

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

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x

IN THE MATTER OF: :

RUBY PIPELINE, L.L.C. : Docket Number

: PF08-9-000

- - - - - x

Civic Center
83 W Main Street
Hyrum, Utah

Wednesday, October 15, 2008

The above-entitled matter came on for a public
scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m.

Presiding: Dave Swearingen

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
P R O C E E D I N G S

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. SWEARINGEN: Good evening. My name is Dave Swearingen and I'm an environmental project manager with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC. To my right is John Muehlhausen with Merjent. Merjent is an environmental consulting corporation that will be assisting us in the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. Jeff MacKenthun and Peg Bolden, also with Merjent, were at the sign-in table at the back of the room. So on behalf of the FERC, I want to welcome all you all here tonight. Let the record show that the Hyrum scoping meeting began at 7:04 p.m. October 15, 2008.

The purpose of this meeting is to give you the opportunity to provide environmental comments specifically on Ruby's proposed project. Ruby entered into the FERC pre-filing process on January 31 of this year, through which began our review of the facilities that we refer to as the Ruby Pipeline Project. This scoping period is a follow-up to the first scoping period held in April of this year. Ruby has refined its proposed route and submitted additional information on which the public may want to comment; thus, the reason for this additional scoping meeting.

The Ruby Pipeline Project would deliver gas from the Rocky Mountain region to the growing markets in Nevada

1 and on the West Coast. The main facilities that Ruby is
2 considering for the project is about 677 miles of 42-inch
3 diameter natural gas pipeline and four new compressor
4 stations. There are a few other associated facilities that
5 Ruby is considering. In a little bit, I'll ask a
6 representative from Ruby to take the floor to present a more
7 detailed project description. They will also be able to
8 answer some of your questions regarding the project, and as
9 you see they've put up some posters and they have some maps.
10 After the formal part of the meeting is over, the folks from
11 Ruby will stick around and you can ask them questions more
12 specific about their project if you want to.

13 Right now, I'm going to talk a little bit about
14 the scoping process and public involvement in FERC projects
15 in general. The main FERC docket number for the Ruby
16 Project is PF08-9-000. The PF means that we are in the
17 pre-filing stage of the project. Once Ruby files a formal
18 application a new docket number will be assigned.

19 The National Environmental Policy Act requires
20 that the Commission take into consideration the
21 environmental impacts associated with new natural gas
22 facilities. Scoping is the general term for soliciting
23 input from the public before the environmental analysis is
24 conducted. The idea is to get information from the public,
25 as well as agencies and other groups so that we can

1 incorporate issues of concern into our review. This scoping
2 period started last month when we issued our Notice of
3 Intent to prepare and Environmental Impact Statement or NOI.
4 In that NOI we described the environmental review process,
5 some environmental issues that had been identified earlier
6 in the previous scoping period and the steps the FERC and
7 the cooperating agencies will take to prepare the
8 Environmental Impact Statement or an EIS.

9 The BLM and the Forest Service are both
10 cooperating agencies in preparation of the EIS because the
11 pipeline route would cross national forests and also
12 federally-administered land. We have set an ending date of
13 October 29, 2008 for this scoping period. However, the end
14 of this scoping period is not the end of public involvement.
15 There will be a comment period, including additional public
16 meetings once the draft EIS is published.

17 An important step in the environmental review
18 process and the preparation of an EIS is to determine which
19 environmental resource issues are most important to you.
20 Your comments and concerns, along with those of other people
21 and agencies participating in the process will be used to
22 focus our environmental analysis. Your comments tonight,
23 together with any written comments you may have already
24 filed or intent to file, will be added to the record as
25 comments on the environmental proceeding.

1 So we then take the environmental comments and
2 other information and work on our independent analysis of
3 the project's potential impacts. We will publish those
4 findings in the draft EIS to be mailed out to all the people
5 on our mailing list. And as I mentioned before, it will be
6 publicly noticed for additional meetings and comments.

7 Now the mailing list that we have for this
8 project right now is over 7,000 people and organizations.
9 So what we're going to do in order to try to control the
10 size of that mailing list is we're going to require a
11 positive response from people who actually want to stay on
12 the mailing list. So if you provide comments, you're
13 automatically going to stay on the mailing list. If you
14 don't provide comments, you need to return the return mailer
15 that came in the mail to you in the NOI or you can pick one
16 up in the back tonight. Basically, that tells us, yes, I
17 want to stay on the mailing list. Because once we publish
18 the EIS, we're not going to send out 7,000 copies if we're
19 going to have 6,500 of them just tossed in the trash. It's
20 a waste of taxpayer's money. It's a waste of effort. So if
21 you want to stay on the list, either make a comment or just
22 tell us that you want to stay on the list.

23 Also, to make it more convenient for a lot of
24 people, we're going to send out CD-ROMs, not the big, thick
25 paper copy of the book that you might expect. If you want a

1 paper copy, you can get one but you have to ask for it. So
2 if you don't tell us anything, you're going to get a CD-ROM.
3 If you want the paper copy, just put a mark on the return
4 mailer that you want a paper copy and we'll be glad to send
5 you one.

6 Now, I need to differentiate between the roles
7 between roles of the FERC Commission and that of the FERC
8 environmental staff. I work for the environmental staff.
9 And the team that I have, my folks back at FERC and with the
10 contractors and the cooperating agencies will be doing the
11 environmental analysis. The Commission, the FERC Commission
12 will be the ones to determine whether or not to issue a
13 certificate of public convenience and necessity to Ruby for
14 this project. That is, the Commission will decide whether
15 or not to approve the project. The EIS that the
16 environmental staff is producing does not make that
17 decision.

18 What the EIS does it describes the project
19 facilities and associated environmental impacts. It
20 discloses to the public those issues, alternatives for the
21 project, potential mitigation measures to avoid or reduce
22 environmental impacts and the FERC staff's conclusions and
23 recommendations. The EIS will then be used to advise the
24 Commission of the environmental impacts associated with the
25 project. The Commission will consider those environmental

1 impacts, along with a host of non-environmental issues in
2 deciding whether or not to issue an approval to Ruby for
3 this project. Non-environmental issues include engineering,
4 markets, rates, finances, tariffs, design and cost. So the
5 Commission will take all that into consideration in making
6 an informed decision on whether or not to eventually approve
7 this project.

8 Are there any questions about the FERC scoping
9 process, anything that I've described so far?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. What I'm going to do is
12 I'm going to ask Dan Gredvig from Ruby Pipeline to come up
13 and give a brief description of the project and then we will
14 move on to get your comments.

15 MR. GREDVIG: Thank you, Dave, for giving us the
16 opportunity. My name is Dan Gredvig and I'm with El Paso
17 Corporation out of Colorado Springs, Colorado here
18 representing Ruby Pipeline this evening. For the record,
19 this presentation tonight is being transcribed and so I'll
20 spell my last name. Anybody who's commenting tonight, if
21 you would please do the same for your first and last name if
22 it's difficult. That would help the transcriber very much,
23 I think, so Gredvig, G-R-E-D-V-I-G.

24 Ruby Pipeline it's a 680-mile, 42-inch natural
25 gas pipeline stretching from Opal, Wyoming to Malin, Oregon.

1 It is being proposed by El Paso Natural Gas Company, El Paso
2 Corporation. Our headquarters is out of Colorado Springs,
3 Colorado. With me tonight is a number of our team members.
4 After the closing of the meeting tonight, we'll gladly
5 answer any of your questions, look over the maps and direct
6 you to folks that might have the detailed information that
7 would help you in your quest for information.

8 As I said, we're headquartered in Colorado
9 Springs, Colorado. We are a natural gas provider. We
10 operate -- the El Paso Corporation operates over 43 or about
11 43,000 miles of interstate natural gas pipeline. We do that
12 in a safe, dependable and efficient manner. What we're
13 looking at on this project is trying to link the natural gas
14 that is prevalent in the Rocky Mountain area, whether it be
15 Wyoming, Colorado, Utah -- there is a supply of natural gas
16 and there is a market out there; and that market is on the
17 West Coast or it could be anywhere in between. And what we
18 try to do is we try to facilitate the marrying of those --
19 the production on one end and the consumption on the other.
20 And so that's where this pipeline comes from. Again, shown
21 here we've got Opal, Wyoming going along our preferred
22 route, which is through the northern part of Utah, northern
23 Nevada and into Malin, Oregon, which is in south central
24 Oregon.

25 Along that pipeline route we've got four

1 compressor stations, one at our head station at Opal, one at
2 a western Utah point in western Utah, one in the middle of
3 Nevada and one in the western side of Nevada. Those
4 compressor stations will help to facilitate moving that gas
5 from the producers to the consumers and keep that pressure
6 and keep that gas going. Along with that we'll have
7 measurement stations at locations where the producers will
8 provide gas to us or where the customers will take gas away
9 from our project.

10 Our timeline for the construction is we're in the
11 pre-filing process right now. As Dave has mentioned, that
12 process started the first part of 2008. Our intention is to
13 file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and enter
14 into the file or filing for a FERC certificate process
15 January 2010 -- I mean January of 2009 with an anticipated
16 FERC certificate either at the end of 2009 or the beginning
17 of 2010. Our construction would start shortly thereafter
18 and in service is estimated to be around March of 2011. And
19 that's our project from a glance.

20 The other thing that I'd like to say is that in
21 this process where we're at in the entire process of our
22 project is we've completed the majority of our centerline
23 survey for the 680 miles. We've completed the majority of
24 our environmental and our archeological work. With that, we
25 have created resource reports that we have filed with the

1 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, with the other
2 cooperating agencies for their review to look at all of the
3 resources that have been identified as being affected by our
4 project.

5 As we go along, we will be getting comments back
6 from the FERC and from the BLM and the cooperating agencies
7 and then we will provide final copies of those resource
8 reports are the foundation and the footprint for that
9 environmental impact study that will be created by the
10 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I have provided here
11 our contact information. One thing that I want to stress,
12 and I'll leave this board at the end when I get done with
13 the presentation. But safety is paramount for our company.
14 Not only do we look for trying to design that pipeline and
15 placing it in an optimal location that fits with the
16 constructibility, but also that we want to build it safely
17 and operate it in a safe manner.

18 We've put pipeline location markers along the
19 pipeline. The biggest threat to buried utilities, whether
20 it's a gas line going into your home or a natural gas
21 interstate pipeline is third party damage. So what we do is
22 we do mark our pipeline. We participate in the one-calls,
23 the blue stakes within the different states that we cross.
24 We do monitor our pipelines 24 hours a day, 7 days a week,
25 365 days out of the year. We do that by telemetry that

1 tells that either at our compressor stations or our block
2 valve locations relaying that information back to our gas
3 control department, which is out of Colorado Springs. And
4 then we will have personnel that will be along the pipeline
5 and manning at those locations where our compressor stations
6 are for both the operation of the compressor station and the
7 operation of the pipeline.

8 We also do routine inspection on the pipeline.
9 Whether we do that aerially or whether we need to do that on
10 the ground, but we facilitate that on an annual basis or a
11 weekly basis, depending upon where we're at and what we need
12 to go check; but that's part of the safety program that we
13 have.

14 We coordinate with local responders. We
15 coordinate with fire departments and hospitals, sheriff's
16 departments so that they know who we are and where we are
17 at, how to get a hold of us if there was an emergency,
18 whether it was a natural emergency or one that was directly
19 affecting our pipeline. And then we hold periodic awareness
20 meetings, whether it's a town hall forum like this or
21 whether it's door-to-door handing out calendars with our
22 1-800 number on it, how to get a hold of us, how to
23 communicate with us and the best way to do that. But we do
24 that through public awareness effects that our Operations
25 Department works.

1 Our contact information, if you want to go to the
2 web, it's at www.RubyPipeline.com. We also have questions
3 at RubyPipeline.com that a number of us are monitoring and
4 providing either answers or directing your questions to the
5 appropriate person to get that information back, and then we
6 have our telephone numbers. And so whether it's our 800
7 number in Houston where our corporate office is or our 800
8 number at the Land Department where I work in Colorado
9 Springs you can always reach us. You can always get a hold
10 of us. So if you have any questions, please don't hesitate
11 to ask.

12 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. Thank you, Dan. In a
13 minute we'll move on to the formal part of the meeting. We
14 will hear comments from audience members. If you'd rather
15 not speak tonight, you may hand in written comments tonight
16 or file them with the FERC -- either mail them in or use the
17 electronic filing. Either way, your comments will be
18 considered. It doesn't matter to me how you get them to me
19 and my staff. They will be considered regardless of the
20 method of conveyance.

21 So before we move into -- we only have one person
22 actually sign up to give comments. So before we move into
23 that, does anybody have any questions? Again, if I can
24 answer any questions about the FERC, what my job is, what
25 the FERC process is, I'll be glad to answer a couple if

1 anybody has any. Yes, ma'am?

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Off mike.)

3 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. The question was about
4 the length of the pipeline, 670 miles, 680 miles. We are
5 still in the pre-filing process, so as Ruby goes out and
6 does civil surveys they are refining the route. So whereas
7 before it might have gone around a hill on one side, now
8 maybe it goes around the hill on the other side. Kind of
9 following an existing corridor or kind of as the crow flies.
10 So over 600, 700 miles you've got those little zigs and zags
11 that are being refined and that will account for the
12 difference in the mileage being expressed.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Off mike).

14 MR. SWEARINGEN: Well, when Ruby files its
15 application -- right now, we're still in the pre-filing, so
16 they're still doing those refinements. Ruby will not file
17 its application until it's been -- as I say nailed down. So
18 once its filed its application, the number that is in that
19 application filing is what they proposed. Now, through this
20 process sometimes there are alternatives and the FERC might
21 require them to move part of their route one way or the
22 other and that will adjust it. But that would be something
23 that comes out of this process, not something that Ruby
24 proposes. If Ruby decides in the middle of the filing that
25 they have some issues that they address and they're going to

1 do a revision, they will file a revision and explain why the
2 route has changed in a particular area.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Off mike).

4 MR. SWEARINGEN: If it comes out before the draft
5 EIS, it will be presented in the draft Environmental Impact
6 Statement and then the public will have a chance to comment
7 on that. If the project is such that there is a wide-scale
8 change in scope of the project, the FERC typically will
9 reopen the scoping period. Most of the time, just for the
10 new people that would become affected. So if the route
11 would go off in a completely different direction affecting
12 potentially new people that are not involved with the
13 process, the FERC then, hypothetically, would send notices
14 to those people asking them for their comments. Yes, sir?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Off mike).

16 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. I'll answer that
17 question. That's more of an environmental comment that
18 would -- more appropriate for, I guess, the environmental
19 comment section of the meeting, but I'll go ahead and answer
20 it. The question was will the Environmental Impact
21 Statement discuss seismic impacts? And yes, seismic impacts
22 is something that the Environmental Impact Statement will
23 discuss and we've already been asking Ruby for information
24 and also obtaining information on our own about the
25 potential seismic effects in this area along the whole line

1 actually. Any more questions about the FERC process?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. Like I say, we have one
4 person signed up to speak. After that, I will open up the
5 floor. Anybody else can come up; give the comments that
6 they want. As Dan mentioned earlier, this is being
7 transcribed. This will go into the public record as an
8 official transcript. So when you come up, I'm going to ask
9 you to speak into that microphone. That microphone does not
10 project into the room, but it allows the transcriber to pick
11 up what it is that you're saying. Come up, state your name,
12 spell it for the record, and give your comments.

13 Okay. We have Mr. Val Grant.

14 MR. GRANT: Hi. We meet again. I don't mean to
15 wish this on you, but I'm hoping that we can get another
16 scoping meeting. Pardon me?

17 COURT REPORTER: Your name, please.

18 MR. GRANT: Val Grant, G-R-A-N-T.

19 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

20 MR. GRANT: You're very welcome. Excuse me, I
21 was so excited about maybe another route, I just got carried
22 away.

23 MR. SWEARINGEN: That particular mike does not
24 project into the room.

25 MR. GRANT: Can you hear me okay?

1 (Position of the microphone is adjusted at this
2 time.)

3 MR. GRANT: Okay. On June 20, 2008, the Little
4 Bear Conservation Alliance submitted a letter to the FERC
5 requesting that Ruby Pipeline consider the Route 30
6 alternative in their pre-filing process. We asked for a
7 fair and balance comparison, much like Fox News, but not
8 quite; and received some comparable data in the latest
9 Resource Report 10, Section 10.4.1.4, Highway 30 Alternative
10 that jumbles the field rather than leveling it.

11 The problems are numerous. First and foremost,
12 we did not have any maps to see where this is going. And
13 essentially, we do not have any USGS quads to show how this
14 route is going through here. Essentially, what we got is a
15 regional scale map that really makes a comparison
16 impossible. The reason for this request is that if it's
17 subject to challenge we would really like to be able to see
18 where this is. Yes?

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Off mike.)

20 MR. GRANT: I'm sorry. I'll try to project a
21 little bit more.

22 (Microphone adjustment.)

23 MR. GRANT: Well, I'm here to collect money
24 (laughter). No, I'd better get my notes. Okay. What we
25 are looking at is that we would like to see where the

1 original quads on the Route 30 and whether it stays in the
2 existing -- and this route has definitely got existing
3 pipeline corridors all the way through it. I have a problem
4 with looking at some of this and there are locations where
5 the route varies and it goes to the -- it goes out into a
6 green field area when actuality there is about 8 miles of
7 pipeline corridor that are in existence there. Also, when
8 this pipeline leaves -- I'm sorry to interrupt this, but how
9 did Opal ever become Opal? That's a question I had for a
10 long time.

11 But it leaves Opal. There are existing pipelines
12 coming out of that corridor also, and I'm trying to figure
13 out why it didn't stay on those corridors. Now, there are
14 existing pipeline corridors coming all the way up through
15 here and that's what we would like to see -- you know, where
16 this -- we would appreciate the quad angle view so that we
17 can make a good comparison.

18 Now, also in the June 20 letter, we provided FERC
19 and Ruby with the information from the Forest Service
20 district ranger in the Montpelier district, Caribou-Targhee
21 National Forest regarding the inventoried roadless areas.
22 Now, originally, of the 8.5 miles in the Worm Creek and
23 Station Creek IRAs, which are Inventoried Roadless Areas,
24 there is a -- the route causes an insignificant loss to the
25 Worm Creek IRA and a non-existence loss to the Station

1 Creek. Then the Worm Creek area it takes a thumb of a
2 rather large section of roadless area. In the Station Creek
3 it actually is -- the route is south of the Preston Water
4 Pipeline. And the area that's considered roadless area is,
5 as the district ranger said, really shouldn't be on the map.
6 It is not a roadless area.

7 So we're wondering about that. And then, all of
8 a sudden, when we read the new chapter 10 or the Resource
9 Report 10, all of a sudden now it's 11.3 miles. It grew
10 some how and there was something proposed in there that all
11 of sudden gave us more roadless area. So this is kind of
12 confusing. We're really like to find out what that is, but
13 we have no maps. We have no ability to really question.

14 Now, in Ruby's Table 10.4-4, we note that the
15 Route 30 alternative is 10 miles longer than the southern
16 route. Now, we also know that extra miles, which nobody
17 likes to build that much, but we know that extra miles can
18 be trumped by the route being in an existing corridor. And
19 for example, is the Medicine Bow lateral in eastern Wyoming
20 was forced to stay in an existing corridor rather than to
21 cut a green field route through private land. We ask that
22 what the FERC granted the ranchers in Wyoming they grant us
23 the same consideration.

24 Regarding private and public land, Route 30 has
25 more private and less public land than what crosses the

1 southern route. What we don't know is the distance that
2 Route 30 is in an existing corridor. So this little tidbit
3 of information is called "pending." This wasn't reported.
4 As mentioned above, at least 8 miles can be added to the
5 existing corridor of Route 30 and probably more once the
6 maps are scrutinized.

7 Now, it is interesting that Ruby's original
8 routing, that Route 30 did not cross the U.S. Fish and
9 Wildlife Refuge in Wyoming, nor did it cross the proposed
10 BLM's special management area, which was proposed. Now,
11 there was no mention of crossing historic trails and now
12 there are five. And there is also the crossing of these
13 other two. Now, probably just a smaller error in judgment,
14 but Ruby also notes that more streams are crossed on the
15 Route 30 than the southern route, 121 versus 111,
16 respectively.

17 Now, what isn't known is how many perennial
18 streams are crossed, which really is a major importance
19 here. There's 18 on the southern route. By quick count,
20 there are five perennial streams crossed by Route 30 and
21 possible another four or five from a Route 30 tie in at --
22 to milepost 183.4 in Utah's Curlew Valley. That's a
23 substantial reduction compared to 121 versus 111.
24 Regarding wetlands, the comparison is apples and oranges.
25 The southern route has been surveyed and the wetlands

1 measured. Route 30 wetlands have been estimated from Fish
2 and Wildlife Services and national Wetland inventory maps,
3 which distinctly exaggerate the acreage. And besides that,
4 the draft EIS notes that there are 94.2 acres of wetlands on
5 the southern route compared to about, I think, 122, which
6 came from the NWI maps.

7 But for some reason, and maybe somebody can
8 explain this to me, 1.5 miles of swamp and marsh were not
9 included in those totals. Perhaps, swamp and marshes are
10 wetlands. Now, we request the FERC to please direct Ruby to
11 truly evaluate Route 30 during the pre-filing period so that
12 members of the Little Bear Conservation Alliance and other
13 concerned citizens in Cache Valley can make a decision based
14 on fact and not in Ruby's interpretation of what we should
15 know. Notably, Ruby has yet to answer a question posed last
16 April concerning why the northern route was just fine from
17 December 2007 until mid-March 2008 knowing full well all the
18 problems they then said caused them to switch to the
19 southern route. What happened? Did someone play a trump
20 card on El Paso forcing them to switch to the southern
21 route? And I thank you for your attention.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. Thank you, Val. The
24 floor is open. Anybody who wishes to come up raise your
25 hand and come up and provide comments.

1 (No response.)

2 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. Like I said before --
3 yes, sir?

4 MR. BACHELLER: Frank Batcheller,
5 B-A-C-H-E-L-L-E-R. Okay. Basically, I endorse everything
6 that has just been said. My main concern here is the east
7 canyon that comes down from Porcupine Dam. It's an area
8 where the meander of the river has just been restored.
9 There are camping sites. It's fishing. It's a recreation
10 area. And this pipeline is going to come down -- again, I
11 don't know exactly where. That's a frustration in this
12 process. There is not sufficient information for people to
13 know if they object or not object at times.

14 I don't know where the pipeline is coming down.
15 Okay. But this canyon, in my view, has to be protected. So
16 we need to look very carefully at East Canyon and the impact
17 there.

18 My other point I would like to make is there are
19 already established right-of-ways. Why not use them? It's
20 like putting I-40, I-60, I-80 all in one place across the
21 country. Secondly, once the right-of-way gets established
22 through Avant, we're going to have other things coming
23 through. There isn't much space. It's an environmentally
24 sensitive area and it's one of the most beautiful areas in
25 Cache Valley. We need to protect that. That's all I have

1 to say.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. SWEARINGEN: Good. Thank you, Mr. Bacheller.
4 Anybody else? Yes, ma'am?

5 MS. FISHER: I'm Laura Fisher, F-I-S-H-E-R. In
6 order to sell natural gas for the development of increased
7 residential and communal -- excuse me, commercial density in
8 areas where lack of fuel has slowed this development
9 historically, 4,300 acres will be taken, according to your
10 literature, and 12,000 acres "disturbed." Impact includes
11 seismic hazards, fire hazards, disturbance of water sources,
12 residential and agricultural, depletion of water resources,
13 creation of noise, air, soil and water pollution and visual
14 blight."

15 People live out here, I among them, in order not
16 to have these things and we are asked to view this incursion
17 into a relatively beautiful area as benign when, in fact, it
18 is going to have some impact. It seems we're here tonight
19 only to attempt to quantitate that. And as Mr. Grant said,
20 without the information we would need, the data we would
21 need in order to even attempt that quantitation. Thank you.

22 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else
23 like to provide comments?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. SWEARINGEN: Okay. If you think of something

1 on the way out, you can write them down and drop them off.
2 You can go back to your home and write comments in, send
3 them in through the mail or through the FERC electronic
4 system if you think of something later.

5 What I'll do then is I'm going to close the
6 formal part of this meeting. As I said, the folks from Ruby
7 will stick around. They have some maps. I'll stick around
8 and answer any questions you may have of the FERC. Anyone
9 wishing to obtain a copy of the transcript should talk to
10 the transcriber to my left. At some point they will be
11 available on the FERC website. The FERC website is
12 www.FERC.gov and within that website there's a link called
13 e-Library. If you type in the docket number, which is PF08-
14 9, you can use e-Library to gain access to all the public
15 information on the record, either submitted by Ruby or
16 issued by the FERC for this project.

17 So on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
18 Commission, I want to thank you all for coming here tonight.
19 Let the record show that the Hyrum scoping meeting concluded
20 at 7:43 p.m. Thank you.

21 (Whereupon, at 7:43 p.m., the above-entitled
22 scoping meeting was concluded.)
23
24
25