more dependent on a fossil fuel,
13 especially a fossil fuel that comes from
14 hostile countries, since that seems to be the
15 19:05:05 source of a good many of our problems right
16 now?

17 Secondly, all of us on the north coast are
18 grateful that we don't have hurricanes and
19 tornados, but we know that we face earthquakes
20 19:05:17 and slides, and in Astoria it's a tourist
21 attraction to drive around and show people
22 where the slides are. Even in areas that have
23 been built up for decades, we still get slides.

24 And as I understand it, the Bradwood site
25 19:05:34 and the pipeline route are going in earthquake

1 19:05:41 areas and slide areas, and it's kind of unreal
2 for me that we're even having a discussion
3 about this because it is such a ridiculous site
4 to do any of this kind of project, especially
5 19:05:55 one that poses its own set of problems if
6 anything goes wrong.

7 I would like to suggest that you update
8 your geologic and seismic information in the
9 DEIS. It's seriously out of date. There is
10 19:06:12 much more current, technologically accurate
11 information than the DEIS presents.

12 So my second question is: Why would the
13 federal government even consider siting such a
14 massive project on such a fragile ecosystem and
15 19:06:31 on such unstable land?

16 A third point is that -- my question is:
17 How can the federal government say that there
18 will be few, if any, toxic fumes from LNG
19 tankers when the tankers and their escort
20 19:06:50 boats, which the DEIS forgot to mention would
21 be running all the time, all of those engines
22 will be running not only during transit up and
23 down the river, but when the LNG tankers are
24 offloading, which takes approximately 24
25 19:07:06 hours -- so three shipments a week up, down,

1 19:07:12 and offloading means --

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Laurie, can you wrap up?

3 MS. LAURIE CAPLAN: Sorry. -- means that

4 almost every day there will be toxic fumes

5 19:07:20 spewing out.

6 The last thing that I want to say is we

7 have been sadly disappointed in the Clatsop

8 County Commissioners because they've been

9 acting like the Clatsop County board of county

10 19:07:35 contortionists. It's been very disappointing.

11 And, unfortunately, despite what you said

12 before about FERC's role, many people have come

13 to believe that "FERC" means Friends to Energy

14 Resource Companies.

15 19:07:49 So I would encourage FERC to take back its

16 role as a regulatory agency and protect all of

17 us from this horrific project. Thank you.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your

19 comments.

20 19:08:00 Next, Mike Smith.

21 MR. MIKE SMITH: My name is Mike Smith,

22 S-M-I-T-H. I am on the pipeline, and I believe

23 my mile mark is 21 through 21.058.

24 I am a realtor and a member of Cowlitz

25 19:08:27 County Association -- Cowlitz County

1 19:08:29 Associati on of Real tors. Cowlitz County
2 Associati on of Real tors has taken a stand,
3 along wi th landowners and Ci tizens for a Safe
4 Communi ty, in opposi ng the pi peli ne; among
5 19:08:40 other reasons, the quality of life it affects
6 on the area.

7 I am here to speak on behalf of myself,
8 Cowlitz County Associati on of Real tors, and the
9 many landowners in the way of the pi peli ne.

10 19:08:54 After fumbling my way through the DEIS, I found
11 plenty of places where it refers to property
12 values and studies -- and the studies seem to
13 be made by NorthernStar or some associated wi th
14 the business, or they say it can't be
15 19:09:16 determined until after the plant is completed.
16 This is not acceptable.

17 A lot of people have purchased their land
18 or inherited in the hopes of a good retirement
19 or to subdivide for our children. With the
20 19:09:30 pi peli ne bi secti ng our land, we have little
21 chance of that. As a real tor, I have seen
22 firsthand how hard it is to sell land or
23 housi ng wi th a pi peli ne in close proximi ty, and
24 to subdivide for our children is an impossi ble
25 19:09:46 task, depending on where they put the pi peli ne.

1 19:09:48 I have read the DEIS, and this pipeline is
2 going within 50 feet of several homes where
3 people live. Who do you think is going to buy
4 this home if the need to sell occurs? Would
5 19:10:02 you? If the price was right. Huh?

6 In a lot of cases, we are not well-to-do
7 and are depending on our land as a -- as a part
8 of our retirement, whether it is to sell or
9 downsize for our senior years or to subsidize
10 19:10:23 our income -- income. I was told that
11 NorthernStar had planned approximately \$158,000
12 to purchase easements through Cowlitz County.
13 This wouldn't cover the losses of one of the
14 many landowners that are affected.

15 19:10:37 For the promise of a few jobs, we are
16 jeopardizing the lives of many people. The
17 Cowlitz County Association of Realtors will
18 usually support any project that brought new
19 jobs to the area, but with all the negative
20 19:10:50 issues associated with NorthernStar, it is our
21 opinion this is not a place for the pipeline or
22 the regasification plant planned for our area.

23 As you have heard from many others before
24 me, this is not a good thing. And, if
25 19:11:05 anything, it should be close -- put closer to

1 19:11:07 the end users, Southern California. We are not
2 an LNG acceptable risk. Thank you.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
4 comments.

5 19:11:17 Next is Jim Townley.

6 MR. JIM TOWNLEY: Mr. Friedman, thank you
7 for the ability to comment this evening. I'm
8 Jim Townley, the executive director of the
9 Columbia River Steamship Operators Association,
10 19:11:37 an 85-year-old, not-for-profit association that
11 was created to represent the interests of
12 deep-sea shipping, the owners, agents that
13 bring the ships to call at ports, including
14 Kalama, Longview, Vancouver; also the deep-sea
15 19:11:50 barges that come to various Oregon coastal
16 ports; and to the inland river system that goes
17 all the way up to Lewiston, Idaho, and operates
18 between Lewiston and Astoria.

19 Our reason for being is to try and keep
20 19:12:01 the ports and the entire river system cost-
21 effective and cost-competitive with other
22 regions around the country, and to do it in a
23 manner that's safe, secure, and environmentally
24 sound. If any new entity comes into the river
25 19:12:17 system, it's looked at by our association

1 19:12:18 because our endorsement is sought, and we were
2 quite skeptical about LNG, the initial proposal
3 made about a year and a half ago.

4 Since that time we've worked with the
5 19:12:30 Coast Guard, other state and federal agencies,
6 other partners, stakeholders in the river, the
7 pilots and other people like that that make
8 their living on the river, and have come to the
9 conclusion, having participated in the waterway
10 19:12:43 suitability assessment and the resulting
11 waterway suitability report, that the
12 particular project is a positive in all
13 categories; meaning economically, on balance,
14 will benefit not just the local region but the
15 19:12:58 entire river system. The safety and security
16 of the river system will actually be improved.

17 And the other condition we are looking for
18 is an improvement and increase in environmental
19 integrity for the systems that we operate to
20 19:13:11 prevent, respond, or restore or remediate
21 should there be an environmental incident,
22 whether natural or accidental or intentional.
23 So we didn't come to this conclusion lightly.
24 We thank you for the opportunity make a
25 19:13:23 position and to encourage the FERC to go ahead

1 19:13:26 and approve the issuance of the required
2 documents.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your

5 19:13:32 comments.

6 Paul Amos.

7 MR. PAUL AMOS: Good evening.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please make sure to spell
9 your name for the court reporter.

10 19:13:55 MR. PAUL AMOS: Paul Amos, A-M-O-S. I'm
11 the President of the Columbia River Pilots. We
12 board the vessels in Astoria for the bar pilot
13 to bring them across the bar, bringing the
14 ships into to Astoria. We take them the

15 19:14:06 remainder of their voyage to Portland,
16 Vancouver, points east. We will be responsible
17 for navigating the vessels from Astoria to the
18 Bradwood Landing, about 20 miles.

19 My purpose for speaking is to assure FERC
20 19:14:19 that we handle ships of this size routinely.

21 It's not something we're unaccustomed to. We
22 train for regularly, and these ships call on
23 ports on a very regular basis, with a similar
24 draft or deeper drafts as the LNG ships we're

25 19:14:35 talking about.

1 19: 14: 36 We have developed vessel traffic
2 information system the last few years that is
3 considered state of the art and allows us to
4 manage the traffic flow of these ships so they
5 19: 14: 43 fit nicely in the patterns that exist in the
6 river now. So we don't feel there is going to
7 be any conflict or any problems occurring with
8 ships calling here. Should fit nicely into the
9 process.

10 19: 14: 56 About, oh, several years ago, our traffic
11 volumes peaked at a little over 2100 arrivals.
12 Last year, 2006, our arrivals were down to
13 1,644. So there's quite a bit of difference
14 there. So you can see that the addition of
15 19: 15: 12 these ships calling on the river won't begin to
16 fill the gap from our peak period. So the
17 traffic load can be well handled, and the river
18 has historically been handled with no problem.

19 But we now have the advantage of the more
20 19: 15: 25 modern technology of the vessel traffic
21 information system. This allows us to predict
22 where we're going to meet vessels along the
23 route, and as part of the Coast Guard
24 requirement for this project, we can only meet
25 19: 15: 36 in certain areas. With this technology we can

1 19:15:39 determine exactly where we will meet and make
2 sure to be in those areas only.

3 It's a safe -- safe river for this type of
4 operation, once the improvements have been put
5 19:15:49 in place the Coast Guard recommended, and if
6 you have any questions, feel free to contact my
7 office.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
9 comments. Next is Marvin King.

10 19:16:07 MR. MARVIN KING: My name's Marvin King,
11 K-I-N-G. And I'm speaking against this for
12 myself and probably a lot of people that don't
13 even come to these meetings and can't make it
14 here.

15 19:16:17 One of my biggest concerns with the LNG
16 plant is the amount of CO2 that it will put
17 into the atmosphere every day. In the
18 processing of the LNG alone, the plant will be
19 responsible for the release of 192 tons of CO2
20 19:16:30 daily. CO2 has been identified as the main
21 cause of global warming, which is melting the
22 world's glaciers at a record pace. It's ironic
23 that the CO2 caused from the release of this
24 will some day put this plant under water.

25 19:16:46 Another big concern is the amount of

1 19:16:47 electricity it takes to make LNG. 24
2 megawatts, or 20,000 homes' worth of
3 electricity daily, will definitely make
4 electricity prices rise as the demand will
5 19:16:58 increase. In this aspect alone, I do not see
6 how NorthernStar can condemn many private
7 citizens' property and run a pipe through it
8 when ultimately it will be responsible for
9 making the utility bills of all Northwest homes
10 19:17:13 higher.
11 If I'm not mistaken, in the eminent domain
12 process, NorthernStar must prove that they are
13 improving life for the public. And they are
14 definitely not proving that here.
15 19:17:26 Another huge concern is the climate in the
16 Northwest. The Northwest has an extremely wet
17 climate, which is the direct cause of the land
18 instability and pipe deterioration. There have
19 been numerous ruptures and explosions already
20 19:17:39 in the Northwest. It happens even in dry
21 climates, such as the 30-inch pipe explosion in
22 Carlsbad, New Mexico, on August 19th, 2000.
23 This happened to be a very dry climate, but
24 still the pipe had corrosion which led to a
25 19:17:54 rupture and the deaths of 12 innocent people.

1 19:17:57 One good question I have: If there is a
2 rupture and an explosion that causes deaths,
3 can the people that voted "yes" be held
4 accountable for the deaths since they knew of
5 19:18:08 this possibility?

6 We have so many renewable resources in
7 Oregon and Washington that are still untapped.
8 FERC should definitely say "no" to this project
9 and seek greener, renewable alternatives
10 19:18:23 instead of harming the planet for all future
11 generations.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
14 comments.

15 19:18:29 Next is Jeff Lovingfoss.

16 MR. JEFF LOVINGFOSS: My name is Jeff
17 Lovingfoss, L-O-V-I-N-G-F-O-S-S. I'm here to
18 speak on behalf of Bradwood Landing and
19 NorthernStar. Their project will provide over
20 19:19:02 \$700,000 in construction costs. 110 million of
21 that will be wage and benefits for union
22 construction workers, over 2 million hours for
23 journeyman level and apprentice construction
24 workers in our community.

25 19:19:18 As our economy grows, Canada's economy

1 19:19:22 grows, and their need for natural gas increases
2 so the amount they will be able to provide us
3 with over the years will be reduced. If that
4 supply is reduced, costs will increase in this
5 19:19:33 area, which will make it hard for our
6 industries to compete.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
9 comments.

10 19:19:45 Next is Darrel Whipple.

11 MR. DARREL WHIPPLE: I'm Darrel Whipple.
12 D-A-R-R-E-L, W-H-I-P-P-L-E. I'm speaking on
13 behalf of Willapa Hills Audubon Society, a
14 public benefit organization of about 225
15 19:20:10 members in Cowlitz and Wahkiakum counties of
16 Washington, and Columbia County, Oregon. The
17 mission of our organization is to support
18 ecologically responsible ways of life, to help
19 maintain biologically diverse habitats, and to
20 19:20:29 promote environmental understanding and
21 enjoyment of nature.

22 My comments are on the turning basin
23 that's proposed. As I understand it, the
24 proposed turning basin section of 2.3.1 is to
25 19:20:46 be excavated in an aquatic conservation unit of

1 19:20:50 the estuary, which was so designated by Clatsop
2 County pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management
3 Act and Oregon Land Use Goal 16, estuary and
4 resources. That turning basin is appropriate
5 19:21:05 to development unit, not to a conservation
6 unit, where only minor navigational
7 improvements are sanctioned. It is an
8 unacceptable stretch to characterize this
9 proposed turning basin as a minor navigational
10 19:21:23 improvement.

11 Moreover, the applicant has not
12 demonstrated that the turning basin is
13 necessary to the operation of the LNG terminal.
14 If it is true, as I have heard, that there is
15 19:21:36 sufficient space for an LNG tanker to be turned
16 around, adjacent to the dock at Bradwood, then
17 the only reason to excavate nearby in the
18 conservation unit would be to lay claim to a
19 bounteous supply of cheap sand for building up
20 19:21:52 of the plant site to design specifications.

21 Then what a few years hence? Abandon the
22 turning basin and avoid the nuisance and
23 expense of maintaining it? What sort of
24 guarantee does the applicant make that the
25 19:22:07 turning basin is so essential to the operation

1 19:22:09 of the terminal that the company will be using
2 it throughout the life of the plant? If the
3 turning basin is just an excuse to tap a nearby
4 source of sand at the expense of the structure
5 19:22:22 and biology of a protected portion of the
6 estuary, then the applicant has perpetrated a
7 deception and should be granted no permits for
8 this project.

9 My final comment generally about the DEIS,
10 19:22:40 we have noticed several sections where there
11 are incomplete portions. They may need to be
12 submitted or actually written, and if there are
13 such added portions to the DEIS, we believe
14 that public comments on those portions should
15 19:23:06 be allowed.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
18 comments.

19 Next, if I mispronounce your last name,
20 19:23:19 please correct me. Brett VandenHeuvel.

21 MR. BRETT VANDENHEUVEL: That's Brett
22 VandenHeuvel. I'm the staff attorney for
23 Col umbi a Ri verkeeper.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Brett, would you spell your
25 19:23:33 last name.

1 19:23:33 MR. BRETT VANDENHEUVEL: Sorry.

2 V-A-N-D-E-N-H-E-U-V-E-L.

3 Columbia Riverkeeper is an conservation
4 organization with over 1500 members. We're
5 19:23:46 also a part of the Lower Columbia Clean Energy

6 Coalition, which is a coalition of groups
7 including business groups, property rights
8 organizations, environmental groups that have
9 all joined together in an unprecedented joining
10 19:24:02 of groups of these types to oppose Bradwood as
11 an LNG terminal.

12 And a lot of us in this area have got a
13 big education analogy in the last three or four
14 years looking at Bradwood and looking at some

15 19:24:16 of the other sites, and there's a lot of
16 pessimism about FERC. People think FERC has
17 failed us on this. They've looked at the EIS,
18 which I have read, and I know a lot of people
19 in this room have read in detail. They think

20 19:24:29 it has been a failure, has a lot of holes in
21 it, includes a lot of misstatements,
22 misinformation that has been fed by
23 NorthernStar.

24 At this stage I still see some hope for
25 19:24:42 FERC in this process, some hope that FERC is

1 19:24:44 going to make the right decision right here.
2 I've been laughed at when I've said that; that
3 FERC has never rejected an LNG terminal, no
4 matter how bad it is, and that's true as far as
5 19:24:54 I understand.
6 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, it's not true.
7 MR. BRETT VANDENHEUVEL: Okay. What's
8 the --
9 MR. FRIEDMAN: There was a project in
10 19:25:00 Providence. Right? Yeah, there was an
11 application rejected in the Northeast.
12 MR. BRETT VANDENHEUVEL: The (inaudible)
13 in Providence?
14 MR. FRIEDMAN: No. I'm not sure exactly
15 19:25:10 where it was. It was the --
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: KeySpan.
17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, the KeySpan proposal.
18 MR. BRETT VANDENHEUVEL: I stand
19 corrected. Thank you.
20 19:25:21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was not a new
21 one.
22 MR. BRETT VANDENHEUVEL: So, other than
23 one out of many -- but I still have hope
24 because this one is an absolute no-brainer.
25 19:25:32 From all the other terminals that we've looked

1 19:25:34 at, there is nothing nearly as egregious as
2 approving this. People have talked about
3 ecologically the problems. Here it would be
4 dredging 58 acres of prime salmon habitat.

5 19:25:47 The United States, private individuals,
6 our organization have all spent hundreds and
7 hundreds of hours of time, millions of dollars
8 trying to restore this economically vital
9 salmon run, only to be degraded for the profit
10 19:26:02 of a private corporation. They hide from us
11 how it's going to be destroying salmon habitat;
12 filling 14 acres of wetland; a pipeline
13 crossing over -- the Palomar pipeline would
14 cross over over 70 water bodies in Oregon and
15 19:26:19 Washington. The proposed NorthernStar pipeline
16 would cross all the way across Cowlitz County,
17 ruining many water bodies, even if it's
18 horizontally directionally drilled.

19 Economically, there's great potential to
20 19:26:30 disrupt river traffic. The Cowlitz County
21 Association of Realtors, I find that very
22 interesting that they're opposing this project
23 because usually anything that brings jobs they
24 approve. Global warming was mentioned earlier.

25 19:26:43 LNG is not the same as domestic natural gas.

1 19:26:47 Two different studies have shown that it's
2 either 30 or 40 percent -- emits 30 or 40
3 percent more greenhouse gases than domestic
4 natural gas.

5 19:26:57 And eminent domain was mentioned earlier.
6 It seems to be FERC's policy and the policy of
7 the United States government that whoever gets
8 their application in first is going to be
9 approved first. Everyone agrees that there's

10 19:27:12 not going to be very many of these LNG
11 terminals approved, so it's a race to get that
12 done first. That's very unwise energy policy.
13 FERC should look closely at the wisdom of the
14 location and the need for the gas and not just
15 19:27:27 approve whoever comes in the door first.

16 Lastly, on this -- lastly, safety.
17 NorthernStar is an energy speculator, funded by
18 investors out of New York. They're not a
19 reputable company. They've never built
20 19:27:40 anything. They've never built a gas station.

21 Dr. Jerry Havens, who's going to -- this is for
22 folks in the audience, too. Dr. Jerry Havens,
23 who is an expert on LNG safety, is in Oregon
24 this week, and he's going to present testimony

25 19:27:56 to you tomorrow night in Knappa. So I

1 19:27:58 encourage everyone to go out and see him.

2 I had the good fortune of meeting with him

3 today and some representatives of Oregon and

4 the federal government, and he wrote the model

5 19:28:08 that's used in 49 CFR 123 that FERC applies,

6 and in the EIS he flew all the way to Oregon to

7 tell you -- and I'm going to give you a little

8 precursor to tonight -- that NorthernStar and

9 FERC applied his model incorrectly and that

10 19:28:22 they vastly underestimated the safety

11 consequences of the vapor cloud dispersion

12 model.

13 In simple English, they say that a vapor

14 cloud fire is going to be much smaller than it

15 19:28:34 actually would be. So this is a very high-

16 consequence event. Granted, everyone agrees

17 it's low risk, but the consequence of this must

18 be analyzed, not only for the terminal itself,

19 but for the city of Astoria and the other

20 19:28:48 organizations --

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Wrap it up.

22 MR. BRETT VANDENHEUVEL: -- and the other

23 population centers that it passes along the

24 route, including right across the river the

25 19:28:55 population center on Puget Island.

1 19:28:58 So those are what quickly what we consider
2 to be the very negative aspects of this
3 proposal. As I said, I think it's a
4 no-brainer. I have hope that FERC can stand
5 19:29:11 strong and reject this application.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
8 comments.

9 We're going to guess on this. It's hard
10 19:29:42 reading the writing. Marcie Denison? Your
11 turn to speak. And if you could spell your
12 last name for the court reporter.

13 MS. MARCIA DENISON: I'm Marcia Denison.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: If you can push the
15 19:30:01 microphone down a bit. He was really tall.

16 MS. MARCIA DENISON: Marcia Denison,
17 Pacific Rainforest Guardians. Just a second.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Can you spell your last
19 name for the court reporter, please.

20 19:30:20 MS. MARCIA DENISON: D-E-N-I-S-O-N.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

22 MS. MARCIA DENISON: I can't get past the
23 part where a branch of our military would be
24 commandeered and they would -- could possibly
25 19:30:35 kill anybody that's in their way. I mean, that

1 19:30:37 part -- you know, I kind of stumble over that
2 one from the beginning, you know. But also
3 their lack of concern for anybody else with
4 something that dangerous. They shouldn't even
5 19:30:52 have a license to operate. When you got
6 something really dangerous, you got to be
7 really concerned about people around you. They
8 won't even set the gas to prevent a disaster
9 from happening. They don't care.

10 19:31:09 My handwriting is terrible, isn't it?
11 Okay.

12 LNG ships are not allowed in California,
13 and they must not be allowed in Oregon because
14 they are too dangerous. I mean, you know, this
15 19:31:23 is just plain as the nose on your face, isn't
16 it?

17 NorthStar must not be allowed to risk
18 burning our forests and killing our wildlife in
19 case of an accident. If they don't care enough
20 19:31:42 to set the gas, you know there's a good
21 likelihood of an accident happening.

22 Okay. They don't care if they suck up all
23 the young salmon into their bilge water. They
24 don't even bother to put a screen on the intake
25 19:32:01 of the bilge pump. They take the salmon and

1 19:32:07 dump them off in Indonesia. What's that for
2 the environment? Is that good for the
3 environment? No. They get a big "F" for EIS.
4 Okay?

5 19:32:18 I'm struggling on this. Okay.

6 The air is so bad already. In Longview
7 and Rainier area, all that crap drifts across
8 the river. I can't even see the hill four
9 blocks away when -- there's too many

10 19:32:34 smokestacks now. The lower Columbia industrial
11 area is ignored by the EPA. They don't monitor
12 all this horrible pollution that we have from
13 all these smokestacks. They just turn their
14 back on it because it's not up around Seattle

15 19:32:50 someplace.

16 And there's a very, very high rate of lung
17 cancer and other lung diseases here, and we
18 don't need any more smokestacks. All that is
19 is going to fuel a whole bunch more smokestacks

20 19:33:01 and kill people, and we don't want it. It's
21 bad. It's frustrating not being able to get
22 the government authorities to do something
23 about it, too.

24 Okay. Oh, man. Okay. We need the air

25 19:33:21 cleaned up in the lower Columbia industrial

1 19:33:24 area. We don't need more plants, and don't
2 make it worse, please. And I think that's all
3 I had to say. Let's see.

4 Oh, yeah. We want wind and wave power.

5 19:33:36 We don't want any more smog and carbon dioxide.
6 The global warming is -- is shocking now. I
7 mean, it's time to slam on the brakes. A good
8 place to start. Thank you.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
10 19:33:50 comments.

11 Again, correct me if I mispronounce your
12 name, John Koehler. And, John, please make
13 sure you spell your last name for the court
14 reporter.

15 19:34:12 MR. JOHN KOEHLER: You got the
16 pronunciation correct. K-O-E-H-L-E-R. I am,
17 as far as I know, not on the pipeline. At
18 least I hope I'm not.

19 A few things I'd like to mention right
20 19:34:27 now. They're really in the form of questions
21 for your final draft, to address, not comments
22 as your preliminaries said. The question
23 that's already been brought up about the
24 question of safety I think is one that's very,
25 19:34:43 very important. Yes, the chances are very low.

1 19: 34: 49 At least we most certainly all hope they're
2 low. However, the chance was very low for
3 Three Mile Island, for Chernobyl.

4 You locate things that are very, very
5 19: 34: 59 dangerous in places that make sense. You don't
6 locate a nuclear power plant at the head of a
7 waterway that will pollute all the waterways if
8 something happens. You don't plant places at
9 the top of a windy mountain so that if you have
10 19: 35: 15 a meltdown, you have that wind spreading things
11 all over the place. You don't put it in the
12 middle of a large population base.

13 I hope that when you're doing your safety
14 consideration, you're not only looking at the
15 19: 35: 29 possibility of danger, of an accident and the
16 impact, but the location. Is this really a
17 safe place to put it? Is it really an
18 appropriate place to put it? You're talking
19 about the largest river in the United States,
20 19: 35: 45 one that has tremendous tidal flow and current
21 flow through there.

22 Any kind of an act that's going to carry
23 that liquid natural gas a long distance very,
24 very quickly, is not going to be a
25 19: 35: 59 lackadaisical situation, where you have plenty

1 19:36:02 of time to respond. It's going to spread
2 itself very rapidly to a very wide area. So I
3 hope those are issues that you're looking at
4 very carefully.

5 19:36:12 Secondly, the reason that I don't believe
6 that I'm on the gas line is because they were
7 intending to come up in the middle of my
8 property, and they discovered when they did
9 some studies -- this is secondhand, but my
10 19:36:25 understanding -- I purchased the property a
11 year and a half ago, and in talking with the
12 people I purchased the property from, my
13 understanding was is that they decided that my
14 property was not adequate because of severe
15 19:36:39 slide dangers.

16 They've moved the location where they are
17 intending to bring it up, I believe, about a
18 quarter of a mile into my neighbor's yard. I
19 hope that you are doing appropriate studies and
20 19:36:54 looking at very carefully to make sure that
21 that short distance of travel is enough that
22 the threat of landslides really has been
23 eliminated. So, you know, it's -- I'll leave
24 it at that.

25 19:37:14 The third issue I'd like to question, ask

1 19:37:17 a question about, is we already have in
2 Washington a natural gas line that goes right
3 through that area. Why, if we're going to use
4 eminent domain to put in an additional gas
5 19:37:31 line, would we not put it in the exact same
6 route?

7 It seems to me that if you're talking
8 about minimizing environmental impact, the best
9 way to possibly reduce the impact of natural
10 19:37:47 gas lines is to lay two of them side by side,
11 space them apart whatever distance is
12 appropriate to make sure that there's no
13 accidental breakage of one line while you're
14 working on the second line, and run the line
15 19:38:00 exactly the same spot. It seems to me that you
16 can't make smaller environmental imprint than
17 doing that rather than running a second gas
18 line that's separated in some cases completely
19 encircled property, making the values very,
20 19:38:21 very low. And that's it.

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, John.

22 Vonda Kay Brock.

23 MS. VONDA KAY BROCK: Good evening. I'm
24 hoping that you will not --

25 19:38:44 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please spell your name.

1 19:38:46 SPEAKER: My name is Vonda Kay Brock.
2 Last name is B-R-O-C-K. I live out of
3 Longview, up in the hills, a place called
4 Stella. And I'm hoping that I can get
5 19:38:58 everything said that I need to say in my three
6 minutes time.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: And if not, you can send in
8 detailed written comments to the commission.

9 MS. VONDA KAY BROCK: Right. I understand
10 19:39:05 that. But I have just this little small thing,
11 but I don't read very well tonight. I'm having
12 a little difficulty. So I hope you'll just
13 bear with me and let me get my statement said.
14 Thank you. Thanks.

15 19:39:26 First of all, I've heard some very
16 interesting comments here tonight, and I think
17 that some of those comments are very
18 far-reaching, and FERC is an organization that
19 needs to also be far-reaching. You need to be
20 19:39:41 thinking ahead rather than at the moment. And,
21 therefore, some of these statements that have
22 been made in regard to the DEIS should be
23 considered very carefully, because you can't
24 judge whether -- that's one of the issues that
25 19:40:02 we have here in the Pacific Northwest, is a lot

1 19:40:04 of hydrology, a lot of geology, and a lot of
2 both of them getting mixed together, which
3 means that we have slippery slopes all over the
4 place. And Washington is number two in the
5 19:40:17 nation as far as frequencies of earthquakes,
6 also.

7 However, what I have to say is something
8 about the fact that this DEIS thing is a
9 redundancy. Shouldn't even -- you shouldn't
10 19:40:29 have to be here. You shouldn't have to be here
11 tonight listening to us. And the reason you
12 shouldn't have to be here is because FERC
13 already had a good plan, and I want to tell you
14 a story about that plan.

15 19:40:45 I have right here statements published in
16 December of 2003 by FERC. The title of this
17 statement is California Natural Gas Market
18 Outlook. And a statement of interest that I
19 quote in that is: Planned gas-fired electric
20 19:41:02 plant in the West for the period 2003 to 2006
21 will be located along the major interstate
22 national -- natural gas pipelines and along the
23 intrastate natural gas pipelines in California.

24 Another FERC statement from that same
25 19:41:17 paper says: Between 2006 and 2009,

1 19: 41: 22 approximately 8.65 billion cubic feet per day
2 of natural gas may be available to California
3 from potential LNG import terminals to be
4 located in California and Baja California, but
5 19: 41: 38 then the wars began. California doesn't want
6 LNG. The people don't want LNG. I have a map
7 here that has 21 locations on it that have been
8 either stopped completely or they're stranded,
9 because the LNG facilities can't go any further
10 19: 41: 58 right now.

11 The wars have started. California --
12 here's a map showing 21 California/Baja
13 California LNG projects put on hold or
14 discontinued. No LNG. World War III developed
15 19: 42: 17 between Conoco Phillips, Marathon, Chevron,
16 Texaco, Sempra, and Shell to gain the permit
17 for Baja California LNG. I'm sure you're all
18 familiar with that. Sempra and Shell joined
19 forces, and they won that war. And that's what
20 19: 42: 33 we mean when we say first come, first serve
21 with FERC. First come, first serve. The first
22 one on the block is the one who gets the apple.

23 Sempra has since dedicated \$11 billion to
24 develop their West Coast infrastructure.

25 19: 42: 47 Sempra experienced a huge blow when their

1 19:42:51 Frontier Line coal-fired electric generator
2 plant and their Sunrise Link coal-fired
3 electric generator plant and subsequent
4 interstate transmission lines failed.

5 19:43:03 MR. FRIEDMAN: Ms. Brock, can you wrap it
6 up?

7 MS. VONDA KAY BROCK: After those defeats
8 and the loss of the Frontier Line campaign,
9 California energy czar Joseph F. Desmond --

10 19:43:12 Sempra switched gears and concentrated on LNG
11 gas-fired generators. They are now working to
12 achieve that end, and Joseph Desmond is still a
13 familiar name in that same pursuit. Joseph
14 Desmond championed Sempra's Frontier Line and
15 19:43:29 now champions NorthernStar's Bradwood Landing
16 as senior vice president of external affairs.

17 The gas and oil exploration by the name of
18 Venoco owns Grace Oil Platform that
19 NorthernStar has contracted to purchase for an
20 19:43:42 offshore LNG terminal in California. Venoco
21 now has plans to explore for natural gas in
22 this region and is aware of previous
23 explorations which discovered potential natural
24 gas storage chambers in the region. Sempra has
25 19:43:53 no storage chambers in their territories.

1 19:43:56 Sempra's chairman of finance is on the board of
2 directors of Venoco. Now comes Northwest --

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please wrap it up and you
4 can send in details.

5 19:44:06 MS. VONDA KAY BROCK: I will take one more
6 minute.

7 -- a partner with NorthernStar and
8 TransCanada, Palomar natural gas pipeline
9 project. It turns out that a Mr. Henry Morse,
10 19:44:14 president and former CEO of TransCanada, is the
11 general manager of the North Baja California
12 pipeline, Sempra's LNG hook-up, and is also the
13 project manager for the Palomar project, which
14 will mesh with Bradwood Landing and intends to
15 19:44:31 accommodate the Midwestern and Southwest
16 natural gas markets.

17 Now, the last quote from your FERC people.
18 Another FERC 2003 quote: In 2011, increased
19 pipeline capacity in the West is projected to
20 19:44:44 serve the Midwest, primarily, and California to
21 a lesser extent.

22 We don't need this pipeline coming through
23 Washington because it isn't for us. It isn't
24 for us at all. Now, it's about big government,
25 19:44:56 it's about big money, and it's not about Oregon

1 19:44:59 and Washington, who want to stay green, who
2 want to stay clean, and who want to step
3 forward quickly on renewable energy resources.
4 We don't need plan B. Thank you.

5 19:45:09 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
6 comments. And if you have detailed comments,
7 please mail them to us.

8 Nancy Munk Christie.

9 MS. NANCY MUNK CHRISTIE: My name is Nancy
10 19:45:31 Munk Christie. My last name is
11 C-H-R-I-S-T-I-E. I'm here on behalf of myself
12 and also my mother, Audrey Munk, who has sent
13 you her own comments already. Her home, in
14 which three generations of our family have
15 19:45:48 lived, has been described as at ground zero for
16 this pipeline. She's been -- she's 86 years
17 old. She's been in this home since she was a
18 child. She would -- her family was there
19 before that. It's at mile marker 34, and I
20 19:46:08 also live at that residence.

21 If I were not opposed to this for the
22 personal reasons that it's going to destroy our
23 family home, I would be opposed to it for many
24 other reasons. First, around our location,
25 19:46:25 which is on 40 hilly acres, the ground is

1 19: 46: 29 extremely unstable. Every year for the last
2 six years I've had to spend a substantial
3 amount of my time helping clean up from a
4 full-size fir tree that has fallen or has had
5 19: 46: 44 to be cut from disease or age.

6 The area where this pipeline is going to
7 go through has many, many full-size fir trees
8 around it. I often worry that one of them is
9 going to fall on our house. I greatly fear
10 19: 46: 58 what would happen if one of them fell across
11 this pipeline. So I'm wondering, would they
12 cut every tree, you know, within miles of it so
13 they wouldn't fall down? These are very big
14 trees.

15 19: 47: 12 If I were not opposed to it, again, for
16 personal reasons, I would still be opposed to
17 it for the larger reasons, for the reasons
18 others have mentioned: For the salmon spawning
19 ground problems, for the CO2 emissions, for all
20 19: 47: 25 the other people who may lose their property.
21 But I am especially enraged over what I would
22 call environmental justice.

23 Whenever a company like NorthernStar and
24 the others who have filed for permits have a
25 19: 47: 40 very questionable and nasty environmental

1 19:47:43 project that they can't seem to manage to site
2 in a large-population area which it's
3 ultimately going to benefit, they try to run it
4 through a rural area, more sparsely populated,
5 19:47:54 where they think perhaps people will jump at
6 the jobs and the chance for industry. And I'm
7 just really enraged that they think that this
8 area where I grew up is -- falls into that
9 category.

10 19:48:10 I think you can see by the comments of the
11 people around here tonight that this is an
12 activist, educated population who are not going
13 to let this issue drop. And if they think this
14 is -- this is a place where they can put this
15 19:48:26 pipeline because people are so desperate for
16 it, they have another thing coming.

17 The few extra jobs, the extra initial
18 possible boost to the economy, I think, is
19 shortsighted. I think in the long term this
20 19:48:40 will be a disaster for this area. Even the
21 larger area, the other ports -- Portland,
22 Kalama -- it will be terrible. It will damage
23 all the other shipping to the exclusion of the
24 LNG, and I really do not want to see this
25 19:48:57 happen in my home.

1 19:48:58 Thank you.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
3 comments.

4 Next is -- please correct me when I
5 19:49:06 mispronounce your names. Leslie Hildula.

6 MS. LESLIE HILDULA: Yes.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: And don't forget to spell
8 your name for the court reporter.

9 MS. LESLIE HILDULA: Leslie Hildula.
10 19:49:18 H-I-L-D-U-L-A.

11 I have a farm in Clatskanie. It looks
12 like is a possibility that the pipeline will go
13 through our farm, and the farm has been in our
14 family since the '30s, and so that's probably
15 19:49:32 my initial objection to it. It doesn't seem
16 like the best use of the land or of the river
17 of this area. When healthy, this land and the
18 river has the potential to support a lot of
19 jobs, create a lot of food, and it's not what I
20 19:49:48 consider the best and highest use of the land
21 or the river.

22 Second of all, the point that other people
23 have made is that California rejected it
24 because of concerns. They are the primary
25 19:50:02 customer; then why should we be so foolish as

1 19:50:05 to allow it?

2 Three, the other issue that concerns me,
3 it seems that we're putting -- we have a lot of
4 difficulty, including fighting wars, with
5 19:50:13 foreign energy, and it doesn't seem like the
6 best use of our government resources or even of
7 our nation's resources to be spending time
8 developing an energy source that is not
9 domestic.

10 19:50:22 And my final point gets into wanting to
11 support renewable sources of energy. I'd be
12 willing to pay more taxes. I drive vehicles
13 that use biofuels, and I would love to have
14 subsidies for domestic renewable sources of
15 19:50:39 energy and to put our efforts there instead of
16 into an LNG facility that has such potential to
17 hurt our land and our river.

18 And I also want to say thank you for being
19 here. I appreciate the opportunity to come
20 19:50:53 here tonight, the fact that you held some more
21 public input meetings, and that you're taking
22 the time to take our testimony.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
24 comments.

25 19:51:07 Now I've reached the time where people

1 19:51:09 would be talking who have previously spoken at
2 other meetings. So before I give them that
3 opportunity, I want to know if there's anyone
4 else who has not signed up who wishes to speak,
5 19:51:17 who did not speak at an earlier meeting. If
6 you do, please raise your hand.

7 MS. MELISSA WILKIE: I haven't spoken.

8 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. And you'd like
9 to speak? Come on up, please, to the
10 19:51:27 microphone and have an opportunity. Just
11 remember to state your name for the record and
12 spell your last name.

13 MS. MELISSA WILKIE: Hi. Thanks for being
14 here tonight. My name is Melissa Wilkie,
15 19:51:41 W-I-L-K-I-E. I live west of Longview near the
16 site where the pipeline's coming through.

17 I'm here this evening to address the lack
18 of concern on the part of NorthernStar and our
19 federal government when it comes to the safety
20 19:51:54 of the citizens who will live along the
21 pipeline corridor. In the DEIS, pipeline
22 safety is basically mentioned in only regard to
23 laws and the Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. In
24 fact, the term "pipeline emergency" is only
25 19:52:08 mentioned once.

1 19:52:09 Beginning on page 4-440, part 192 of the
2 law explains area classifications are based on
3 population density in the vicinity of the
4 pipeline, with "vicinity" defined as 220 yards
5 19:52:22 on either side of the pipeline along one
6 continuous mile of pipeline. Areas are divided
7 into classes, depending on the number of
8 buildings. Most of the pipeline route is
9 designated class one and class two, for a total
10 19:52:37 of 33.3 miles.

11 No homes within that distance are
12 considered HCAs, or high consequence areas,
13 meaning our federal government considers those
14 living in the class one and two areas
15 19:52:50 acceptable risks in case of a pipeline failure.

16 Additionally, on page 4-442 it is clearly
17 stated no additional specialized local fire
18 protection would be required to handle pipeline
19 emergencies. Southwest Washington is an area
20 19:53:05 where three pipeline explosions have happened
21 in the last 20 years, with two of those events
22 happening in Cowlitz County, all due to
23 ground-shift issues, each within short miles of
24 this proposed pipeline.

25 19:53:19 Section 4.11.9.2, pages 4-442 to 4-444,

1 19:53:26 pipeline accident data, absolutely no mention
2 of William Northwest pipeline issues, multiple
3 leaks and explosions resulting in the emergency
4 shutdown of the 24-inch line and transfer of
5 19:53:40 capacity to the parallel 30-inch line.

6 How many people in this room were even
7 aware the smaller Williams line running through
8 Cowlitz County had been abandoned because
9 repairs were too costly? There is no need for
10 19:53:53 the additional capacity. The remaining
11 operational 30-inch line was exposed during
12 heavy rains last winter and floated into the
13 Toutle River.

14 Section 4.11.3 on page 4-444, impact on
15 19:54:09 public safety. When national figures are used
16 in support of the regional issue, at best those
17 figures should be considered skewed. Regional
18 topography, climate, seismic activity, winds,
19 et cetera, create issues specific to a region.

20 19:54:24 What happens in southwest Washington is not the
21 same as what happens in the high-plains area of
22 central and eastern Washington.

23 Therefore, using a figure of potentially
24 -- of potential fatality every 2,752 years is
25 19:54:42 ludicrous. Tell that to the families with the

1 19:54:44 12 people who died as a result of the El Paso
2 pipeline explosion in the '90s. The force of
3 the explosions associated with the disaster was
4 strong enough to set off three seismic readings
5 19:54:53 that were used as evidence in wrongful-death
6 lawsuits against El Paso.

7 Ground shift is enough of a concern in
8 this area that Mike Kay would -- with Northwest
9 Natural Gas, NorthernStar's partner, has told
10 19:55:07 more than one landowner that following the KB
11 pipeline is not an option along most of the
12 route for that exact reason. No human life is
13 an acceptable risk, and for this data to be
14 left out or generalized is unacceptable.

15 19:55:22 Thank you.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
17 comments.

18 Again, I would ask if anyone who has not
19 spoken previously who wishes to speak, please
20 19:55:34 raise your hand now. Please come on up, and
21 you have the opportunity. I just ask that you
22 state your name and spell your last name for
23 the record.

24 MR. JERRY JANSSEN: I can do that. My
25 19:55:45 name is Jerry Janssen, J-A-N-S-S-E-N. So

1 19:55:50 anyways, I'm not real prepared here. I'm not
2 going to -- I don't have the draft EIS. I'm
3 just going to give you a couple of my opinions.

4 First of all, in the overall project, I
5 19:56:01 grew up in Astoria, and I remember, you know,
6 20, 30 years ago, fishing was a very large
7 industry down there, and it pretty much has
8 dwindled away. So with that in mind, it kind
9 of doesn't make sense for me, even though I
10 19:56:17 don't live there but I still have family and
11 friends there, to -- how they can think that
12 they're going to spend a bunch of money to
13 bring the salmon back or protect the salmon,
14 and on and on and on, while they're doing so
15 19:56:31 much damage to the river. Okay? The salmon
16 haven't come back in 30 years, so I don't
17 know -- money isn't going to make them come
18 back.

19 The other thing that kind of concerns me
20 19:56:41 is, you know, you put this plant at the mouth
21 of the -- near the mouth of the Columbia and
22 bottleneck it, when you got four or five ports
23 upriver, and supposedly these ships have to be
24 escorted in and out, which nobody really knows
25 19:56:59 for sure because the Coast Guard is being very

1 19:57:02 hushed on what's actually required. Okay?

2 So, you know, people up the river I don't
3 think realize -- maybe they do. I don't
4 know -- that it's going to affect the shipping,
5 19:57:16 you know, more than just the mouth of the
6 Col umbi a.

7 The jobs. You know, I have friends that
8 are union, you know, carpenters and jobs are
9 good. Okay? So they're going to go work for a
10 19:57:31 couple years maybe, get their pay, move on, and
11 everybody's got families to support. That's
12 fine. I don't have a problem with that. Five
13 years from now or five years from when the
14 plant's built, you know, you got 20, 30, maybe
15 19:57:44 40 people working at this plant, probably
16 aren't going to be from this area, probably are
17 going to be more, you know, technical people.
18 So, I don't know, you know, shortsighted. Who
19 knows? I don't know.

20 19:58:00 The other thing that kind of concerns me,
21 and this is now more of a personal deal, is
22 probably for the last five years I've worked my
23 ass off to buy this piece of property and built
24 my house for my family, my kids. So now I get
25 19:58:20 this rumor starting a few years ago that this

1 19:58:23 pipeline is coming and pretty much going to go
2 up 450 feet of my five acres that I own. So --
3 but there again, I don't know for sure because
4 nobody can give us a straight answer. Okay?

5 19:58:38 Because a lot of this is hushed.

6 So I'm at the point where I don't know
7 what I'm supposed to do with my property. Do I
8 let the -- let them come in? Do I get a
9 lawyer? Do I fight it? Can I fight it? I

10 19:58:52 don't have, you know, money to fight it. You
11 know, so there you go. I just -- I don't know.

12 I think the project is moving ahead too
13 quickly, and with all these comment periods, 30
14 days or whatever they are, and the decisions

15 19:59:07 are too big to be made in that short of time.

16 And the only information that I've really
17 received directly was a letter a few years ago
18 from somebody basically asking permission to
19 survey my property. And being on the pipeline

20 19:59:28 route, I haven't received anything else in that
21 amount of time, other than this Corps of
22 Engineers report that was inaccurate. And it's
23 just -- there's so many questions to be
24 answered, I just don't really see how it can be

25 19:59:45 done in 30, 40 days or whatever the time line

1 19:59:47 is. So anyways, thank you.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
3 comments.

4 As those of you know, in our notice of
5 19:59:55 availability, there is 120-day comment period
6 on the DEIS, 120 days. So don't think that's a
7 short time or period.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you mention
9 the deadline, please, Paul.

10 20:00:10 MR. FRIEDMAN: The deadline is December
11 24, 2007, for comments on the DEIS. If you
12 don't know if you are a property owner on the
13 pipeline, there are NorthernStar
14 representatives in the room. Please talk to
15 20:00:22 them. I think they can tell you whether or not
16 their pipeline is crossing your property.

17 Next on -- no. Once again, is there
18 anyone who has not spoken who would like to,
19 who has not spoken before? Please come up,
20 20:00:39 state your name, and spell it for the court
21 reporter.

22 MS. NANCY ASHLEY: I'm Nancy Ashley.
23 A-S-H-L-E-Y.

24 I was raised Native American. This land,
25 20:00:52 the trees, the fish, the rivers, the mountains,

1 20:00:55 all of it is our religion. It's our life.
2 It's our great spirit. This river is a living
3 entity. It's not just something to be used to
4 make money for big business, to benefit
5 20:01:08 somebody on the other side of the earth. The
6 U.S. government has run over us from the
7 beginning. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
10 20:01:19 comments.

11 Is there anyone else who has not
12 previously spoken who would like an opportunity
13 to do so at this time? If not, I'm going to
14 start calling on people who have previously
15 20:01:31 spoken but want a second opportunity.

16 Duncan, you're the first. And don't
17 forget when you come up here to restate your
18 name and spell it again for the court reporter.
19 I'm sorry that that's redundant.

20 20:01:42 MR. DUNCAN MacKENZIE: Good evening. My
21 name is Duncan McKenzie. D-U-N-C-A-N,
22 M-A-C-K-E-N-Z-I-E.

23 Your attention is directed to the
24 discussion of routine discharge condensing
25 20:01:52 water from the submerged combustion vaporizers

1 20:01:54 as found on pages 4-149 and 4-150 of the DEIS.

2 It is noted that the discharge will be
3 approximately 68 degrees and will contain a
4 concentration of total dissolved solids of ten
5 20:02:07 times the concentration found in the river.

6 It is assumed that the dissolved solids
7 are the reaction products arising from the
8 treatment using caustic soda to adjust the PH
9 of the condensive water to a neutral state, and
10 20:02:21 these reaction products are typically carbon,
11 sodium carbonate and sodium nitrate.

12 The National Marine Fishery Service has
13 commented on this aspect in its request for
14 additional information on the Bradford Landing
15 20:02:34 LNG terminal on page 10, lines 27 through 43.

16 The applicant has partially replied to the
17 National Marine Fishery Service in a letter
18 dated the 6th of July on pages 25 and 26: The
19 scaling down of a heat exchanger system to use
20 20:02:50 LNG to cool the discharged water is too
21 expensive and not a feasible solution.

22 However, this argument is found less than
23 convincing as one finds in appendix D on pages
24 217 and 218 of the Kitimat LNG terminal
25 20:03:04 environmental assessment report and

1 20:03:06 comprehensive study prepared by the British
2 Columbia Environmental Assessment Office, dated
3 13 April 2006, that the proposed and permitted
4 LNG terminal at Kitimat will employ a covered
5 20:03:18 settling pond, precipitated dissolved solids,
6 and an LNG-to-conductive-water heat exchanger
7 to hold the discharged water to within half a
8 degree centigrade of the receiving waters.

9 There is a concern that the current design
10 20:03:30 envisioned by the applicant does not address
11 the long-term effects on the downstream river
12 environment occasioned by a localized plume of
13 alkaline material emanating from the outfall.

14 As found in the United Nations Environment
15 20:03:45 Program Publication, sodium carbonate --
16 initial assessment report for SIAM 15 held in
17 Boston in October of 2002, sodium carbonate in
18 concentrations greater than a hundred
19 milligrams per liter will cause mortality in
20 20:03:59 fish.

21 However, for salmon and trout lethal
22 effects were observed at levels of 67 to 80
23 milligrams per liter. Add to this the active
24 and chronic mixing aspect now found in the
25 20:04:10 applicant's thermal mixing model of hexavalent

1 20:04:14 chromium and silver, and the insult to the
2 salmon is exacerbated.

3 In view of the applicant's numerous press
4 releases extolling its environmental

5 20:04:23 responsibility, and as found at the bottom of
6 4-150, quote: The applicant has committed to
7 provide an overall benefit to the environment
8 of the lower Columbia River ecosystem. The
9 applicant's argument of expense found in the
10 20:04:36 response to the Fishery Service is considered
11 unavailing as a justification for ignoring
12 practicable thermal pollution mitigation
13 measures for this critical habitat area.

14 In view of the potential thermal pollution
15 20:04:49 of the receiving waters and the potential for
16 long-term discharge of alkaline sediment into
17 the river over the operational life of the
18 facility, it is strongly suggested that, in
19 addition to the recommendation requiring the
20 20:05:02 applicant, as he has now furnished the
21 thermal-mixing model, FERC recommend to the
22 applicant that they fully examine and address
23 the long-term effects of alkaline sediment
24 buildup downstream of the STP outfall and to
25 20:05:14 review the Kitimat LNG system of discharge

1 20:05:17 water treatment for possible incorporation of
2 this system into the applicant's proposed
3 facility design.

4 Thank you very much.

5 20:05:23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
6 comments.

7 Gloria MacKenzie. By the way, when I get
8 written comments given to me directly, like
9 this case with Gloria, I do put them into the
10 20:05:48 public record.

11 MS. GLORIA MacKENZIE: Thank you. Good
12 evening, Mr. Friedman and staff. My name is
13 Gloria MacKenzie. M-A-C-K-E-N-Z-I-E.

14 This evening I am speaking for myself and
15 20:06:00 on behalf of the Audubon Societies of Willapa
16 Hills, Portland, and Washington state. I am
17 submitting a CD and testimony from the October
18 22nd Clatsop County Board of Commissioners
19 hearing in which I also addressed the

20 20:06:16 information regarding the need for LNG. I will
21 continue to refer to these reports now.

22 In the introduction page 1-3 of the DEIS
23 it states, and I quote: There has been and
24 will continue to be an increasing demand for

25 20:06:32 natural gas in the United States and the

1 20:06:35 Pacific Northwest, end of quote.

2 I have two problems with this statement.

3 One, in the July 10 public hearing Gary

4 Coppedge, senior vice president, clearly stated

5 20:06:48 that the gas is not going to California, but

6 that it is to remain in the Northwest and not

7 even mentioning anything about the rest of the

8 West.

9 Two, the information that I have just --

10 20:07:04 the information -- excuse me. The information

11 that I have seen to justify the demand or need

12 for natural gas has been exaggerated.

13 NorthernStar has repeatedly in their

14 presentations used the economic impact analysis

15 20:07:18 of Dr. Philip Romero and information from the

16 Northwest Gas Association. In several

17 instances the information has been doctored,

18 materially altered, or eliminated to establish

19 need. A complete letter with this information

20 20:07:36 and backup material, more of this, will be

21 submitted to FERC.

22 While none of this information appears in

23 the DEIS, it has been used locally to establish

24 and justify the need for the proposed zoning

25 20:07:55 and comprehensive land use changes and

1 20:09:11 Next is Frans.

2 MR. FRANS EYKEL: Good evening. Thank you
3 for accepting our comments. Eykel, E-Y-K-E-L,
4 my last name.

5 20:09:29 My comments are in reference to the DEIS,
6 page 4-78, the water resources. This is -- the
7 data is not in your DEIS. This was a document
8 submitted, a technical memo by Coast & Harbor
9 Engineering for NorthernStar about the mixing

10 20:09:53 zone analysis for Bradwood Landing point-source
11 discharges.

12 I'd like to mention a minor error on
13 paragraph 2.4, page 3, where they mention a
14 flow rate of 4,200 gallons per hour. This in
15 20:10:16 regard to fire/water discharge. It should read
16 4,400 gallons per minute.

17 My other comment is in regard to the
18 memorandum, paragraph 2.2, page 2 and 3, the
19 hydrodynamic conditions. The analysis of the
20 20:10:37 mixing zone was intended for a worst-case
21 scenario of the -- and under hydrodynamic
22 conditions. The research recognized a reversal
23 flow of the river during flood stage -- excuse
24 me -- which is very significant at times. The
25 20:11:02 memorandum, however, uses a 0.0 foot per second

1 20: 11: 10 flow as a worst-case scenario.

2 And I disagree with this statement or with
3 the practice of the modeling because as they
4 discharge the effluent and the river reverses
5 20: 11: 23 flow again, it actually gets a double dose of
6 the effluent, and you get a much stronger plume
7 of discharge.

8 My major concern, however, is the amount
9 of chromium 6 created by the -- by the process,
10 20: 11: 44 by the submerged conversion vaporizers. They
11 create .27 milligram per liter, and I know that
12 doesn't sound very much, but if you figure that
13 the United States export/import bank, the
14 baseline total -- total for chromium is .5,
15 20: 12: 12 this being .27 for chromium 6 only. You also
16 have discharge of additional chromium, of
17 chromium 3, which is a beneficiary chromium,
18 but total chromiums should never exceed .5 by
19 the World Export Bank, which finances
20 20: 12: 34 third-world country infrastructure, not the
21 United States.

22 And the total discharge of this chrome
23 crumb is 190.55 pounds per year, that being in
24 the estuary, with the cumulative effect of
25 20: 13: 00 years of operation, and subsequent dredging of

1 20: 13: 04 the channel would -- would create considerable
2 pollution, and because of that issue I have
3 notified the U.S. Corps of Engineers to make
4 them aware of the situation. Since we are a
5 20: 13: 26 beach nourishment site, I will refuse any and
6 all dredge oils on our property from now on,
7 and if I refuse it, nobody else gets it because
8 we all have to agree on this. And for the
9 Corps to lose that -- that much potential of
10 20: 13: 45 dredge-oil property, upland property, is
11 detrimental.

12 I have two requests for you, Paul. In
13 your presentation you show a liquefaction on
14 your slides. You show a liquefaction plant. I
15 20: 14: 03 was wondering if since we are here talking
16 about a regasification facility, if you could
17 show a slide of a regasification facility with
18 submerged conversion vaporizers, because these
19 vaporizers have large -- it's all stacks, 48
20 20: 14: 22 inches in diameter, per -- per vaporizer. And
21 this facility will have -- this proposed
22 facility will have seven of them. And that is
23 another addition of site pollution.

24 One more item, a request for NorthernStar
25 20: 14: 43 to be more forthcoming and show those stacks on

1 20: 14: 47 their artwork and make people aware of that --
2 that is what you see, not just camouflaged
3 tanks and minimize ship sizes and maximize
4 river property, but put it in the right
5 20: 15: 02 perspective. Thank you very much.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
7 comments. And, Frans, if you have more
8 detailed comments, please send them in writing.
9 You know we like stuff in writing.

10 20: 15: 14 MR. FRANS EYKEL: They're in the mail.

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

12 Next is Gary Allen. Is Gary not here?

13 Okay. Chris Bock?

14 MR. CHRISTIAN BOCK: Hello. My name is

15 20: 15: 42 Christian Bock, B-O-C-K, but I go by Kilo. I
16 live on the west end of Cowlitz County.

17 Before I built a house on a cliff, I hired
18 a geologist, and he advised me how to

19 distribute the load on the cliff side and to

20 20: 16: 07 remove any excess weight from the side to the

21 river, upon which I removed 570,000 pounds and
22 built a house. Now the starting point for the

23 pipeline is near my house, behind it, and from

24 that point it is planned to drag a pipe

25 20: 16: 33 approximately one mile long under the Columbia

1 20: 18: 29 benefi ts. We j ust have negative effect. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
4 comments.

5 20: 18: 39 Next is Bill castle.

6 MR. BILL CASTLE: Thank you. My name is
7 Bill Castle, C-A-S-T-L-E. My comments tonight
8 will be directed towards the sections of the
9 DEIS that address private water supplies,

10 20: 18: 57 wells.

11 On page 4-59, paragraph 3, we are told in
12 the event of that water well is damaged as a
13 result of the construction, NorthernStar would
14 arrange for a temporary source of potable
15 20: 19: 11 water, if required, and provide for the repair
16 of the well or replace the water supply. On
17 page 4-314, in the last paragraph, we are told
18 there could be potential damage to existing
19 septic systems or wells.

20 20: 19: 31 This is a major concern to a majority of
21 the landowners along the pipeline route. If
22 our water is gone, our property is worthless.
23 What is meant by "replacement of water supply"?
24 Does that mean potable water will be trucked in
25 20: 19: 47 daily for infinity? How about those of us that

1 20:19:51 irrigate with it in the summer for three or
2 four weeks, 24/7?

3 If NorthernStar is so sure that they will
4 not disturb the wells, and which I've had
5 20:20:03 conversation with three members, let them put
6 their money on the table. Let the money speak,
7 not their mouth. Put this money in an escrow
8 to be able to secure a replacement possibility.
9 We don't want to risk them going bankrupt, like
10 20:20:23 some in the country have.

11 In the Mill Creek area, there are six
12 wells forming a circle around and within 300
13 feet of the approximate Columbia River HDD
14 site. An additional 14 wells are within 1,320
15 20:20:41 feet, a quarter mile, of the drill site. All
16 of these wells potentially share the same
17 aquifer. That drill site goes right through
18 the fractured basalt that supplies the water
19 coming from the aquifer. All 20 of these wells
20 20:20:58 have the potential of becoming contaminated
21 from the bentonite or loss of water,
22 potentially all the waters.

23 Let's remember the final depth of this
24 pipe going under the river we were told by Mike
25 20:21:12 Heywood, representative of Northwest Natural

1 20: 21: 14 Gas, would be approximately a 600-foot drill,
2 to be 50 feet below the bottom of the channel.
3 Based on the information supplied by Mike
4 Heyward on -- Heywood on the drill site,
5 20: 21: 30 placement of the drill would be at a 13-degree
6 angle and the HDD -- for the HDD, 13 degrees.

7 Since common sense tells us the hole will
8 be about 500-foot mark, will be within ten to
9 99 foot of some of the water wells at the
10 20: 21: 47 bottom of the hill, which are only drilled to
11 125 feet. Our well is 522 feet deep and
12 supplies 14.5 gallons a minute with a static
13 column of water 140 feet from the surface,
14 which means we have 382 feet of water at our
15 20: 22: 07 disposal at any time.

16 More importantly data listed on table
17 4.3.2-2 where NorthernStar indicates 20 private
18 wells within 150 feet of the pipeline
19 construction is incomplete. Many wells in
20 20: 22: 22 Cowlitz County are not registered and,
21 therefore, not listed. Our own well was not
22 listed a year ago and does not appear on that
23 chart. Our well will be within 150 feet or
24 less of the construction area, to our best
25 20: 22: 38 knowledge.

1 20: 22: 39 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Castle, please wrap it
2 up.

3 MR. BILL CASTLE: One paragraph.

4 The DEIS needs to include more information
5 20: 22: 45 and requirements for loss or contaminated --
6 contamination of water due to construction of
7 the pipeline. An open time frame needs to be
8 included over the life of the pipeline.

9 Remember, FERC, we did not ask NorthernStar or
10 20: 23: 01 any other private utility to disturb us.

11 Mr. Friedman, I'd also like you to know
12 that you keep making comments to ask a
13 NorthernStar member about where this pipeline
14 is. Two weeks ago in Astoria I had a
15 20: 23: 17 conversation with Mr. Si Garrett and Mr. Paul
16 Soanes about where the hole was to be drilled
17 on this ridge. Mr. Garrett would not answer me
18 other than, "It is not on your property." But
19 he would not tell me where it's at. Mr. Paul
20 20: 23: 34 Soanes told me that he would get back to me and
21 promised that he would share that information.
22 To this date, that has not happened, sir.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Is there a representative
24 from NorthernStar here who could stand up,
25 20: 23: 48 please? Mr. Coppedge, would you be able to

1 20:23:51 answer Mr. Castle's -- privately, his question?

2 Thank you.

3 I want to remind everyone to please try to
4 keep your comments to three minutes, and if you
5 20:24:09 have detailed comments that would exceed three
6 minutes, we would welcome your written comments
7 sent in to FERC.

8 Next is Gayle Kiser.

9 MS. GAYLE KISER: Gayle Kiser. That's
10 20:24:28 G-A-Y-L-E, K-I-S-E-R, but I'm sure you remember
11 from my previous speeches.

12 Last night I spoke to the specifics.
13 Tonight I'm here to speak to the process as a
14 whole. This document has all the appearances
15 20:24:41 of being rushed into print. Why? The former
16 head of your agency was quoted as saying that
17 the United States only needed about eight
18 receiving terminals. At this date, I believe
19 around 22 have been permitted. Again, why?

20 20:24:58 I believe the answer lies in the Energy
21 Policy Act of 2005. We were warned by our
22 legislators what would happen if FERC were
23 given sole siting authority over LNG
24 facilities, but we didn't pay close enough
25 20:25:11 attention. I'm in the process of contacting

1 20: 25: 13 every Senator and Representative in every state
2 that is experiencing a battle over where to put
3 these facilities and asking them to revisit
4 that act and the Natural Gas Act, paying
5 20: 25: 25 particular attention to the Hackberry decision.

6 Many people don't realize what this
7 decision does. It flew in under the radar, and
8 I seriously doubt if many of our Congresspeople
9 even realize it exists. It incentivizes the
10 20: 25: 41 building of LNG facilities. I love that word,
11 "incentivize." Even my computer doesn't
12 recognize it.

13 By making a special law that removes all
14 commercial regulations covering tariffs, rates,
15 20: 25: 51 and open access, you handed the energy
16 companies the key to the cash box. That
17 explains the rush to build the these plants and
18 I believe the rush to colonize the Pacific
19 Northwest.

20 20: 26: 04 I've attended many meetings in the past 18
21 months, and two demographics stands out: One,
22 the average age and, two, the average income of
23 the people whose lives are going to be
24 destroyed by the proposed pipelines. Most are
25 20: 26: 15 elderly, rural folks who only want to retire on

1 20:26:18 their property, and most are in the lower
2 income bracket. It is unconscionable to ask
3 them to bear the brunt of this assault so
4 energy speculators can make another huge profit
5 20:26:30 at their expense. I believe this is
6 inadequately addressed in the DEIS.

7 In a time when we see certain portions of
8 the federal government shrinking -- for
9 instance, here locally the U.S. Forest Service
10 20:26:41 had to recently close the Coldwater Ridge
11 visitors' center on Mount St. Helens -- it
12 would seem FERC is experiencing a growth boom.
13 You people have been handed a tremendous amount
14 of power, and with that should be a tremendous
15 20:26:55 amount of responsibility.

16 I am sorely disappointed in the DEIS. I
17 expected so much more from an agency with the
18 power you have. It is my opinion that this
19 document is deficient and should be completely
20 20:27:08 reissued. Next time include material that will
21 help in the decision-making process, things
22 like an emergency response plan, the complete
23 water suitability report, the completed
24 biological assessment, an independent needs
25 20:27:25 assessment, and an independent economic

1 20:27:27 assessment.

2 Rework your evaluation criteria to include
3 the human element. If this cannot be done,
4 then this document should be placed where it
5 20:27:36 will never be affected by solar energy.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
7 comments.

8 Next is Steve Dragich.

9 MR. STEVE DRAGICH: Mr. Dragich,
10 20:27:54 D-R-A-G-I-C-H, representing Dragich Trust.

11 The specific comments I have tonight deal
12 with the local court's designation in the
13 FERC's introductory statement, presentation,
14 and CFR 49192.5, class location. If time
15 20:28:16 permits, ex parte communications and CEI
16 revision order, CEI standing for critical
17 energy infrastructure information.

18 In your introductory comment to this DEIS
19 presentation, you mention local courts if a
20 20:28:37 negated settlement is unable to be reached, yet
21 on August 8th, 2005, President Bush signed the
22 Energy Policy Act, giving you, FERC, exclusive
23 jurisdiction over LNG facilities. The
24 cooperating agencies are exclusively federal,
25 20:28:56 as designated in the DEIS: United States Army

1 20:29:01 Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S.
2 Department of Transportation.

3 Yet you distinctly do not mention the
4 United States District Courts as a remedy for a
5 20:29:13 person or landowner unable to come to
6 negotiated agreement; yet if you uses the local
7 courts, using an example from the Superior
8 Courts of the State of Washington, RCW 8.24,
9 eminent domain, miscellaneous provisions, in
10 20:29:31 relation to order of immediate use and
11 possession, which a proponent such as a
12 pipeline or NorthernStar Energy Limited
13 Liability Corporation can request that the
14 landowner so stipulate to an order of immediate
15 20:29:52 use and possession.

16 If the landowner does not stipulate to the
17 order of immediate use and possession, he will
18 not receive court or attorneys' fees, yet there
19 is no such requirement under the U.S. federal
20 20:30:08 court system, and payment for just compensation
21 has to be up front under the U.S. District
22 Court system.

23 To use an example from the Office of
24 Washington State Attorney General, eminent
25 20:30:26 domain task force, assistant attorney general

1 20: 30: 29 Tim Ford and eminent domain task force member
2 Craig Johnson characterizes negotiations under
3 eminent domain as negotiation by shotgun.

4 I cannot tell you the location of the
5 20: 30: 48 pipeline on the Dragich Trust land. You must
6 first submit a CEII request to the FERC CEII
7 coordinator before I can tell you that
8 information, because I don't have it myself.

9 And if NorthernStar is to abide by that same
10 20: 31: 08 regulation, they have submitted documents
11 through their attorney, VanNess & Feldman in
12 Washington, D. C. , citing privacy of individuals
13 on the pipeline for reasons for not releasing
14 pipeline maps or individual lists of pipeline
15 20: 31: 24 owners. These are filed under the FERC
16 Commission.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Dragich, can you wrap
18 it up, please.

19 MR. STEVE DRAGICH: In conclusion, under
20 20: 31: 35 the revision for CEII orders issued on October
21 30th, a week ago, FERC order 121 FERC 61.107,
22 it is now possible to access pipeline maps for
23 landowners and adjacent landowners to identify
24 which specific property -- property is under
25 20: 31: 57 threat of domain, which FERC has included a fee

1 20: 32: 02 requirement so we may find out which property
2 you will confer eminent domain over.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
4 comments.

5 20: 32: 11 Next, Vance Fraser.

6 MR. VANCE FRASER: Hello. My name is
7 Vance Fraser. It's F-R-A-S-E-R. I represent
8 myself and also Webb Drain age District in the
9 Oregon side.

10 20: 32: 30 I'd like to say that the Pacific Northwest
11 is and always has been Oregon, Washington, and
12 Idaho. Any references to the Northwest which
13 include any other areas outside Oregon,
14 Washington, and Idaho should not be allowed.

15 20: 32: 46 Any redefinition in terms from historic and
16 commonly understood is only intended to mislead
17 the public and responsible authorities. FERC
18 should not allow this and cause any information
19 or data outside Oregon, Washington, and Idaho

20 20: 33: 03 to be separated out in its own segregated area
21 within the DEIS, when it's been previously
22 referred to as in the Northwest, but outside
23 those three states.

24 Regarding dredging the turning basin for
25 20: 33: 25 the LNG vessels, NorthernStar should be

1 20: 33: 28 required to follow all the same rules the Corps
2 of Engineers are required to follow in their
3 Columbia River channel deepening project,
4 specifically sampling, removal, and disposal
5 20: 33: 40 methods.

6 I'd also like to point out that my uncle
7 was a ship captain, any ship, any ocean, and he
8 was based out of Portland, Oregon. I've been
9 up and down the river with them him, and I can
10 20: 33: 52 tell you without a doubt he would not
11 appreciate having to wait for an LNG ship while
12 heading out to sea.

13 The river channel is now being deepened to
14 support grain exports, container ships and --
15 20: 34: 08 that are supported by over 50,000 jobs. How
16 soon before these export ships and jobs move
17 elsewhere when LNG ships delay export ships,
18 all for LNG which we don't need? And I ask
19 that these economic impacts be made more clear
20 20: 34: 32 and studied further and included in the DEIS.

21 As far as the Webb Drainage District,
22 which is on the pipeline route, we depend on
23 our levies to protect us from flooding. The
24 soils in the districts such as ours is
25 20: 34: 50 corrosive, saturated type at a depth the

1 20: 34: 53 pipeline will be set at. The soil can also be
2 described as jelly- and putty-like. When
3 earthquakes occur or when heavy agriculture
4 equipment cross over the pipeline, this will
5 20: 35: 07 cause soil and pipeline movement and possible
6 accelerated deterioration of the concrete
7 fittings of the pipeline, which will also cause
8 accelerated corrosion of the pipe.

9 The expected life of this pipeline cannot
10 20: 35: 21 be considered to be even close to 50 years,
11 especially when the KB pipeline leaked in less
12 than one year in a similar district. Please
13 address why we are not worth putting odorant in
14 the line.

15 20: 35: 43 Thank you.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
17 comments.

18 Next is Marjorie Castle.

19 MS. MARJORIE CASTLE: Marjorie Castle.

20 20: 35: 56 C-A-S-T-L-E. This is my second time to speak
21 before you, and another concern I wish to bring
22 to your attention has to do with the roads in
23 Cowlitz County.

24 Since the majority of this county would be
25 20: 36: 09 considered rural, it must be brought to your

1 20: 36: 11 attention, FERC, that the cliff -- that like
2 Clifton Road, many roads are narrow, to the
3 point of being single to one and a half lanes
4 wide. Yes, these are paved roads. They are
5 20: 36: 24 public roads.

6 I bring this up because in the DEIS, on
7 page 2-35, paragraph 1, it reads:
8 Modifications or improvements to existing roads
9 used to access the project would not be
10 20: 36: 37 required. It also says on the footnote A of
11 table 4.3 -- 4.2.3-2, NorthernStar would use
12 existing access roads that would not require
13 modification or improvement and would,
14 therefore, not represent additional soil
15 20: 36: 58 impacts.

16 Paragraph 3, page 4-98, NorthernStar would
17 use existing access roads, which would not
18 require modification or improvement and would,
19 therefore, not represent any additional impacts
20 20: 37: 11 on wetlands.

21 Page 4-305, paragraph 4, NorthernStar
22 would access the construction right-of-way via
23 existing public and private roads that
24 intersect the right-of-way. Modifications or
25 20: 37: 26 improvements to support the expected roads

1 20: 37: 28 would not be required.

2 Whitewater Road is a public road. Yes, it
3 does eventually go into a private road. It is
4 only one example of the kinds of roads we have
5 20: 37: 41 in Cowlitz County. Many of them that

6 NorthernStar wishes to use at one time were
7 logging roads that have been paved over. They
8 are not two-lane or larger.

9 Whitewater Road is a planned access road
10 20: 37: 56 for NorthernStar to reach the site for the
11 Columbia River HDD. That road is paved, one
12 and a half lanes wide, has hazardous blind
13 spots and no turnouts for opposite traffic.

14 People currently use the shoulder, which is
15 20: 38: 11 gravel, as their turnout. Each side is
16 dangerous.

17 That road will be used for at least 37
18 days during the drilling process. Three
19 tractor-trailers we've been told will carry the
20 20: 38: 25 drill rig and is extremely heavy. All the
21 support vehicles will be using that road.

22 Heavy vehicles this road is not accustomed to
23 will traverse its length. Twenty families
24 depend on that road as their only access in and
25 20: 38: 41 out on any daily basis.

1 20: 38: 44 This public road cannot withstand this
2 traffic, and those modifications are not
3 included or any consideration of modifications
4 of that road included, nor has the Cowlitz
5 20: 38: 56 County road department been apprised of this
6 situation. And this is not the only example.
7 There are many areas in the draft DEIS that are
8 not addressed. The biological assessment is
9 not finished and is not totally in there.

10 20: 39: 14 There is communication happening daily on
11 the FERC Web site, that we all read, that
12 indicate that the draft -- that the DEIS should
13 not have been released when it was.
14 Mr. Friedman, this piece of cheese (indicating)
15 20: 39: 28 is like the DEIS: It's full of holes.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
18 comments.

19 Next, Carol Kriesel.

20 20: 39: 47 MS. CAROL KRIESEL: I am Carol Kriesel.
21 K-R-I-E-S-E-L.

22 I have several concerns regarding the
23 NorthernStar project, and jobs is one of them.
24 In the DEIS, on page ES-4, 65 jobs for a total
25 20: 40: 04 annual payroll of 3.8 million is listed. Now,

1 20:40:08 I can tell you jobs are important, but I
2 question at what risk to others. I'm not
3 talking about injury to a person or to their
4 property but employment risk. I don't do any
5 20:40:17 of that new math they teach kids, but I'm
6 pretty good at adding and subtracting.

7 In the DEIS on page 2-3 under Section
8 2.1., LNG ships, it states: NorthernStar has
9 stated that it expects about 125 LNG carriers
10 20:40:37 per year to unload cargo at its terminal, with
11 LNG ships ranging in size from 100,000 to
12 200,000 cubic millimeters in capacity.

13 Seems to me good business sense leans
14 towards getting the biggest profit you can go
15 20:40:54 with the most, you can get and turn around and
16 sell. So I'll start with the big ships which
17 NorthernStar told the Coast Guard they wanted
18 to use: Anticipated numbers of deliveries as
19 stated in the DEIS, about 125. Size of ship,
20 20:41:10 200,000 cubic meters. Total amount of LNG
21 received per year, 25 million cubic meters.

22 Now, the Coast Guard has determined
23 NorthernStar can use no ships larger than
24 148,000 cubic meters until some type of study
25 20:41:26 is conducted on big ships and they are deemed

1 20: 41: 29 safe. So that means that best NorthernStar can
2 hope again for using, again, their 125
3 shipments per year, is 118,500,000, cubic
4 meters or a loss of about 6.5 cubic meters.

5 20: 41: 46 I can't see NorthernStar or any other
6 company choosing to lose money. I think they
7 will try to recoup what they can. They have
8 investors that want to see a return on their
9 money. Therefore, NorthernStar will increase

10 20: 41: 57 the number of shipments to gain that additional
11 6.5 million cubic meters with an additional 44
12 ships. That increase in traffic, with

13 consideration of today's homeland-security
14 issues, would mean there could be potentially

15 20: 42: 14 three LNG tankers in the river at any given
16 time, with one maybe even parked in the channel
17 waiting its turn at the earth.

18 Because LNG is labeled a terrorist target
19 and needing escort convinced me, and a whole

20 20: 42: 29 lot of other people, this will not affect our
21 ports. Nowhere in the DEIS is this potential
22 negative economic issue addressed. Nowhere in
23 the DEIS is the loss of jobs, far more than 65,
24 addressed and what those losses will do to the

25 20: 42: 43 economy of these two states if shipping is

1 20: 42: 46 interrupted.

2 I'm not saying the river and bar pilots
3 are not capable in their jobs; I am saying
4 security conditions change, and LNG will have a
5 20: 42: 54 precedence over everything on this river but
6 military and cruise ships. After all, the
7 Coast Guard expressed these same concerns a
8 year ago last August.

9 NorthernStar uses the word "about." The
10 20: 43: 07 DEIS used the word "about." So what's the real
11 number of how many ships and what will the
12 impact beyond the ports on this river system,
13 which goes far beyond Portland? This topic
14 needs to be addressed. The livelihoods of
15 20: 43: 19 thousands of people depend on it.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your
18 comments.

19 I've reached the end of the speakers'
20 20: 43: 27 list. Is there thing else who has not yet
21 spoken who wishes to do so?

22 If there is no one else who would like to
23 speak, who has not already spoken at this time,
24 I'm going to close the meeting. I want to
25 20: 43: 41 thank you all for coming tonight and for

1 20: 43: 43 providi ng your comments on the Bradwood Landi ng
2 LNG project DEI S.

3 Let the record show that we concluded
4 tonight at approximately 8: 43 p.m. Thank you.

5 20: 44: 29 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8: 43 P.M.)

6 * * *

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	TESTIMONY INDEX	
		Page
1		
2		
3	Testimony by Ms. Charlotte Persons	18
4	Testimony by Ms. Laurie Caplan	21
5	Testimony by Mr. Mike Smith	24
6	Testimony by Mr. Jim Townley	27
7	Testimony by Mr. Paul Amos	29
8	Testimony by Mr. Marvin King	31
9	Testimony by Mr. Jeff Lovingfoss	33
10	Testimony by Mr. Darrel Whipple	34
11	Testimony by Mr. Brett VandenHeuvel	36
12	Testimony by Ms. Marcia Denison	42
13	Testimony by Mr. John Koehler	45
14	Testimony by Ms. Nancy Munk Christie	54
15	Testimony by Ms. Leslie Hildula	57
16	Testimony by Ms. Melissa Wilkie	59
17	Testimony by Mr. Jerry Janssen	62
18	Testimony by Ms. Nancy Ashley	66
19	Testimony by Mr. Duncan MacKenzie	67
20	Testimony by Ms. Gloria MacKenzie	71
21	Testimony by Mr. Frans Eykel	74
22	Testimony by Mr. Christian Bock	77
23	Testimony by Mr. Bill Castle	79
24	Testimony by Ms. Gayle Kiser	83
25	Testimony by Mr. Steve Dragich	86

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

TESTIMONY INDEX (Continued)

	Page
Testimony by Mr. Steve Dragich	86
Testimony by Mr. Vance Fraser	89
Testimony by Ms. Marjorie Castle	91
Testimony by Ms. Carol Kriesel	94

* * *

CERTIFICATE

I, Robin L. Nodl and, a Washington
Certified Shorthand Reporter, an Oregon
Certified Shorthand Reporter, a Registered
Diplomate Reporter, and a Certified Realtime
Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in
stenotype the proceedings had upon the hearing
of this matter, previously captioned herein;
that I transcribed my stenotype notes through
computer-aided transcription; and that the
foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true
and accurate record of all proceedings had
during the hearing of said matter, and of the
whole thereof.

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this
28th day of November, 2007.

Washington CSR No. 2530

Oregon CSR No. 90-0056