

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

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x

IN THE MATTER OF: : Docket No.  
JORDAN COVE ENERGY PROJECT, L.P. : CP07-444-000  
PACIFIC CONNECTOR GAS PIPELINE : CP07-441-000  
PROJECT, L.P. :

- - - - - x

North Bend Community Center  
2222 Broadway Street  
North Bend, Oregon 97459

Monday, October 27, 2008

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:30 p.m., John Scott, project manager for Tetra Tech EC, presiding.

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (6:30 p.m.)

3 MR. SCOTT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'd like to  
4 get started. Welcome to the public meeting to hear comments  
5 on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's draft  
6 Environmental Impact Statement on the Jordan Cove Energy and  
7 Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline Projects.

8 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
9 Commission, I'd like to thank everybody for being here this  
10 evening. My name is John Scott. I'm the project manager  
11 for Tetra Tech EC. We are the contractor that has been  
12 working with FERC since early 2006 in doing the  
13 environmental analysis for these projects and in preparing -  
14 - can't hear me? Is that better? Sorry.

15 We've been working with FERC since early 2006 in  
16 doing the environmental analysis for these projects and in  
17 preparing the draft environmental impact statement.  
18 Unfortunately, due to a last-minute series of events,  
19 including some medical conditions and travel issues, there  
20 will not be anyone from FERC Staff here tonight.

21 As I said, there's medical issues and travel  
22 snafus that happened that have resulted in just members from  
23 Tetra Tech being here tonight. And --

24 VOICE: This is not a legitimate --

25 MR. SCOTT: FERC has asked that the meeting

1 continue as planned. And I know that there's -- I realize  
2 that it's probably very disappointing, but please be assured  
3 that tonight's meeting and your comments at tonight's  
4 meeting will be --

5 VOICE: We need a mike --

6 MR. SCOTT: That's not connected to the house  
7 system.

8 But please be assured that your comments tonight  
9 will be on the public record just as if the meeting had a  
10 FERC Staff here. Other than --

11 MR. SCOTT: As I said, this meeting will be part  
12 of the public record and the comments made tonight will be  
13 just as if it was any other meeting.

14 VOICE: They won't be here to talk to us. We want  
15 to hear from FERC. We want to talk to FERC. You are not  
16 the FERC.

17 MR. SCOTT: Now the purpose of this meeting, if I  
18 can continue, is for us to hear comments on the draft  
19 environmental impact statement which was issued by the  
20 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission -- can you all hear if  
21 I speak loud enough?

22 (Chorus of "no's.")

23 MR. SCOTT: Seriously.

24 VOICE: Reschedule.

25 MR. SCOTT: In the back of the room, can you

1 hear?

2 VOICE: Reschedule.

3 MR. SCOTT: In the interest of all the people  
4 that have made an effort to be here tonight and taken their  
5 time, FERC has asked that this meeting go on as planned.

6 VOICE: I did not hear FERC.

7 VOICE: We have a vote.

8 VOICE: I did not hear FERC.

9 MR. SCOTT: I'm not going to force you to stay  
10 here if you don't want to, it's entirely up to you, but we  
11 will continue the meeting as planned.

12 Can you hear me in the back of the room?

13 (Chorus of "no's.")

14 MR. SCOTT: Seriously, in the back of the room,  
15 can you hear me?

16 (Chorus of "no's.")

17 MR. SCOTT: Okay. People in the front are saying  
18 they can't, but people in the back are saying they can.  
19 Please bear with me, I will continue to try to use this mike  
20 even as it's breaking out.

21 As I said, the purpose of this meeting is to hear  
22 comments on the draft EIS that was issued on August 29th.  
23 At the time, FERC set a 90-day comment period on the draft,  
24 which ends December 4th. FERC will accept all comments on  
25 the draft during that time, either written comments or

1 verbal comments made at this meeting or a series of three  
2 additional meetings scheduled for later this week along the  
3 proposed pipeline route.

4 After the close of the formal comment period, the  
5 FERC will produce a final environmental impact statement.  
6 The final EIS will include responses to comments that are  
7 received tonight at this meeting, at the other public  
8 meetings and written comments that are received.

9 There is a staff member from FERC on his way as  
10 we speak. He may -- it's unlikely he'll be here this  
11 evening, but he is en route.

12 MR. SCOTT: I think he's planning on using at  
13 least one of those.

14 Now although the formal comment period ends on  
15 December 4th, comments will be accepted after that point up  
16 to a reasonable time at which they can still be addressed  
17 and incorporated into the final EIS. The current schedule  
18 for FERC's issuance of the final EIS is February 2009.  
19 February 2009, in case you didn't hear that.

20 Following the issuance of the final EIS, the  
21 Commission will use the EIS as one element in its review of  
22 the proposed projects and it will determine whether the  
23 projects should be authorized.

24 The Commission, which is the five-member  
25 appointed board itself, will consider both environmental and

1 non-environmental issues in making its decision. While the  
2 EIS and the mitigation developed in the EIS process is an  
3 important factor in the Commission's decision, the EIS  
4 itself is not a decision document. The EIS is an  
5 environmental review that's intended -- the EIS is an  
6 environmental review that's intended to identify and  
7 quantify the environmental --

8 VOICE: (Inaudible) -- microphone.

9 MR. SCOTT: I'm sorry, I --

10 (Inaudible voices heard.)

11 VOICES: Reschedule.

12 MR. SCOTT: Test, test. I apologize for the  
13 microphone. I will do my best to keep a check on the plugs  
14 until we find one that works.

15 The components of the proposed projects  
16 themselves are described in detail in the draft EIS. And  
17 I'm going to assume that most people are at least somewhat  
18 familiar with those, so to avoid a long introduction, I'm  
19 not going to go into detail about what the proposed projects  
20 are except for a brief summary.

21 Jordan Cove Energy proposes to construct and  
22 operate a liquefied natural gas import and regasification  
23 terminal on the North Spit of Coos Bay. The terminal would  
24 accept up to about 80 LNG vessels per year that would  
25 transit the existing Coos Bay -- the vessels would transit

1 the existing Coos Bay navigation channel up to the proposed  
2 site.

3 In addition, the International Port of Coos Bay  
4 would construct the LNG ship berth at the site and would  
5 dredge a deep water -- would dredge a deep water access  
6 channel between the new berth and the existing navigation  
7 channel.

8 (Inaudible voices heard.)

9 MR. SCOTT: -- (on new microphone) -- The Port of  
10 Coos Bay are considered integrally related to the proposed  
11 LNG terminal and they are addressed in detail in the EIS.  
12 That is the construction of the ship berth and the access  
13 channel to the berth.

14 Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline proposes to  
15 construct and operate a send-out pipeline from the Jordan  
16 Cove terminal which would consist of about 230 miles of 36-  
17 inch diameter high-pressure buried welded steel pipeline  
18 that would cross portions of Coos, Douglas, Jackson and  
19 Klamath Counties and end near Malin, Oregon. The Pacific  
20 Connector project would also include one compressor station  
21 near Butte Falls and meter stations at four locations along  
22 the pipeline.

23 The FERC Staff produced the draft EIS in  
24 cooperation with several other agencies, including the Army  
25 Corps of Engineers, the EPA, Coast Guard, U.S. Forest

1 Service, BLM, Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Department of  
2 Transportation Office of Pipeline Safety and Douglas County.

3 Now at this point, I'd like to begin taking  
4 comments from the audience. We asked as you entered tonight  
5 to sign up if you wish to speak. I will go down through  
6 that list and ask those on the list to come forward to the  
7 microphone and please speak your name clearly. As you've  
8 seen, the meeting is being transcribed and there will be a  
9 formal transcript of the meeting. Please speak your name  
10 clearly at the beginning of your comments and that will help  
11 to ensure that the transcript is accurate.

12 When we've gotten through the list, I will ask if  
13 there's others that would like to speak. Right now, we have  
14 over 40 people that have signed up. I'd like to ask that  
15 you limit your comments to five minutes in the effort to  
16 allow as many people as possible the chance to speak  
17 tonight. If we get through that list and there's still time  
18 and people are still willing, we'll continue to take  
19 comments from others, or if you'd like to speak twice,  
20 that's fine, once we get through that initial list.

21 And finally the format of this meeting, as I've  
22 said a couple times, is intended to take comments from the  
23 audience. That is as opposed to a question and answer  
24 format. History shows that the meetings progress faster and  
25 we can take more comments if we limit the format to just

1       commenting on the EIS. However, that said, if there are  
2       questions that pertain to the process of the EIS or the FERC  
3       process and I feel I can answer those quickly and  
4       efficiently and help with a response, I will do my best to  
5       do that. But in general, I will -- at the end of each  
6       comment, I will finish by saying thank you for your comment  
7       and then we'll move on to the next comment.

8                 So with that, let's get started. The first  
9       person on the list is Wendy Wong-Haigh, and second up on  
10      deck if you could be ready is Dustin Clarke.

11                Please just do your best with the microphone.  
12      I'm sorry -- give it a minute -- it cuts out and comes back  
13      on.

14                MS. WONG-HAIGH: Hi. My name is Wendy Wong  
15      Haigh, W-e-n-d-y W-o-n-g H-a-i-g-h.

16                I feel really stupid talking to a microphone and  
17      to no FERC officials at all. It's kind of disappointing.  
18      But since they don't want to be held accountable for  
19      anything, I'm just going to start anyway. I'm a health  
20      consultant in Roseburg. I have a business, teaching people  
21      how to take care of their health. And what I'm mainly  
22      concerned about here is the permanent contamination that  
23      would occur if there was an LNG terminal here in Coos Bay.  
24      I don't even live here in Coos Bay, I live in Days Creek.

25                I consider myself lucky to live in paradise. I

1 live on 40 acres of beautiful Oregonian land, clean water  
2 and clean air. And I moved up to Oregon so I could have  
3 clean water and clean air. And when I heard about this LNG  
4 terminal, I couldn't believe that people would even consider  
5 having their water, the groundwater, contaminated by leaks,  
6 which would eventually happen because nothing man-made is  
7 perfect. Eventually something is going to leak, whether  
8 it's in the bay, in the pipeline eventually, it will get  
9 into our groundwater, it will affect our fish and thus  
10 affect our fishermen and our fish industry.

11 I can't believe that anybody would even consider  
12 the fact that it would be filling in permanently miles of  
13 estuary and tearing down beautiful forest land. They're  
14 actually proposing cross over LSRs, which are areas which  
15 have old growth and things that have been growing for over a  
16 thousand years. So it's like here we live in paradise,  
17 people all over the world come here to visit because we  
18 actually have clean water and clean air and our ground is  
19 still relatively pristine compared to the rest of the world.  
20 And we're inviting a project that's going to be polluting  
21 our beautiful land and our beautiful soil and our water.  
22 And we take our health for granted -- I mean, it's like  
23 pretty soon you're going to hear more people getting cancer  
24 because of leakages in the water system and then they're  
25 going to say well it's not our fault.

1           Because that's what's happened, if you look  
2 around the country at waste dumps around the country -- I  
3 used to work for a company in LA called Ecology and  
4 Environment. And there were toxic waste dumps all around  
5 the country where industry had come in and didn't clean up  
6 their mess. And if you look through the FERC document, any  
7 time they actually admit that there is a place where  
8 something is going to be damaged, they basically say well we  
9 have this procedure that's going to mitigate this.

10           For instance, for the analysis that they say  
11 about the warming of the waters in the bay when they're  
12 processing or regasifying the LNG, it says we do not think  
13 that this warmer engine cooling water would have significant  
14 adverse effect or impact on the water -- this is on page  
15 4.3-26 -- because of mixing and other factors. It says  
16 first, tides would be continually exchanged in the water --  
17 oh, so that means we're going to have diluted contaminated  
18 water because oh the rest of the ocean water will make it so  
19 it's not so contaminated in your bay.

20           And then it says basically down at the bottom  
21 there may be some local areas near the cooling water  
22 discharge that would be warmer than this average and  
23 basically the way they mitigate it and say well look at this  
24 plan that we have instituted and we're just going to make  
25 sure that we follow the regulations that are in place.

1           Well how many other places around the U.S. has  
2 that happened where communities have had health problems  
3 afterward and said who's going to pay for all of these  
4 problems that we have now and the companies say well we  
5 followed the regulations. These regulations told us to do  
6 this and so we followed them. We can't help it if you guys  
7 are sick, it has nothing to do with that. And they have all  
8 these facts and figures that show that they're not  
9 accountable.

10           Well there's no place in this FERC document that  
11 has any accountability to FERC allowing them to do this  
12 project or even the company itself -- if there's any  
13 problems with our health in the future, there is nowhere to  
14 go. There's nobody to say oh, it was my fault, I'm sorry.  
15 And so that's why I'm concerned more than anything else that  
16 this project be stopped and that FERC look at their -- I  
17 don't understand how they can even say how they approve of  
18 this and that most of the things aren't going to affect the  
19 environment at all.

20           I mean, if you look at Jordan Cove's map, they  
21 say look at the map, there's barely any pipelines in Oregon.  
22 Well that's why it's so clean here still. There's all these  
23 pipelines in Texas and the East Coast, that's why  
24 everything's polluted over there. And if you looked at the  
25 LNG terminals where they actually process the LNG in the

1 other countries, they're polluting those countries as well  
2 and people are getting sick over there.

3 So I firmly -- if I could only convince everybody  
4 that health is so much -- your life is more important than  
5 this and our health, our public health, is more important  
6 than this kind of energy coming in.

7 That's all I have to say. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. SCOTT: Dustin Clarke. And then next we have  
10 Mark Sheldon.

11 MR. CLARKE: Dustin Clarke. That's D-u-s-t-i-n  
12 Clarke, C-l-a-r-k-e.

13 My name is Dustin Clarke and I'm the general  
14 manager for Coos County Sheep Company, a small family owned  
15 and operated timber company near Fairview. And we have  
16 about 2.5 miles of exposed pipeline that will cross our  
17 third-generation tree farm and it's going to bisect that  
18 tree farm and significantly reduce our ability to  
19 effectively--

20 VOICE: Can't hear you.

21 MR. CLARKE: Excuse me, effectively manage our  
22 forest lands. Coos County Sheep Company is here to support  
23 the amended Blue Bridge alternative route. The Blue Bridge  
24 alternative route will keep the pipeline out of our water  
25 supply or less in the water supply, I guess, and keep our

1        watersheds cleaner. We all know that clean water is good  
2        for everyone from fish to farmers and so we're hoping to  
3        keep it out of as much of the watershed as possible, and  
4        that's exactly what the amended Blue Bridge alternative  
5        route would do.

6                We're also concerned with this project which is  
7        billed as a project for the public good. We think that that  
8        project for the public good should be on public land, and  
9        the amended Blue Ridge alternative route increases the  
10       amount of public land that the pipeline runs through to  
11       about 60 percent, from milepost 9.2 to the Fairview area.  
12       The benefits and burdens of this project should be shared by  
13       everyone and putting it on public land would certainly help  
14       everyone out there. Keeping it on top of the ridge would  
15       also keep it away from residential watersheds and away from  
16       human activity, which is one of the things that tends to  
17       damage the pipeline.

18                So to summarize, the Coos County Sheep Company is  
19        hoping that everyone will take a look at the amended Blue  
20        Ridge alternative route for the purpose of water quality,  
21        putting the public -- project on public land and keeping it  
22        away from private residences.

23                Thank you.

24                (Applause.)

25                MR. SCOTT: Thank you for your comments.

1                   Mark Sheldon? And then next up Steve Jones.

2                   MR. SHELDON: I'm Mark Sheldon. I'm from Coos  
3 Bay, Oregon. I'm a lifelong Oregon resident. But I'm here  
4 tonight to speak for two individuals who can't be here:  
5 Patrick Henry and the late President Thomas Jefferson, you  
6 remember them, both champions of individual community,  
7 county and states rights. Patrick Henry, for those of you  
8 who don't know, who was the stalwart father of the Bill of  
9 Rights, and Thomas Jefferson, who we love to quote, wrote  
10 the timeless document the Declaration of Independence.

11                   If Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Henry were here tonight,  
12 they would have one thing to say to us all: we ought to  
13 have a vote. We ought to be able to vote.

14                   (Applause.)

15                   MR. SHELDON: We ought to have a city vote. We  
16 ought to have a county vote. We ought to have a state vote.  
17 We ought to have a vote.

18                   The tragedy here is that we will never know what  
19 the majority wants. We will never know because we aren't  
20 going to have this opportunity to have a vote unless some  
21 courageous entity decides to have one. And you know why  
22 that is? Well maybe you didn't know. This is a national  
23 emergency. This is a national emergency and the federal  
24 government is going to decide for us what is best for us.  
25 They will make this decision. So the 232-year tradition

1 that Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Henry gave their last measure for  
2 and their lives for is going to be swept away and that city,  
3 county and state say is gone.

4 This is about oil and gas companies who have  
5 reaped hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of  
6 dollars worth of profits who want more money. And this is  
7 about federal agencies that, without these companies, don't  
8 have anything to regulate. The one thing a bureaucracy  
9 needs is more to do.

10 Now if we want to be the Alabama gulf, the  
11 Louisiana Bayous, and the Texas Gulf Coast, well by God if  
12 the majority votes yes, I will stand with the majority. But  
13 we ought to have a vote.

14 You know why this region is getting this shoved  
15 down its throat? Because California and Washington have  
16 more votes. It's about the vote.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. SHELDON: They have more power, they are the  
19 bigger pain in the rear for the federal government, they've  
20 said we don't want it here, the federal government says  
21 Oregon's going to be a lot easier to deal with than  
22 California or Washington. They have the votes.

23 Now if you want to know, on a sadder note, what  
24 all those founding fathers would have said, they would have  
25 said shame on the federal government. Because what was

1 their greatest fear? Their greatest fear, you are correct,  
2 was a tyrannical federal government who was all powerful.  
3 Their greatest fear was the loss of local, county and states  
4 rights. Don't let 232 years and decades and generations who  
5 have lived and died to find that path and that model which  
6 has created the longest living democracy that man has ever  
7 known be swept away because of this darn thing.

8 By God, if everybody wants gunboats leading the  
9 largest tankers in the world up this little pipsqueak harbor  
10 and a pipeline built from out there to Malin, Oregon and the  
11 majority says they want it, I want it. But tonight I have  
12 the pleasure to say what I think Thomas Jefferson and  
13 Patrick Henry would have said to us all: shame on those who  
14 say we should not have a vote. I want a vote.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. SCOTT: Thank you for your comment.

17 Dan Searres? Dan Searres? Dan Searres? And  
18 then Robert Westerman next.

19 MR. JONES: Now I know what it feels like to  
20 follow Jimi Hendrix.

21 (Laughter.)

22 Good evening. I'll try to keep this really brief  
23 here. My name is Steve Jones. I'm the director of Coos  
24 River Keeper. Our mission here in Coos County is to protect  
25 the environment and the waterways of the entire county. We

1 represent voters, we represent fishermen, we represent  
2 environmentalists, biologists, and we represent business  
3 owners here in Coos County.

4           Although the creation of jobs is of most  
5 importance to us and to things in our community, we also  
6 care about the preservation of our environmental, our  
7 lifestyle and the waters of Coos County. Currently if one  
8 were to assess the health of the Coos Bay estuary, only one  
9 conclusion can be drawn. Speaking on behalf of some local  
10 fishermen, biologists -- well there we go -- biologists and  
11 the Coos River Keepers, the conclusion that can only be  
12 drawn is that our estuary is currently stressed. This draft  
13 EIS falsely assumes that there will be little to no impact  
14 upon the estuary here. The submitted draft EIS in no way  
15 devotes any section to the health, the current health of the  
16 Coos Bay estuary. We don't understand -- okay, we'll try  
17 that now. Where was I?

18           We don't understand how this draft can formulate  
19 any kind of opinion pertaining to the impact of the proposed  
20 action upon the Coos Bay estuary. Your draft EIS, may I  
21 say, is a mess. The process that has been submitted also  
22 pertaining to the alternative proposals fall far short of  
23 any NEPA requirements to dismiss all other alternatives  
24 without a more in-depth study completely disregards the NEPA  
25 process. And John, you of all people should understand the

1 NEPA process.

2 Coos River Keeper now requests that a proper and  
3 required programmatic EIS, environmental impact study, be  
4 conducted prior to proceeding any farther with the proposed  
5 action. Therefore, Coos River Keeper stands with the Oregon  
6 Department of Energy, we stand with Governor Ted Kulongoski,  
7 we stand also with the Honorable Senator Ron Wyden, we stand  
8 with the Secretary of State Bill Bradbury and the many  
9 taxpaying citizens of this great state who may have their  
10 land annexed for an unneeded pipeline to California.

11 We stand and demand a fair and unbiased  
12 environmental impact study, not the predetermined conclusion  
13 provided by us -- provided to us by the Jordan Cove Energy  
14 Project.

15 I'm tired of dealing with the microphone here.

16 You need to do your homework. What is proposed  
17 here -- there's so many mistakes in this draft that I cannot  
18 pick any one subject, any one item out. They are numerous.  
19 I don't see how you have any pertinent conclusions here. The  
20 whole thing just needs to be redone.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. JONES: And we need to ask again for a  
23 programmatic environmental impact study to check out all the  
24 alternatives.

25 Thank you. Thank you all for coming tonight.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

3 Dan Serres, and then Robert Westerman.

4 MR. SERRES: So I'm just going to shout. If the  
5 microphone picks it up, then that's better.

6 My name is Dan Serres. I'm here representing  
7 FLOW and the Southern Oregon Clean Energy Coalition. My  
8 last name is spelled S-e-r-r-e-s and the first name is D-a-  
9 n.

10 I think the way a lot of us view the issue who  
11 are opposed to the project isn't so much a question of jobs  
12 versus the environment, which is a fight that we're used to  
13 having in Oregon. It's much more a question of jobs versus  
14 jobs and the people who live along the 230-mile pipeline  
15 that is proposed to extend from the Jordan Cove project all  
16 the way to Malin. That pipeline will be forced on people  
17 through eminent domain if they are unwilling to sign off.

18 Now it's not exactly a fair negotiation if FERC  
19 is granting the right of eminent domain without an adequate  
20 analysis and giving essentially the company the right to put  
21 a gun to your head and say well we can take it through  
22 eminent domain or you can negotiate with us. And that's the  
23 situation that hundreds of Oregonians find themselves in  
24 with this project and it's not fair and it's not ethical.

25 The Oregon Department of Energy says that this

1 project is not needed to meet our energy demands. They  
2 stated that flatly in a report that was issued in May 2008.  
3 They backed it up against FERC when FERC said oh no, we'll  
4 ignore that when Oregon Department of Energy went to bat  
5 against Bradwood LNG. And they continue to assert that that  
6 is the case, but there are ample alternatives to liquefied  
7 natural gas in Oregon and some of those have to do with  
8 natural gas and natural gas pipelines. I think Oregon  
9 Department of Energy has concluded that two Rockies proposed  
10 pipelines, Blue Bridge -- or actually there's three of them,  
11 there's Blue Bridge, Sunstone and Ruby -- all provide  
12 reasonable alternatives to this project.

13 FERC concludes in its EIS that the Ruby pipeline  
14 is a speculative project. I can't imagine what's more  
15 speculative than buying into liquefied natural gas, a  
16 foreign fossil fuel that would make us more rather than less  
17 dependent on other countries that don't have our best  
18 interests in mind.

19 One of the last points I want to make is that the  
20 price of LNG is exorbitant. If you are just doing dollars  
21 and cents, if you were just looking at the monetary impact  
22 of this on ratepayers and on the economy of Oregon, you  
23 would conclude -- as Oregon Department of Energy has  
24 concluded -- that this project is bad for Oregon.

25 LNG is three or four times the price of domestic

1 gas right now. I can't imagine how this is going to be a  
2 good thing for our regional economy if we get hooked on an  
3 even more high-priced foreign fossil fuel. If you like  
4 what's going on with oil, you'll love LNG.

5 Just last week, Iran, Qatar and Russia, who  
6 control 60 percent of the world's oil reserves -- I'm sorry,  
7 LNG reserves -- decided that they should form a cartel just  
8 like OPEC to control the export of LNG. This is a bad idea  
9 for Oregon. We shouldn't be buying into this stuff and it's  
10 headed to California anyway. So to the extent that we  
11 actually do get some of the gas, we're going to pay through  
12 the nose for it.

13 Just a few things to add to the question of the  
14 price for the gas -- and again, these are the conclusions  
15 that have been reached not by me but by the Oregon  
16 Department of Energy and, frankly, they're being reached by  
17 others in the LNG industry right now.

18 Two gulf coast projects have switched and have  
19 decided well, we've imported some LNG but actually the price  
20 is so high overseas -- again three to four times what we're  
21 paying here -- they want to re-export the LNG from the gulf  
22 coast.

23 Kitimat in Canada, the same supply basin that we  
24 currently get our gas from, has so much gas to sell that  
25 they turned an import project into an export project,

1        imagine that. So now they're going to be sending gas to  
2        Japan and Korea, who paid this year up to \$20 a million BTU.  
3        If you think we're going to get growth and jobs out of this  
4        price energy, I think it's fantasy. It's not going to  
5        happen.

6                    In the long term it's going to cost us real  
7        progress in terms of moving towards renewable energy and  
8        conservation and efficiency, energy goals that most  
9        Oregonians hold.

10                    And that last piece of this is with all these  
11        things in question FERC is prepared to issue a license that  
12        will grant eminent domain. As soon as they issue that  
13        license, the company has the right of eminent domain. They  
14        don't even have to show they comply with our state laws.  
15        They get that license before they've shown that they comply  
16        with the Clean Water Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act  
17        and the Clean Air Act.

18                    And this is happening right now in Bradwood.  
19        They gave Bradwood a license up on the Columbia River to  
20        build an LNG terminal just like this one. And Bradwood with  
21        that license has the right to go out and take land. So at  
22        the very least, FERC shouldn't move forward issuing licenses  
23        and granting the right of eminent domain until the state  
24        gets a chance to say. I think Governor Kulongoski and the  
25        state agencies want a vote as well and I think the people of

1 Oregon deserve that. They deserve at least for the project  
2 to comply with our laws before people are put out of their  
3 private property rights.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. SCOTT: Robert Westerman. And then next on  
7 deck, Richard Chasm.

8 MR. WESTERMAN: I'm Robert Westerman, W-e-s-t-e-  
9 r-m-a-n. I'm business manager for IBW Local Union 932 and  
10 president of the Southwestern Oregon Central Labor Council.  
11 I'm here tonight in strong support of the Jordan Cove LNG  
12 Project and I'll tell you why. Our economy is in shambles  
13 right now. Construction is at an all-time low. It hasn't  
14 been this low since the early Nineties. This job, this  
15 project will employ over 36 months to 3-1/2 years an average  
16 of 475 construction workers, estimated at \$119 million in  
17 construction wages alone. It will increase, besides the  
18 amount of construction workers, there will be an additional  
19 345 estimate jobs indirectly introduced into our local  
20 economy. We need this money into our local economy and we  
21 need these jobs. We need to build this project.

22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

25 Richard Chasm, and then Diane Phillips next.

1                   MR. CHASM: Good evening. My name is Richard  
2 Chasm. I live at 730 Hoover Hill Road in Winston, Oregon.  
3 Please add these comments to the record. I gave written  
4 comments earlier.

5                   I do not resent at all anyone over here wanting a  
6 decent job. Participating in this issue, I have been in and  
7 out of Coos Bay, as I have my entire life. Driving around  
8 Coos Bay, I see whole building sitting empty. Many of them.  
9 Times are tough in southern Oregon at the best of times, but  
10 I can see Coos Bay is pretty bad off economically. So I  
11 certainly sympathize and understand the desire to have a  
12 decent job, not a bad job, a decent job. And I can accept  
13 that there are people, even many people, who believe this  
14 concept of the LNG terminal is a good idea.

15                   If one reviews the history of this bay, there  
16 have been several waves of industrial development from  
17 pioneers times forward until today. As a child and a young  
18 man, I knew a gentleman named Jack Cluster. He was raised  
19 in a logging camp up in Eden Valley southeast of Powers.  
20 His mother baked pies in the cook shack and his father was  
21 the head mechanic and pipe fitter for a big logging camp.  
22 He told me that from the camps out that direction there was  
23 two big passenger trains a month into Coos Bay. He told me  
24 that he did as he was told and hunted for odd jobs in search  
25 of extra money to take to Coos Bay on those trains.

1                   When Jack Cluster described Coos Bay before World  
2 War II to me, he told me about a busy seaport full of  
3 steamships, trawlers and tugboats. The hard work was done  
4 in Coos County, the lumber was shipped out of Coos Bay, but  
5 the decisions were made in corporate boardrooms elsewhere.  
6 This place was logged out and left abandoned and this has  
7 happened several times over the history of this bay.

8                   Once again the leaders of Coos Bay seek to hang  
9 everyone's economic hat on one big industrial concern.  
10 Eventually, you will be left high and dry one more time just  
11 like all the other times. The pipeline that connects this  
12 LNG terminal to the money extends your back flip off the  
13 economic bridge in an ugly trench across four counties of  
14 Oregon. Your handful of jobs threatens our lands, our  
15 waters, our investments, our way of life.

16                   I have done every dirty job there is in southern  
17 Oregon: I've planted trees, I've split stone with a hammer,  
18 I've set chokers, I've worked under the high lead, I've  
19 worked behind Cats, I own my own timber land, I'm not scared  
20 of a day's work to own my land and to live in my community.  
21 And we come as a group.

22                   As proponents of this development, it seems to me  
23 correcting the defects in this proposal would be in your  
24 best interests in both the short term and the long term. In  
25 the short term, this shell game style of economic

1 development makes the way business is done in Coos Bay and  
2 in the international Port of Coos Bay of political interest  
3 to a broad spectrum of southern Oregon. In the long run,  
4 the full impact of this major industrial installation an  
5 irretrievable commitment of Oregon's lands, waters and  
6 creatures who live here, not the least of which is my  
7 neighbors, will not be known even marginally until it is too  
8 late.

9           The damage to the salmon runs alone may well  
10 outweigh the benefits of this proposal. But how do we know?  
11 Now is the time to make sure the plans for this terminal and  
12 pipeline are done properly. All of the ramifications and  
13 full costs need to be known before giving multinational oil  
14 companies anything. This is entirely the point of the  
15 National Environmental Policy Act and the purpose of an  
16 environmental impact statement; that's what it does. This  
17 EIS is incomplete. Why should the burden once again fall to  
18 country people and the public in general? Let the well-paid  
19 oil industry executives and engineers finish their work and  
20 then give us 90 days to comment. When they enjoy the right  
21 of eminent domain, we ought to have the right to see the  
22 entire completed proposal out in black and white.

23           From the very beginning, the public and impacted  
24 communities have borne the burden, from the incredibly poor  
25 website put up by FERC -- I'm also a real estate agent. We

1 lie and die on our website. And there's not a real estate  
2 broker or CEO in this country who would look at that FERC  
3 website for 15 seconds and say get somebody in here and fix  
4 this. It was horrible. Remember, we live out in the sticks  
5 and we have dial-up computer service. It takes hours and  
6 hours to download this stuff. It was gobbeldy-gook. It was  
7 ridiculously bad.

8 Then it was the corrupted DVDs. Then it was the  
9 DVDs that had a title to get into it that was so long none  
10 of us had computers that were big enough to do it, we had to  
11 go find special computers, break it open and then rename it  
12 so we could get into the darn thing.

13 Now we have a draft EIS that simply a farce.  
14 During the scoping period we earnestly and laboriously wrote  
15 and delivered letters about our concerns -- here is the  
16 letter that I wrote April 15th, 2007. These are among the  
17 700 comments mentioned in the letter FERC sent to Senator  
18 Wyden telling him to buzz off. This draft essentially  
19 ignores, defers or glosses over every single point. That's  
20 bad for jobs in Coos Bay.

21 Without a biological assessment, it is tortured  
22 reasoning to even call this an EIS. As I understand it,  
23 there are over 140 additional reports, permits and  
24 conditions to be delivered before work can start. How about  
25 an assessment to show if there's even a need? There seems

1 to be a growing supply of cheap domestic natural gas and  
2 many alternative sources of energy are out on the horizon.  
3 I find it appalling that such an irretrievable, destructive  
4 and ugly intrusion into our rural way of life is being done  
5 in so slap-dash and shabby a manner.

6 And Wendy, I agree with every single word you  
7 said.

8 Many, many of us who live in these hills live  
9 here because this kind of stuff is not here. I keep bees.  
10 There's wild swarms all over the place here, but you can't  
11 find them in other places because of the chemicals. And  
12 that means a lot to us.

13 More importantly, these defects obviously call  
14 for a lawsuit of some sort. Why do this? Those citizens  
15 who want to see a real project and who want jobs -- and  
16 again, I do not resent you feeling that way one bit -- ought  
17 to insist that FERC require the applicant to deliver a  
18 completed EIS to us. The landowners directly affected by  
19 this are country people, we live close to the land. This  
20 pipeline is a violation of our homes, our investments, our  
21 way of life. If it comes anywhere through my valley, it  
22 comes through where I live. If this pipeline slices through  
23 southern Oregon, it slices through my home. If they build a  
24 terminal on the North Spit -- if I didn't have to work for a  
25 living, I'd come over here and go fishing.

1           Most of us live here because this is not here.  
2           There is no amount of money that can buy the beauty and the  
3           power of our lands and waters and it is an insult that the  
4           applicant would give us this pig in a poke EIS and then  
5           claim the right of eminent domain to give us what they think  
6           what our way of life is worth. And then the one-time  
7           pittance that they're going to give us for it is an outrage  
8           in comparison to the decades of immense profits the oil  
9           companies have become accustomed to and intend to continue  
10          to collect.

11           Weyerhaeuser got five times their tax value for  
12          the 1300 acres that the Port purchased from them.  
13          Landowners get eminent domain in a down market. That is  
14          shameful.

15           The deadline for comments is a great hardship for  
16          us because it falls on one of the busiest times of the year  
17          for rural dwellers. We're harvesting our crops, canning our  
18          food, fishing contracts in construction, cutting firewood,  
19          hunting, fishing and generally getting things ready for the  
20          wet months ahead. This is our livelihood more than money  
21          and it needs to be done. My firewood is in a big heap under  
22          a tarp instead of stacked in my woodshed like it would  
23          ordinarily be.

24           The deadline of December 4th, in addition, comes  
25          with FERC hearings tonight right on top of some of the most

1 important elections of our times. This is the worst  
2 possible times for country dwellers to apply themselves to  
3 this sort of reading and comment. This is time and money  
4 out of our pockets when both is scarce. This is also not a  
5 coincidence. This is careful planning to keep the people in  
6 the line of fire out of the loop in the dark diverted tired  
7 and broke. It also won't work. And the assumption that  
8 there's a lot of hillbillies --

9 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chasm --

10 MR. CHASM: -- between here and Malin is on one  
11 hand a good one but it is not entirely true. There are a  
12 lot of people who have moved here with real money that are  
13 spending millions to develop homes, wineries, resorts,  
14 recreational opportunities, they're not real thrilled about  
15 this.

16 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Chasm, can you wrap up, please?

17 MR. CHASM: Now we are hearing a theory that once  
18 installed this terminal could be used to liquefy cheap and  
19 plentiful domestic gas into LNG for export to China, Japan  
20 or Korea. Don't worry, Coos Bay will still get its jobs.

21 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

22 MR. CHASM: If this is so these projects  
23 qualify --

24 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

25 MR. CHASM: -- neither for eminent domain or aid

1 from the state. Without a needs analysis, we can only  
2 speculate.

3 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

4 MR. SCOTT: You need to wrap up, Mr. Chasm.

5 MR. CHASM: This is all leading, once again, to a  
6 lawsuit, 100 percent chance. I can't tell you what it will  
7 be about or where it will be, but I can guarantee you there  
8 will be a big lawsuit to tie this up just like Bradwood  
9 Landing. Do you think you're going to be any different down  
10 here?

11 Why should citizens have to sue to get simple  
12 compliance with elementary NEPA regulations? If you really  
13 want jobs, demand here and now that FERC require the  
14 applicants to finish this EIS.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

18 Diane Phillips? And on deck Dave Messerle.

19 MS. PHILLIPS: Hello. My name is Diane Phillips,  
20 D-i-a-n-e P-h-i-l-l-i-p-s. I have heard over and over again  
21 in presentations by Jordan Cove and the Pacific Connector  
22 representatives that shipping LNG into Coos Bay will provide  
23 natural gas to the area at a cheaper cost. I would like to  
24 show the ridiculousness of that statement and how the DEIS  
25 supports this. I would also like to point out information

1 the DEIS leaves out that would further support what I am  
2 saying and show that a supply of LNG to Jordan Cove on the  
3 world market is far from assured.

4 One page 1-13, the DEIS admits -- quote -- "the  
5 West Coast has historically enjoyed natural gas prices below  
6 the national average because of its relative proximity to  
7 Canada and the Rockies" -- it actually says WCSP -- "and  
8 local competition from hydropower plants that provide a  
9 significant amount of energy to the region" -- unquote.

10 The DEIS also says on page 1-14 -- quote --  
11 "however, if new interstate pipelines are authorized and  
12 built and transport domestically produced gas at  
13 substantially lower cost than imported LNG, then the market  
14 may not support the construction of LNG import terminals in  
15 Oregon -- unquote.

16 So the DEIS says that if the Rocky Mountains  
17 pipelines are built and the Coos Bay LNG terminal is built  
18 also, the LNG terminal here could sit idle because its gas  
19 is too expensive to sell in the region compared to domestic  
20 sources. So much for lower-costing gas.

21 The Oregon Department of Energy's recent study  
22 support this statement. It says that gas from domestic  
23 sources via newly proposed pipelines is preferable to  
24 imported LNG for several reasons. One main reason is price.  
25 It concludes that -- quote -- "that Rockies gas will

1 continue to cost substantially less than LNG" -- unquote.

2 FERC Commissioner Wellinghoff supports this  
3 conclusion in his letter explaining why he voted against  
4 Bradwood LNG proposed for the Columbia River. He says --  
5 quote -- "There is other evidence that supports Oregon  
6 Department of Energy's conclusion regarding the relative  
7 cost of Rockies gas to LNG. For example, WML conducted a  
8 separate study assessing the availability of LNG in the  
9 global market. The LNG supply study finds that the  
10 development of new LNG supply capacity is increasingly  
11 failing to keep pace with demand. Importing countries are  
12 delaying projects due to concerns about their own increasing  
13 demand for gas, rising exploration and production costs,  
14 environmental pressures and political/geopolitical issues.  
15 In short, the LNG supply study concludes that from 2011  
16 forward, the probability of an LNG market in which demand is  
17 constrained on a sustained basis by lack of supply looks  
18 increasingly realistic. Another indication is the growing  
19 gap between the number of countries importing and exporting  
20 LNG. Shell Gas and Power estimates that in 2012, importing  
21 countries will increase from 17 to 29, but the number of  
22 exporting countries will only increase from 15 to 18 --  
23 unquote.

24 Quote -- "We are already seeing market signals  
25 that are significant with these findings, that LNG supply

1 capacity is struggling to keep pace with demand. Korea Gas  
2 Corp recently agreed to buy LNG for the 2010 to 2012 period  
3 for twenty thousand million BTU. Also, the existing LNG  
4 terminals in the U.S. are only operating at 50 percent of  
5 capacity, with imports clustered around the summer months.  
6 This analysis and facts support LNGs conclusion that Rockies  
7 gas will continue to cost substantially less than LNG" --  
8 unquote.

9 "The West Coast is in direct competition with  
10 other countries in the Pacific Rim, especially Japan and  
11 South Korea for LNG. Japan and South Korea have no choice  
12 but to pay whatever it takes to bring natural gas to their  
13 countries as they have no domestic supply."

14 I have a Power Point here on my computer actually  
15 that shows Japan's strategies for keeping its imported  
16 supply going, including owning an available fleet of LNG  
17 tankers. They also talk about making their contracts  
18 flexible enough to work in their favor and be competitive to  
19 securing supplies. This doesn't add up to cheaper gas for  
20 the West Coast.

21 Which brings me to another point: if Jordan Cove  
22 and the detrimental 230-mile Pacific connector pipeline were  
23 to be approved, the companies involved may be forced to  
24 export U.S. natural gas to stay financially afloat. The  
25 market is starting to show signs of this now: two LNG

1 terminals -- and this was mentioned before -- that were  
2 recently built in the gulf states to import gas have been  
3 sitting idle and are now applying for permits to export  
4 natural gas. Also, an LNG terminal built in British  
5 Columbia to import LNG is apply to export LNG.

6 So I would say in summary domestic supplies of  
7 natural gas are cheaper than imported LNG. The DES says so  
8 -- DEIS says so. Because of these facts, Coos Bay could  
9 have a huge industrial project on the North Spit that is  
10 economically not viable and the Port of Coos Bay can forget  
11 about the promised tax revenues needed to pay loans to buy  
12 the Weyerhauser land or Coos Bay could end up exporting  
13 domestic natural gas overseas and thereby contribute  
14 instability to the U.S. energy markets, or Coos Bay rethinks  
15 their support for Jordan Cove and the Pacific connector and  
16 instead looks to attract alternative energy companies for  
17 needed manufacturing jobs in the community and a sustainable  
18 energy future. The choice is yours.

19 Thank you very much.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

22 Dave Messerle, and on deck Harry Abel.

23 MR. MESSERLE: My name is Dave Messerle, M-e-s-s-  
24 e-r-l-e. I'm representing Fred Messerle and Sons. I'm  
25 presenting testimony regarding the Blue Bridge route

1 variance, milepost 9 to milepost 22, reference in the draft  
2 environmental impact statement in Section 3 pages 63 to 65.

3 Let me first provide a bit of background  
4 information. Early on, as we saw how the pipeline impacted  
5 our ownership between mileposts 9 and 22, Messerle and Sons,  
6 along with the Coos County Sheep Company and Leatherman Land  
7 and Timber Company, filed as intervenors and requested that  
8 FERC look at what we call the Blue Bridge alternative route.

9 FERC in November of 2007 requested that the  
10 Pacific Connector Pipeline Group look at the alternative  
11 route. Pacific Connector did a desktop comparison of the  
12 two routes and concluded that the Blue Bridge alternative  
13 route was not feasible. We believe that erroneous  
14 assumptions were made and that further analysis and ground  
15 proofing would warrant the pipeline reroute.

16 Additionally, now that FERC has directed that  
17 Pacific Connector to reroute to what is called the WC 1-A  
18 route -- which is basically from Haynes Slough easterly to  
19 the Coos River -- we are now proposing what we are calling  
20 the amended Blue Bridge alternate route. From milepost 9 of  
21 the WC 1-A, we see the pipeline bypassing Lillenthal Creek  
22 and Graveyard Point, or Christensen Ranch, and going  
23 generally in an easterly directly to the Coos River and then  
24 following Vogel Creek drainage to the Bureau of Land  
25 Management ownership and the original Blue Bridge alternate

1 route. We have several reasons for proposing this amended  
2 alternate route.

3 Number one, it shortens the alternate route  
4 compared to the proposed route between milepost 9 and 22 by  
5 approximately 2.5 miles. Now they tell us that the total  
6 pipeline construction cost is estimated to be \$1.2 billion  
7 and the length is around 230 miles. Well math tell us that  
8 then the cost per mile is \$6 million and, if you multiply  
9 that by 2.5 miles, it seems to use that that's a \$15 million  
10 cost savings to the Pacific Connector group.

11 Secondly, the amended alternate follows higher  
12 ground eliminating fish-bearing streams, wetlands and  
13 domestic water supplies and watersheds.

14 Thirdly and most importantly, the amended route  
15 places the pipeline on public land. This project has been  
16 touted for the public good, so let us maximize the pipeline  
17 route on public lands, in this case the Bureau of Land  
18 Management. Our analysis shows that the percentage of land  
19 involved by the BLM on the amended Blue Bridge alternate  
20 route is nearly 60 percent compared to only 10 percent on  
21 the proposed route.

22 As an aside, this reroute does not eliminate  
23 Messerle and Son's lands from the pipeline, but it does  
24 shorten the distance that we will be impacted by 1.5 miles.

25 Time constraints do not allow me to offer more

1 details. We will, however, provide a much more extensive  
2 written comment that will include maps, charts and graphs.

3 In summary, we simply ask that the Federal Energy  
4 Regulatory Commission direct the Pacific Connector pipeline  
5 group to reroute to the amended Blue Bridge alternative.

6 Thank you for the opportunity to appear tonight.  
7 And, because I don't trust the PA system, I have hard  
8 copies.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

11 After Harry Abel, M.A. Hansen.

12 MR. ABEL: My name is Harry Abel, it's H-a-r-r-y  
13 A-b-e-l. I'm a lifelong resident of Coos County. And for  
14 those that are not familiar with Coos County that are here  
15 tonight, Coos County was a timber industry for many years.  
16 That's what basically we grew up with was timber. I grew up  
17 in the Bunker Hill area and I would wake up many mornings  
18 and come out and find the car covered with ash from the  
19 wigwam burners and the other parts of the mill that was  
20 below us called Evans Product Company and we lived with the  
21 noise that went on with Evans Product Company. But you know  
22 we all enjoyed the benefits of Evans Product Company and Al  
23 Pierce Lumber Company and Weyerhaeuser and all the other  
24 mills that have built this community, that have contributed  
25 taxes to this community and have been a great support to our

1 community.

2 I am the owner or President of Abel Insurance  
3 Agency, a business started back in 1946, and that's who I'm  
4 speaking on behalf of tonight. The next two names that I  
5 give I'm not speaking on behalf of but I also serve as a  
6 Board of Education member at Southwestern Oregon Community  
7 College and an elder at Shoreline Community Church. I tell  
8 you this because what I wanted to talk about tonight is the  
9 trickle-down effect that would result if Coos County is  
10 given the opportunity of having the terminal located here.

11 I would seriously doubt that my business will be  
12 the direct beneficiary of business from this terminal, but I  
13 suspect we will get some trickle-down effect from it. Our  
14 church will not directly benefit, however it's possible that  
15 we may see some increase in attendance as a result of the  
16 additional jobs provided by the LNG terminal. But one thing  
17 I know for certain is that the Southwestern Oregon Community  
18 College will directly benefit by providing some of the job  
19 training that comes through the currently offered courses at  
20 Southwestern. And when the college prospers, there's a  
21 positive effect on the entire community.

22 I know the placement of the LNG facility here has  
23 been the source of a lot of emotional controversy, as is  
24 seen here tonight, and I respect the fact that there are  
25 people that have differing opinions than mine and they're

1 entitled to their opinion and I trust that they will respect  
2 the fact that I have a differing opinion.

3 This community has had its hopes raised on many  
4 occasions at the prospect of having a new industry  
5 considering to locate here in the bay area, but then end up  
6 choosing to locate elsewhere for one reason or another. I  
7 think that in some cases business choose not to come to this  
8 area simply because they experience too much negativism by  
9 people in this community who seem to appear to not want any  
10 growth.

11 I expect the people behind the Jordan Cove energy  
12 project expected a certain level of opposition when they  
13 first presented this venture because they have done a  
14 remarkable job of addressing the concerns that were raised.  
15 They've even made additional enhancements to their project  
16 to address the safety concerns people expressed, and I must  
17 say that some of those concerns require a lot of assumptions  
18 that any and every thing that might go wrong could go wrong  
19 and will go wrong. This community may have the opportunity  
20 of having a good solid business partner join our community  
21 and I for one welcome them.

22 I liken this to a time about 15 years ago when a  
23 young man came to our home and sat at our kitchen table and  
24 asked my wife and me if he could marry our daughter. My  
25 wife exclaimed that he wanted to take our daughter from us

1 and he quickly corrected her by saying he did not want to  
2 take our daughter but, rather, he wanted to join our family.  
3 Our son-in-law is quick witted and a delight to us and I'm  
4 glad he joined our family.

5 I hope that the decision makers for the LNG  
6 facility will allow them to join this community and give us  
7 the opportunity to embrace this industry. I hope that we  
8 are given the opportunity to see this venture become a  
9 reality so that everyone, including those who are afraid of  
10 the terminal will be able to enjoy the fruits produced by  
11 the LNG facility.

12 The North Spit area of Coos Bay is a tremendously  
13 underused asset that we have and now we have an industry  
14 that can make good use of it and also enhance our economy  
15 significantly. I would like to give them the opportunity to  
16 join our community and our family. Certainly there are a  
17 lot of people who have lived in this community just as long  
18 as I have and are as much against the terminal as I am for  
19 it, and we will likely not change each others' minds. But  
20 let's agree to disagree and let's welcome this good industry  
21 to come to our community and put our natural resource to its  
22 best use.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

1 M.A. Hansen, and then next Carl Siminow.

2 MR. HANSEN: I guess we're trying this without  
3 this thing.

4 MR. SCOTT: It seems to be working if you don't  
5 touch it. I think keep your hands off it.

6 MR. HANSEN: Well, okay, I can't reach it.

7 My name is M.A. Hansen, M period, A period,  
8 Hansen. I live on 100 acres in Myrtle Creek, Oregon. My  
9 understanding is we're here to talk about the EIS that was  
10 issued by FERC on the Jordan Cove terminal and the Pacific  
11 Connector gasoline. I have a degree in planning and I have  
12 a thorough training in writing EISs and EIRs.

13 I would say that FERC should be ashamed of this  
14 excuse for an EIS. A private company would not stay in  
15 business as long as they provided such a document. Under  
16 the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, FERC is  
17 required to issue an objective DEIS that tells whether the  
18 proposed project is needed, whether there are realistic  
19 alternatives, and what the project impacts would be on  
20 people and the natural environment. This meeting is to give  
21 citizens a chance to comment on the inaccuracy or the  
22 accuracy and completeness of the DEIS.

23 No matter what side you're on, that's what we  
24 should do. We have got to -- even if you're for this  
25 project, this EIS is really incomplete. It is a 1500 page

1       precooked justification for approving the Jordan Cove  
2       Pacific Connector project. Jordan Cove Energy Partners, a  
3       Canadian energy conglomerate, is proposing to send expensive  
4       natural gas from potentially unfriendly foreign countries  
5       through a 230-mile pipeline over the Cascade Mountains to  
6       the California border. After dismissing alternatives to  
7       this complicated scheme in two or three sentences each, the  
8       DEIS says Jordan Cove Pacific Connector project this is what  
9       we need.

10                   Interesting. That is what FERC said about  
11       completing proposed Bradwood Landing LNG project on the  
12       Columbia River. It's what FERC likely will also say about  
13       the three current competing proposals to build pipelines  
14       from the Rockies into Oregon. That's because FERCs approach  
15       is to issue approvals regardless of the real needs and  
16       impacts and leave the actual decisions to the financial  
17       wizards of the marketplace.

18                   Commenting on the DEIS is our chance to make FERC  
19       and the Jordan Cove Pacific Connector own up to the real  
20       consequences of this needlessly destructive project. If we  
21       point out the weaknesses in the DEIS and FERC does not  
22       meaningfully address our comments, a federal court will  
23       force them to. While some of the failings of this DEIS  
24       require biological and geological expertise to understand,  
25       it has lots of obvious major shortcomings that any citizen

1 can see. These are the points that are missing.

2 Detailed maps are missing for some areas so  
3 landowners cannot be sure of the extent to which their  
4 property will be condemned or otherwise impacted. The  
5 recent identification of huge new domestic and Canadian  
6 natural gas resources boosting the north American supplies  
7 to well over 100 years' worth is not discussed. The DEIS  
8 cites a few facts in Oregon energy -- Oregon Department of  
9 Energy's reports on whether Oregon needs LNG but ignores its  
10 unfavorable conclusion.

11 The proposed domestic natural gas pipelines from  
12 the Rockies are dismissed. These alternatives are not given  
13 full analysis. Possible tsunami impacts on the LNG ships  
14 and storage tanks are not required to be submitted until  
15 prior to construction, long after comment period ends.

16 How mercury contamination will be avoided on the  
17 east fork of Carl Creek crossing will not be identified  
18 until the end of the comment period, thus the public has  
19 very little time to review and comment.

20 A full analysis of impacts on the North Bend  
21 airport have not been completed. The DEIS suggests it may  
22 be done prior to the end of the comment period, thus the  
23 public has very little time to review and comment.

24 The substitution of wind, geothermal, solar and  
25 biomass sources for energy for relatively dirty imported

1 liquefied natural gas is given short shrift despite Oregon's  
2 strong policy commitment to renewables.

3           The DEIS fails to mention the biggest issue of  
4 all, why should Oregonians be faced with thousands of our  
5 neighbors and our environment at risk just to send more  
6 natural gas to California, especially since Californians  
7 have turned down every LNG project proposed for locating LNG  
8 terminals in their state where it's going.

9           According to the DEIS, 17,000 people live in the  
10 LNG hazard zone and the pipeline would cross 244 streams and  
11 16 watersheds and 386 private properties. Each of these  
12 people, waterways and properties would face a high level of  
13 risk of the known impacts of this project, and for what, for  
14 39 permanent jobs -- this is a quote from the DEIS -- 39  
15 permanent jobs at the Coos Bay terminal promised by the  
16 company to be filled by local Oregonians and five permanent  
17 jobs on the pipeline. Now we are thinking of losing our  
18 property to eminent domain because of this. I cannot see  
19 how anybody could think that it's worth that.

20           This is our chance to tell FERC that this project  
21 is not needed, that FERC's statements of the impacts and  
22 risks are ill founded and that we don't want to be the ones  
23 to bear the real impacts and risks for the state -- for the  
24 sake of profits for large corporations proposing these  
25 projects.

1 Thank you very much.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

4 Carl Siminow. And then next up Richard Knablin.

5 MR. SIMINOW: My name is Carl Siminow, C-a-r-l S-  
6 i-m-i-n-o-w.

7 I'd like to bring up a subject that has not been  
8 brought up yet and that is from a person that lives less  
9 than half a mile from Jordan Cove. And we're talking about  
10 noise, we're talking about dangers, we're talking about if  
11 there is a dangerous situation there's no odor to the gas,  
12 you'll never know it until you start burning. I've heard of  
13 many people that are planning to move, so if we have 39  
14 people employed here, you're going to be losing a fair share  
15 of that.

16 The noise that we hear now coming from the spit  
17 is just about 24 hours long, and you hear that and I  
18 actually have followed it and it's right across from the  
19 airport and it's also next to the LNG, which means 24 hours  
20 a day LNG 24 hours of more noise. Do I like that? No. I  
21 moved here coming from a large city of a lot of noise and we  
22 love the pristine area here.

23 I feel the spit is a natural wonder. It should  
24 be enjoyed. It should be used for recreation. It should be  
25 used by the natural habitat, the birds and such, and not

1 have any industrial usage.

2 Do I want jobs here? Yes, I want jobs. I want  
3 jobs that will last, that will not hurt anybody or any  
4 thing. That's what I'm striving for.

5 Also, nothing's been said about the stations that  
6 will be along the route to keep the pressure up on the  
7 pipeline. I've been told that the noise coming from that  
8 can be like a 747 airplane. Nothing's been said about that.

9  
10 I felt -- they say 39 jobs. The way I look at  
11 it, number one, the people being employed from this area  
12 will be janitors and security people. I don't know anybody  
13 here that knows how to read the gauges and keep up the  
14 operation. So I don't think there's going to be that many.  
15 Who knows how many people will be used -- or how many  
16 companies that will be used to build this pipeline, let  
17 alone the plant on the spit. We don't know that.

18 So I would think differently, if you're thinking  
19 about LNG. If you're thinking about it because you think a  
20 lot of jobs, I don't think so and a lot of people don't  
21 either.

22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

25 Richard Knablin. And next up Mary Geddry.

1                   MR. KNABLIN: I'm Richard Knablin. It's spelled  
2 K-n-a-b-l-i-n. I live in North Bend.

3                   Even a cursory reading of this document reveals  
4 this to be a faith-based environmental impact statement.

5                   (Laughter.)

6                   MR. KNABLIN: We are asked to make a judgment on  
7 the promises, possibilities and suppositions that we are  
8 told will come in later reports scheduled for release after  
9 today's meeting. This rushing to publish an incomplete DEIS  
10 violates the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969,  
11 which demands a complete and understandable report of  
12 impartial decisions made scientifically. In particular, I  
13 wish to examine the tsunami studies not included here but  
14 recently announced in the local newspaper.

15                   Jordan Cove project promoter Bob Braddock has  
16 been quoted as saying he got the idea for a tsunami study  
17 last summer during Coos County land use hearings for the LNG  
18 terminal when one of the speakers mentioned tsunami studies  
19 taking place at Cannon Beach. This is a disingenuous  
20 statement from Mr. Braddock, as the possibility of tsunamis  
21 was broached four years ago at a Coos County Citizens for  
22 Representative and Government meeting with him and his  
23 supporters.

24                   Jordan Cove LLC knew from the beginning that this  
25 site was in a hazardous zone subject to earthquakes and

1        tsunamis yet chose to ignore the issue. Now we will have to  
2        wait 10 more days after this meeting to see this vital  
3        report. This makes it impossible for the public to properly  
4        review the report and present statements before this  
5        Committee -- if it were here.

6                    This action alone should preclude approval of  
7        this project as presented and, at the very least, provide  
8        reason enough for an extension of the comment period  
9        recently refused to Senator Wyden.

10                    Until the report is released, we do not know if  
11        the requirements for tsunami abatement included the EPAs own  
12        studies which show that sea level rise could be as high as  
13        six or seven feet above present levels by mid-century and  
14        would easily make the proposed berm barrier ineffective. In  
15        fact, the figures in this chart are from 2007 -- and this is  
16        the EPA chart -- and do not reflect the latest findings  
17        which state that sea level rise is happening at a higher  
18        rate than earlier anticipated.

19                    My instinct tells me that the probability of a  
20        sea level rise is not included in this new study. This is  
21        vital for basing a yea or nay decision on this project and I  
22        would not expect FERC to approve it without considering this  
23        projection.

24                    Thank you.

25                    (Applause.)

1 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

2 Mary Geddry. And then next up Dana Gaab.

3 MS. GEDDRY: My name is Mary Geddry, G-e-d-d-r-y.

4 I'm the developer of a radical new small wind  
5 turbine and CEO of Rogue River Wind. I'm working in  
6 conjunction with Portland State University and we are  
7 building as we speak a new generator that is so efficient  
8 that the output looks to be that we can create three  
9 kilowatts in a 12 mile an hour wind with only a one meter  
10 fan. Pretty cool.

11 Anyway so what I'm really here to talk about  
12 tonight is decentralization. The draft EIS report prepared  
13 for FERC does not discuss decentralizing at all.  
14 Decentralizing or distributed energy is producing power at  
15 or near the point of consumption and it's ironic to note  
16 that the report lists as an objection to renewable energy  
17 the fact that there is insufficient transmission lines  
18 available. It's also ironic to note that they are willing  
19 to go ahead and build a big pipeline but they don't want to  
20 put in transmission lines.

21 However, I don't agree with building transmission  
22 lines either. I believe that it's really important for us  
23 to stop thinking in the box and start thinking about  
24 producing power locally and in small microgrids, combined  
25 heat and power. There are studies done -- well it's being

1 done in Europe all over but there are studies being done  
2 showing that the capital costs are as much as 44 percent  
3 lower, the ultimate cost to the consumer is significantly  
4 lower and the reliability is greater.

5 One thing I'd like to point out, when you think  
6 about small wind or solar or geothermal, if you were to  
7 take, you know, 1025 kilowatt small wind turbines like mine  
8 which you can put on a rooftop and put them on commercial  
9 rooftops, that's a 250 megawatt wind farm that's tapped in  
10 at the distribution level, the lower-voltage lines, and  
11 those are jobs. The installation of those turbines are  
12 jobs. The maintenance of those turbines are jobs. The  
13 manufacture of those turbines are living wage family jobs.  
14 And that's what we're trying to do right here in Coos Bay.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. GEDDRY: One of the major barriers to  
17 distributed energy globally in both developing and developed  
18 countries believe it or not is a lack of skilled labor. So  
19 believe me it can be done and those are jobs. Those are  
20 real jobs. Those are long-term jobs.

21 And the other thing I'd like to point out, it's a  
22 little bit off the topic but I think it's still relevant, I  
23 believe that the EIS did not address decentralizing at all  
24 and that they were errant in doing so and that they really  
25 need to consider it because it is being done regularly in

1 Europe and other countries. But also I just attended a wind  
2 energy finance project workshop in New York City. It was  
3 about 200 people there, about 85 of them were  
4 multimillionaires, or at least they were up until recently.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MS. GEDDRY: And then there were people like me.

7

8 But they were very relieved because the  
9 production tax credit had been extended for one year, only  
10 one year. Wind, the development of wind -- I'm not  
11 including solar and geothermal in this -- but the  
12 development of wind is dependent upon the PTC, the  
13 production tax credit. This is -- we're talking about  
14 centralized wind farms and institutional lenders and  
15 investors. The extensions for the similar tax credits for  
16 solar and geothermal and other things extended eight years.  
17 But let me talk about the difference there. That eight  
18 years only cost \$900 million.

19 For one year of production tax credit extension,  
20 \$8 billion. But here's what I really want to tell you about  
21 that: In the end, what this build out, what this whole  
22 conference was about is producing 20 percent wind by the  
23 year 2030, which requires in a centralized model 19,000  
24 miles of new 765 kilovolt transmission lines and we're  
25 talking lots of eminent domain going across the country

1 here.

2           They were touting as a way of selling it to the  
3 public is the fact that rural tax bases would increase  
4 during that time by \$1.5 billion and that some landowners  
5 would receive in lease revenues for siting wind towers, big  
6 towers on their property, \$600 million a year. So that  
7 means it only costs the taxpayer -- since they get \$1.5  
8 billion back, only costs the taxpayer \$6.5 billion, not \$8  
9 billion for that one year of production tax credit. Now as  
10 a developer I'm really glad that they extended that for a  
11 year because it makes wind still viable, it's still out  
12 there in the public. As a taxpayer, I'm not so great about  
13 it.

14           What they didn't say though is that -- or what  
15 they did say but what you don't hear is that there is an  
16 expected \$23 trillion in revenue to be gained from this  
17 build out of 20 percent wind, \$23 trillion compared to the  
18 \$8 billion production tax credit. Just think if that was  
19 publicly owned instead of investor owned and what we could  
20 do for health care and bridges and dams. Think about those  
21 kinds of jobs.

22           Anyway. Thank you.

23           (Applause.)

24           MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

25           And next up after Dana, Robert VanderVelden.

1 Dana Gaab, D-a-n-a G-a-a-b.

2 MR. GAAB: I hope you've all had a chance to  
3 review this document. This is not all of it, actually  
4 there's at least another quarter in another book. I've had  
5 the pleasure of going through it piece by piece and there's  
6 a particular section that I kind of gravitated to because I  
7 knew a little bit more about that than some other sections,  
8 so I'd like to clear up a little, what I think is a little  
9 misrepresentation with the DEIS.

10 And that's in Section 4.84, it's the  
11 socioeconomic section and this is about property values --  
12 4.823. It reads: "Based on the findings of a previous  
13 study that assessed the impact of LNG storage facilities on  
14 residential property values and a review of property values  
15 within one mile of existing LNG peak storage facilities in  
16 Newport and Portland" --

17 MR. SCOTT: You might want to do that.

18 MR. GAAB: Okay. "Based on the findings of a  
19 previous study that assessed the impact of LNG storage  
20 facilities on residential property values and a review of  
21 property within a mile of the existing peak storage  
22 facilities in Newport and Portland, ECONorthwest concluded  
23 there was no basis to anticipate that the proposed facility  
24 would reduce nearby property values."

25 I'd like to suggest that this study is

1       disingenuous at best. They're comparing apples and  
2       elephants to compare a peak shaving or storage facility with  
3       an LNG import cargo terminal. I won't bother getting into  
4       the differences. That will be made clear to FERC and some  
5       of you may in fact know. That's what exists on the  
6       waterfront up in Newport. But it's a storage facility, it  
7       has nothing whatsoever to do with a terminal where they're  
8       bringing LNG in.

9                With that in mind, I did go through Section 4.8,  
10       the socioeconomic section, and it was filled with a lot of  
11       conjecture and ambiguities to say the least, and I've  
12       written down a few of them here that I'd like to read off.

13               I had a teacher, by the way, when I was in grade  
14       school that kind of stressed using of the words -- be  
15       careful with the use of the words could, should and would.  
16       Could is an alternative to can, suggesting less force or  
17       certainty, should, what is expected -- most of us probably  
18       know what to expect from expectations, at least some of the  
19       time -- and would as being wished or desired.

20               So with that in mind some of terms, some of the  
21       phraseology used in 4.8: could have an adverse impact,  
22       could affect, could negatively affect, could be negatively  
23       affected. It is estimated, it is anticipated, does not  
24       anticipate. Should have, should not have, should be able,  
25       should be sufficient, should not result, should not stress,

1 should not be a difficult task, may be delayed, may collect  
2 receipts, reliable methodologies do not exist for accurate  
3 quantification of fugitive dust. Pacific Connector has  
4 stated that it would consider. We believe local communities  
5 could absorb an increase. We are unaware of any studies.

6 Well with that last phrase in mind, we are  
7 unaware of any studies, I'd like to refer to page 4.8-4,  
8 property values. "We are unaware of any studies that assess  
9 the impact of LNG marine traffic on property values along  
10 the waterway." Well, it's apparent that the DEIS didn't do  
11 very thorough research because in June of 2006 Passamaquoddy  
12 Bay, where an LNG terminal was proposed on the Maine-  
13 Canadian border had a whole bay study done by Yellow Wood  
14 Associates. One of the questions that they addressed was  
15 what's the likely impact of an LNG terminal on property  
16 values. I'll quote some of this study, and this was done  
17 for Passamaquoddy Bay -- but Passamaquoddy Bay historically  
18 the economy revolved around fishing and timber, much like  
19 our own.

20 "The value of property in Passamaquoddy Bay  
21 exceeds the value of buildings and is the principal fiscal  
22 asset of each town. Waterfront property is particularly  
23 valuable. Anything that threatens to diminish the value of  
24 property, particularly the most valuable property along the  
25 shore, threatens the long-term fiscal health of the town.

1 LNG terminals are sited on the waterfront. Their presence  
2 is likely to reduce the value of adjoining lands and lands  
3 within a two-mile radius. In addition, by decreasing the  
4 perceived safety and real access to the waterfront and  
5 waterways, LNG terminals will reduce the value of shore land  
6 along the routes."

7 Now they went ahead and assessed the property  
8 value and gave some percentages, and the property values  
9 really don't have much to do with here because they'd be  
10 somewhat different. But they did give some percentages of  
11 the reduced property values: 20 to 35 percent reduction in  
12 the value of properties right next to the site, 10 to 25  
13 percent reduction in the value of properties within a mile  
14 of the site, 5 to 15 percent reduction in the value of  
15 properties within two miles of the site.

16 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Gaab, could I ask you to begin to  
17 wrap up, please?

18 MR. GAAB: Yes.

19 I'd like to suggest that this document is the  
20 biggest appeal to ignorance that I've ever had the  
21 displeasure of happening to look at. It's a total appeal to  
22 ignorance and I would suggest that Jordan Cove, Mr.  
23 Braddock, the Port of Coos Bay and SCDC pick up their stick  
24 because there's no way in hell that this project is going to  
25 happen. Lawsuit time. Big time.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

3 Robert VanderVelden. And then after Ron Opitz.

4 MR. VANDERVELDEN: Robert VanderVelden, V-a-n-d-  
5 e-r-V-e-l-d-e-n.

6 Thank you for the opportunity for me to offer  
7 testimony on the referenced project. I have read and heard  
8 many comments over the last few months about blast zones,  
9 about how many people killed within certain distances --

10 VOICE: Can't hear you.

11 MR. VANDER VELDEN: -- scientific theoretical  
12 models, et cetera. I'd like to point out some interesting  
13 observations to the Commission and to fellow citizens of  
14 this area. When I look at the LNG plants since the Forties  
15 in the United States, the total number of deaths and  
16 injuries since the Forties and then compare what has  
17 happened in the last four or five years in Coos County,  
18 we've had more commercial fishermen die going out in our  
19 ocean fishing, we've had more people die in car accidents in  
20 our county, we had more people die due to drug overdoses,  
21 we've had more people die of murder, we've had more  
22 contractors -- of which I'm a general contractor -- die due  
23 to on the job injuries. I've heard comments made about our  
24 schools, we've had more kids die of cancer. We've had more  
25 loggers die of logging accidents in our county. So looking

1 at these facts, it appears to me that Jordan Cove and FERC  
2 have done a great job of assessing the risks, but it's  
3 apparent to me also that getting up driving to work and  
4 working is more dangerous than if I was camped on the LNG  
5 project itself.

6 Another series of comments have been voiced over  
7 and over about foreign gas, LNG going to feed Californians,  
8 and this is somehow bad. Last time I went to the grocery  
9 store, I saw tomatoes from California, lettuce, fruit and  
10 vegetables, our movies are made a lot of them in California,  
11 some of our lumber goes to California, some of our dairy  
12 products go to California, and in this largely global  
13 economy not everything we produce in Oregon can be consumed  
14 in Oregon. We import and export products and services  
15 across our state lines all the time. Our gasoline comes  
16 from out of state. The majority of our natural gas comes  
17 from a foreign country, Canada. So it boils down to this,  
18 LNG is another product that we can bring in, add value to  
19 and ship on to another consumer in another state.

20 By the way, when I was listening to these  
21 comments made tonight, if we do get our gas -- our natural  
22 gas from the Rocky Mountain pipelines, aren't also those  
23 pipelines going to have to be used through eminent domain,  
24 so what would be the difference of this county having  
25 eminent domain or another county? It still boils down to if

1       you build the gas line then you're still going to have to  
2       use eminent domain.

3               MR. VANDER VELDEN: My final comments concern the  
4       Port of Coos Bay. By definition, a port receives and ships  
5       domestic and foreign goods to domestic and foreign markets.  
6       I feel that our port could eventually lose our dredging  
7       funds if we do not get our tonnage up. That goes also for  
8       the jetties and the repairs.

9               Tourist dollars will not be sufficient to keep  
10       this bar open and safe. The number of ships coming in will  
11       do that. The land that the Port has under option to  
12       purchase is zoned industrial and has been for many years. I  
13       feel the LNG facility is a good use for the land and the  
14       port and it's a good fit for long-term development of our  
15       port.

16              Thank you.

17              (Applause.)

18              MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

19              Ron Opitz. Next up, Jim Bice.

20              MR. OPITZ: Thank you. My name's Ron Opitz, O-P  
21       as in Paul-i-t-z.

22              Well I didn't come here tonight to lecture you  
23       about the Constitution, the economy in the hills, but I am  
24       here to share some information about what's going on in our  
25       own communities.

1           For the past few years, we've been bombarded with  
2 rhetoric -- in fact, we've heard some more tonight -- from  
3 the opponents of LNG. All this time, those of us who know  
4 the true facts about the project have been tolerant to let  
5 the opponents ramble about with their unfounded issues and  
6 false expertises.

7           The group continues to demonstrate that they know  
8 the value of everything but they know the price of very  
9 little. As --

10           (Inaudible comments from audience.)

11           MR. OPITZ: Excuse me?

12           MR. SCOTT: Please, let him speak, please.

13           MR. OPITZ: As executive director of South Coast  
14 Development, our organization's board of directors is made  
15 up of professionals, has followed the Jordan Cove project  
16 closely. In fact, as we heard more and more conjecture  
17 about the profitability of having an LNG facility here and  
18 what it means to the community, we formed a research paper,  
19 completed a white paper through ECHO Northwest entitled  
20 "Forecast of the Net Economic Benefits of a Proposed LNG  
21 Terminal in Coos County, Oregon." The independent study  
22 determined that the LNG terminal would have a positive  
23 effect on the region's economy.

24           In addition, we have closely followed local,  
25 state and federal review of the approval process. No matter

1       what the outcome of the process, it doesn't seem to be  
2       satisfactory. The EIS is garbage, nothing seems to work  
3       according to the opposition.

4               Jordan Cove continues to move transparently  
5       through and toward approval. For those of us that can  
6       understand the process are very pleased that the regulatory  
7       agencies have moved without prejudice through a process and  
8       a tough process that demands the facts.

9               This is not made up -- this project is not made  
10      up of --

11              VOICE: I'm from California, he's not.

12              (Inaudible comments from audience.)

13              MR. OPTIZ: That's too bad that we can't share  
14      our thoughts.

15              As I said, Jordan Cove continues to move  
16      transparently toward approval and those of us that  
17      understand the process -- I was in the energy industry for  
18      34 years and I understand LNG, I understand the construction  
19      of Newport, I understand the construction of the Portland  
20      LNG plants. And though they're not terminals and the  
21      Newport facility was designed as a terminal and I was there  
22      during the hearings for that facility. And it wasn't a  
23      blast zone, it wasn't a death zone, it was called a death  
24      cloud at the hearings there. That was 36 years ago when  
25      they built it and there's not been as much as a broken arm

1 in that whole facility during that time.

2 This region has started to recover from decades  
3 of downward spiraling economy and anyone who's lived here  
4 long enough understands that. However, we need large  
5 employers to go along with the smaller firms that we're  
6 recruiting -- and we are recruiting them here -- firms with  
7 25 to 75 jobs and they'll be successful. They'll have  
8 investments of \$45- to 50 million. However, if you take a  
9 look at the region's economy and look at a \$2 billion  
10 investment in our area, after three years that comes out to  
11 \$10 million in tax money to the county annually.

12 Part of the opponents do not seem to understand -  
13 - part of what they don't understand is that without living  
14 wage jobs families cannot survive. The socioeconomic impact  
15 of those families is telling. I recently summarized just  
16 simply for the school district in Coos Bay that over 62  
17 percent of all the children are on free or reduced lunch  
18 programs. Those same programs continued through the summer  
19 and many times are providing children with their only meal  
20 of the day.

21 I'm not talking about methodology, I'm not  
22 talking about blue sky wishes, I'm talking about the hard  
23 facts. One of the schools in Coos Bay, Madison, has 466  
24 students. 356, 77 percent, are on that lunch program  
25 because they come from families that can't afford -- can't

1       afford -- they're not with living wage jobs. As I said, the  
2       total district, there are 62 percent of the students on  
3       those programs.

4               Beyond the economic plight of the regions, we go  
5       back to the socioeconomic fallout that can be supported by  
6       the number of legal cases involving child abuse, spousal  
7       abuse, alcoholism and drug abuse. All are part of an  
8       economic downturn that deprives some of our citizens the  
9       ability to support -- that's feed, clothe and shelter and  
10      educate their families. Such conditions do not necessarily  
11      increase the frequency of abuse, but the incidences are  
12      harder to track since the offenders use a poor economy as a  
13      way to mask their behavior.

14             The Department of Housing in Coos County,  
15      recently I talked to them, and each month over a thousand  
16      people go to them and seek shelter because we don't have  
17      jobs. We're not talking about 39 jobs, we're talking about  
18      60 jobs and we're talking about 60 other jobs running  
19      tractor tugs and other support jobs in the community. These  
20      jobs are jobs between -- that make the difference between a  
21      lot of families making it and not making it. The jobs in  
22      the community are spun off of this project. There's so many  
23      other industries that are going to be started, that are  
24      going to be successful in the area once the LNG plant is  
25      built.

1                   Statistical data also -- rates of child abuse  
2                   increase -- may not increase by a large margin, but they  
3                   haven't decreased in the last 36 months. We need jobs and  
4                   we need them from not only LNG but we need them from  
5                   associated industries and companies.

6                   Those who falsely claim to have expertise about  
7                   LNG, its handling, and apparent lack of understanding for  
8                   the needs of the region and the better of our local society.  
9                   In a recent article in The World, October 11th, the self-  
10                  proclaimed leader of the LNG Group, Jody McCaffree, was  
11                  quoted --

12                  MR. OPTIZ: -- was quoted --

13                  (Inaudible comments from audience.)

14                  MR. SCOTT: I believe he's very close to wrapping  
15                  up. Let's let him finish, please.

16                  MR. OPITZ: Those who falsely claim in an  
17                  editorial or an article in the paper said, and I quote she  
18                  has noticed an increase in the number of supporters though  
19                  she isn't impressed. She went on to say, and I quote: "I  
20                  see it as uninformed people coming to meetings because they  
21                  want jobs." First she's inferring that supporters of LNG  
22                  who attend meetings are uninformed, secondly, she's -- can  
23                  you imagine people wanting jobs. I rest my case.

24                  (Applause.)

25                  MR. OPITZ: Although we understand --

1 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

2 MR. OPTIZ: No. Although we understand --

3 MR. SCOTT: Can you wrap it up, please, Mr.  
4 Optiz.

5 MR. OPITZ: -- the final decision --

6 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

7 MR. OPITZ: -- will be made at the federal level,  
8 it is important for us to encourage a positive outcome and  
9 thank you for presenting such a thorough process of  
10 approval.

11 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

12 MR. OPITZ: No longer can we sit back and allow  
13 families to become victims of poor judgments of a few  
14 citizens who are against expanding economy, especially our  
15 Jordan Cove project. We ask you to consider the wishes of  
16 the majority that support the Jordan Cove project.

17 Thank you very much.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

20 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

21 MR. SCOTT: Please, let's treat each other as  
22 neighbors here and with respect and let everybody state  
23 their opinion, please.

24 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

25 MR. SCOTT: I've been trying to watch the clock.

1 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

2 MR. SCOTT: I've given some people extra breaks  
3 when they're interrupted, but I will try to keep closer  
4 track.

5 Jim Bice and then, following Jim Bice, Joseph  
6 Morgan.

7 MR. BICE: My name is Jim Bice, J-i-m B-i-c-e.  
8 I'm publisher of Coos News and many of you know me, I'm not  
9 interested in agendas, I'm only interested in hard  
10 information. Yeah, groan if you want but you're the people  
11 that don't want to hear the truth and that's too damn bad, I  
12 really don't care.

13 Here's the deal. For a long time in this area  
14 we've been trading dollars back and forth amongst ourselves.  
15 This cannot continue, it's an unhealthy economic situation.  
16 Already we have seen cuts in public services and we're gonna  
17 see more. We see Band-Aid operations by various political  
18 groups to try to get us money in here but it's all short  
19 lived. Bottom line is we're going to have to pull ourselves  
20 up by the bootstraps here.

21 I want you to listen to some interesting numbers.  
22 You know in the past 24 hours 6.2 people have died in  
23 traffic accidents nationwide. In the past 54 hours, one  
24 person died from electrocution. Yet in the past 40 odd  
25 years, only one person has died from the shipping or storage

1 of LNG. Now I don't know about you, but I'm not going to  
2 quit driving, I'm not going to turn off the electricity in  
3 my house, and everything involves a certain amount of risk.

4 I grew up on a farm in southeastern Iowa. We had  
5 a natural gas pipeline that passed on the neighbors'  
6 property about 500 feet from our house. You know what, I  
7 didn't die from it and, to the best of my knowledge, since  
8 I've left nobody's died from it. It's buried 12 feet  
9 underground, they farmed right over the top of it. The only  
10 reason we knew it was there was because of the little  
11 markers they had out there.

12 If you've been anywhere else in the country,  
13 natural gas, natural gas pipelines are a common thing,  
14 they're all over the place because our nation runs on  
15 energy. And I've listened to talk about alternative energy  
16 and that's a good thing. But the best estimates, the most  
17 optimistic estimates are alternative energy is going to take  
18 a minimum of 25 years to replace 50 percent of our current  
19 carbon-based energy needs.

20 I don't know about you, but I'm not gonna freeze  
21 my butt off in my house for the next 25 years and I'm not  
22 going to sit with my car in front unable to fuel it.  
23 Natural gas is a good, viable alternative because it's  
24 clean, it's relatively inexpensive, it's very plentiful.

25 Now we've heard tonight from a lot of people that

1       oppose the LNG facility on the North Spit and everybody has  
2       a right to their opinion, there's nothing wrong with that,  
3       it's the American way. But if you're gonna have an opinion  
4       and you're gonna voice it publicly, you should base it in  
5       some sort of fact rather than on fantasies that certain of  
6       your leaders have told you.

7                Many of you people are very well meaning and I  
8       appreciate that and respect it. But you've been led astray.  
9       Many of the same people, including the organizer of this  
10      group, has opposed virtually everything that we've tried in  
11      this area regarding economic development. They opposed the  
12      New Core steel rolling plant. They opposed the South Coast  
13      reinforcement project to bring more electricity to our area.  
14      They opposed the county's natural gas pipeline. They  
15      opposed a multi-use shipping terminal because it may in some  
16      way facilitate the location of the LNG facility.

17               In all these cases, just with the LNG terminal  
18      they've used doom and gloom and fear to substantiate their  
19      opposition. The sky is falling, the sky is falling, oh my  
20      God we're all gonna die. That's all we've heard. And  
21      according to them LNG terminals and any other form of  
22      economic development will probably attract giant asteroids  
23      that will most certainly wipe out all of mankind.

24               I don't know about you, but I don't live in fear  
25      and I don't think anybody else should either. We need to

1 look at this in a realistic manner, look at what's best for  
2 our community. And right now we are dying -- whether you  
3 like it or not, that's the fact. I see it every day. I  
4 talk to business people every day. There are no jobs.

5 Now we've heard the what if game, what if this,  
6 what if that. Well you know what, maybe if my aunt had  
7 different plumbing, she'd be my uncle. You know you can  
8 play this what if, what if the thing explodes, you know,  
9 what if the pipeline ruptures. There is a certain amount of  
10 risk to daily life. You've got to determine what's  
11 acceptable risk. And when you do that, you look at numbers.  
12 Just like I said, in the past 24 hours 6.2 people have died  
13 in traffic accidents.

14 The sad thing, to me anyway, is that the  
15 organizers of the anti group, the ones that have been anti-  
16 everything, don't care a bit about the rest of us or about  
17 the community. They've got their sources of income from  
18 whatever form and they don't think about the rest of us that  
19 have got to make a living or families with their children  
20 growing up and having to move outside the area to find jobs.  
21 This is a wonderful place to live --

22 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Bice, can you start to wrap up,  
23 please.

24 MR. BICE: I can do that. Why is it that some of  
25 these people got to drone on for damn near 10 minutes and

1 I've got to wrap it up?

2 MR. SCOTT: No, you're right, I think.

3 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

4 MR. SCOTT: I sense a growing impatience. We  
5 still have over 20 people who have signed up, so I --

6 MR. BICE: I will wrap it up.

7 Right now this nation faces an energy crisis.  
8 We're importing a lot of oil from all over the world, most  
9 of it from people that don't like us. LNG is a viable  
10 alternative to petroleum. Right now in Alaska we've got an  
11 almost unending supply of LNG and we're selling it to Japan.  
12 You know why, because we have no place to ship it in the  
13 Lower 48. They would have to ship it clear around South  
14 America to get it to the ports because there's nothing on  
15 the West Coast. If we had an LNG facility, maybe we could  
16 use some of our own natural gas and not have to sell it  
17 elsewhere, does that make sense?

18 MR. BICE: We've got a great opportunity right  
19 here to be the energy capital of the West Coast and all the  
20 people complaining about most of this going to California,  
21 well golly I guess we shouldn't import vegetables or any  
22 manufactured goods from California. Anybody ever hear of  
23 interstate commerce? Things go both ways, folks.

24 We need the jobs. That's the bottom line.

25 (Applause.)

1                   MR. BICE: Since the demise -- since the demise  
2 of our natural resource industries, often with the blessing  
3 of many that oppose this project, we're left with a  
4 situation where we just can't continue to even maintain our  
5 current infrastructure --

6                   MR. SCOTT: Mr. Bice, can you wrap it up, please?

7                   MR. BICE: I will wrap it up. Basically I  
8 support the LNG. I've taken a neutral position for a couple  
9 of years until I had the information that I needed to make a  
10 valid decision. Right now, if you look at everything  
11 equally, the benefits by far outweigh the risks. I think we  
12 need it and I'm going to strongly support it from this point  
13 onward.

14                   Thank you.

15                   (Applause.)

16                   MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

17                   Joe Morgan, and then following that Brian Gumbs.

18                   DR. MORGAN: My name is Dr. Joseph Morgan, M-o-r-  
19 g-a-n. First I want to state that I do not represent or  
20 belong to any organization, either --

21                   (Inaudible comments from audience.)

22                   DR. MORGAN: Is that better? I don't think --  
23 there, is it working now?

24                   Okay. First, I want to state that I do not  
25 belong to or represent any organization either for or

1       against the LNG terminal and I'm here entirely because of my  
2       concerns about the potential health impact this installation  
3       would have on our area.

4               I'm an allergist. I've practiced in Coos Bay for  
5       almost 43 years and the LNG terminal at the Jordan Cove site  
6       would have a major negative impact on our air quality.  
7       According to Jordan Cove Resource Report, Docket Number  
8       PN062500, the estimated airborne emissions from the LNG  
9       terminal will amount to 523.5 tons -- that's 1,047,000  
10      pounds per year -- of oxides of sulfur, nitrogen, carbon  
11      monoxide, volatile organic compounds and particulates  
12      smaller than 10 microns which permanently lodge in a  
13      person's lungs and cannot be removed by the body. The DEIS  
14      gives this figure at 450 tons or about 900,000 pounds per  
15      year. There's a discrepancy there of 73 tons, which is  
16      really not an insignificant number.

17             The DEIS also lists estimated emissions from the  
18      LNG carriers and tugs of 288.8 tons per year. So we're  
19      looking at a total of somewhere between 1,400,000 pounds or  
20      1,600,000 pounds of air pollutants. Whichever number we  
21      accept, the amount is huge and everyone living in this area  
22      will have an equal opportunity to breathe part of it every  
23      year.

24             Now there's three categories of persons who stand  
25      to be the most affected. The first is children, and how

1 many in this room have either children or grandchildren who  
2 live in this area? Children breathe more air in relation to  
3 body weight than adults. Their metabolism and their immune  
4 systems render them more susceptible to toxic injury from  
5 both acute and chronic exposures. The incidence of  
6 childhood asthma, for example, has risen drastically in  
7 recent years and air pollution is an established major  
8 factor.

9 Then there's the elderly. Our bodies and immune  
10 systems reach their peak in the late teens and early  
11 twenties and as we age we become progressively less  
12 resilient, especially as we reach our sixties and seventies  
13 and beyond. Lung capacity and cardiac reserve decrease as a  
14 part of the normal aging process. And then anyone with  
15 allergies, especially allergies of the nose, sinuses and  
16 anyone with asthma or emphysema is going to be more  
17 susceptible.

18 There can be great individual variability in  
19 susceptibility from one person to another. In some cases,  
20 the effects would be felt very quickly, targeting those who  
21 are already impaired. In some cases the effects would be  
22 more subtle, such as colds which seem to last for weeks on  
23 end, recurrent sinus infections, a chronic cough, the new  
24 onset of asthma or gradual aggravation of COPD or emphysema.  
25 Pre-existing allergies are likely to worsen. A certain

1 number of individuals who are not aware of any current  
2 problems will eventually be affected.

3 I do not believe I am being at all alarmist to  
4 make these statements. The detrimental effects of  
5 industrial air pollution on the respiratory and  
6 cardiovascular systems are well documented in the medical  
7 and scientific literature.

8 Clean air is one of the things making the bay  
9 area attractive to retirees and tourists, too. Hundreds of  
10 tons of air pollutants released from a location between two  
11 and four miles from the center of the population and which  
12 is directly upwind for a large part of the year would  
13 destroy local air quality. This would negatively affect the  
14 desirability of the bay area for both of these groups, both  
15 retirees and tourists. The wind off the ocean would require  
16 many, many miles to dilute and dissipate emissions of the  
17 magnitude anticipated.

18 The EIS claims the state and federal regulations  
19 will protect us, but I do not find that statement at all  
20 reassuring. The existing permissible levels of air  
21 pollutants may protect healthy young adults from acute  
22 effects, but by and large they do not protect children, the  
23 elderly and the infirm, nor do these regulations protect the  
24 ostensibly healthy from long-term effects.

25 I've in the past treated patients who could not

1 remain in the bay area because of smoke from the now defunct  
2 mills. The most recent case was just a year or so ago -- a  
3 couple of years ago before the Menasha paper mill on the  
4 North Spit closed. I've treated extremely sensitive  
5 patients who could not live at Waldport, Oregon because of  
6 the fumes from the pulp mill at Toledo, 13 miles away.

7 Many of the people who move here to retire do so  
8 very deliberately because of our clean air. They come from  
9 major metropolitan areas and industrial centers and many  
10 already have allergies and heart and lung problems and they  
11 sort of hung on in their former locations just long enough  
12 to reach retirement age and then look for a more safe  
13 environment. If our air quality is degraded, many of them  
14 will be forced to move again. Those who choose to remain  
15 will see further deterioration in their health, word will  
16 spread and new retirees won't come.

17 We're told that the LNG terminal itself would  
18 represent a maximum of 60 full-time jobs for the community.  
19 Completely aside from the negative health effects, one must  
20 consider the economic impact of a major source of air  
21 pollution. Dr. Mark Phagen, head of the Department of  
22 Sociology and Social Work at Jacksonville State University  
23 has studied extensively the effect of retirees on  
24 communities in various parts of the country since the mid-  
25 1980s. He's found that every retiree household moving into

1 an area would offset -- would have the impact on the economy  
2 of 3.2 to 3.4 industrial wage jobs. This means that only 18  
3 or 19 retiree households would offset 60 permanent jobs at  
4 Jordan Cove.

5 I can easily see that the net loss of households  
6 would add up to many times 18, both from families moving  
7 away and those who would never come here in the first place.

8 MR. SCOTT: Dr. Morgan, could I ask you to wrap  
9 up, please?

10 DR. MORGAN: Thank you.

11 I'll just conclude by saying that to locate an  
12 LNG terminal or any source of significant air pollution so  
13 close to a population center will create a serious public  
14 health problem and, in the specific case of the bay area,  
15 I'm certain there would be adverse secondary economic  
16 consequences. I think we're at great risk of becoming the  
17 victims of a very bad idea which will certainly have a major  
18 impact on the health of those living in the area and will  
19 also negatively impact our economy.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

23 Brian Gumbs, and then next up Nicole Jackson.

24 DR. GUMBS: My name is Dr. Brian Gumbs, B-r-i-a-  
25 n, last name is G-u-m-b-s.

1           Thanks, Dr. Morgan, for talking at great detail  
2           about the health consequences. I also wanted to address the  
3           health consequence in relation to the medical community  
4           which impacts all of us, and that is the proximity of the  
5           proposed terminal to the airport.

6           And on page 537 of the draft EIS, recommendation  
7           18 states: "Jordan Cove shall submit a request for an FAA  
8           feasibility study to ensure proper aspects of the project  
9           alternatives are studied. Before the end of the comment  
10          period on the draft EIS, Jordan Cove shall file a copy of  
11          the feasibility study."

12          The purpose of this meeting was to comment on the  
13          draft EIS statement. I find it difficult for us to comment  
14          on the feasibility in relation to the airport and a number  
15          of other parts of the EIS because they provide no data and a  
16          public comment period is necessary.

17          The importance of the airport and the potential  
18          impacts of the Jordan Cove site on the airport are really  
19          critical. Barrier Hospital, as we should know, is a public-  
20          owned facility 172-bed acute care hospital and it's a  
21          regional referral center. It is the largest hospital on the  
22          Oregon coast. The hospital requires availability of flights  
23          in and out of Southwest Oregon Regional Airport 24 hours a  
24          day, seven days a week. And anyone who's needed to be  
25          medevac'd out of the hospital would not want to wait for the

1 LNG tankers to transit the bay or finish unloading their  
2 cargo. And we don't know what the impact would be on the  
3 airport or on transport in and out of the airport because  
4 there's no data given.

5 Likewise, the hospital gets blood supplies via  
6 fixed-wing transport and many of the medical products that  
7 we need, whether it's biologics or hardware, for instance,  
8 in surgical cases come in and out of the community via  
9 airplane and on an emergent basis. And if you or your  
10 family member were waiting to receive a product via the  
11 airport that couldn't come in, your life could be at risk.

12 Likewise, as a pediatrician, I'm involved in  
13 taking care of critically ill children, from premature  
14 babies on up through adolescence and even a few minutes'  
15 delay in sending people out on a fixed-wing or rotary wing  
16 aircraft can make a life or death difference. And I don't  
17 think my patients should have to wait for an LNG tanker to  
18 finish dumping their cargo to be able to fly out to receive  
19 the care they need. But I don't know the impact that would  
20 have on my patients or my practice because there's no data  
21 given.

22 So that in a sense summarizes my concerns is that  
23 there are many issues that are broached, brought up as  
24 potential problems with the Jordan Cove site but there's no  
25 data given so that we as the community can comment on what

1 the impacts may be.

2 A lot of people have talked about jobs and the  
3 economy and the health and welfare of the community.  
4 Barrier Hospital is a huge employer: 172 beds, I don't even  
5 know the numbers of employees and living wage jobs there.  
6 If we can't rely on the airport to provide the services that  
7 we need, we won't be able to provide care for the people on  
8 the coast.

9 Likewise, it will be much more difficult to  
10 recruit people to work in the hospital in the community,  
11 because they won't want to live near an industrial site that  
12 has all these consequences, many of which Dr. Morgan  
13 enumerated.

14 I, for one, know that -- I didn't find out about  
15 the LNG terminal siting or potential siting until after I  
16 came to the community, and I know that many people of my  
17 generation who are the new lifeblood of the physician  
18 community would not move to this area knowing that this kind  
19 of industrial facility is here. We moved to Oregon and to  
20 the coast to get away from New York City.

21 I trained in New York City and, like Dr. Morgan,  
22 treated many, many patients with problems with asthma and  
23 allergies related to the industrial pollution in New York  
24 City, and that was something that I and many medical  
25 providers coming into the area want to avoid. And to bring

1 an industrial facility into this area would be a great  
2 detriment to the medical community, as well as, you know,  
3 the health of the people we are trying to serve.

4 So I hope I didn't overrun my time. Thanks very  
5 much.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

8 Dr. Jackson. And next up, Ron Sadler.

9 DR. JACKSON: My name is Nicole Jackson. Can you  
10 hear me? Okay. N-i-c-o-l-e J-a-c-k-s-o-n.

11 On page 5-37 of the draft EIS, the FERC lists  
12 recommendations numbering 14 through 21 which shall -- in  
13 quote "shall be addressed by Jordan Cove by the end of the  
14 comment period on the draft EIS" -- end quotes. To comply  
15 with these recommendations, Jordan Cove could conceivably  
16 submit the requested information on December 3rd, 2008, one  
17 day before the end of the public comment period. Although  
18 this might satisfy FERC, it would negate the purpose of the  
19 comment period, which is to allow interested parties  
20 including the public, all of us here and others, to review  
21 and comment on the draft EIS. To me this appears to be non-  
22 compliance with NEPA requirements to prepare a proper EIS.

23 I'm going to just pull out a few of the  
24 recommendations that they suggest be done by the end of the  
25 comment period. On page 5-38, number 21 -- quoting:

1                   "Before the end of the comment period on the  
2 draft EIS, Jordan Cove shall file information providing the  
3 following: a, a demonstration that the ambient temperature,  
4 relative humidity and wind speed selected are a combination  
5 of those which result in longer predicted downwind  
6 dispersion distances than other weather conditions at the  
7 site at least 90 percent of the time based on recorded data  
8 for the area" -- end quote.

9                   As a resident who lives and sleeps in an area  
10 that's only about 1.5 miles southeast of the proposed  
11 facility, it's important to me that the predicted downwind  
12 dispersion distances are calculated using the best available  
13 data. I would like to review and comment on the data that  
14 are used, especially the wind speed data, but will be unable  
15 to if the information is not filed and made available to the  
16 public at least 30 days prior to the end of the draft EIS  
17 period.

18                   Also I feel that a standard -- quote -- "at least  
19 90 percent of the time" -- end quote -- is inadequate and  
20 should be changed to at least 99 percent of the time in the  
21 above-cited number 21A line number three. This higher  
22 standard should be applied because 10 percent of the time,  
23 that 10 percent of the time with higher wind speeds also  
24 happen to be the time with the greatest likelihood of  
25 accidental strandings -- accidental dispersion.

1                   Historically the time that marine vessels in the  
2                   area of Coos Bay have been involved in strandings or crashes  
3                   or come loose from their moorings or been able to be  
4                   controlled by tugboats have primarily been during storms.  
5                   These storms, coincidentally, are often also the times that  
6                   wind speeds exceed the -- quote -- "weather conditions at  
7                   the site at least 90 percent of the time." So I recommend a  
8                   higher standard of 99 percent.

9                   If the information requested on page 5-38 Section  
10                  21A is not available to the public at least 30 days before  
11                  the end of the comment period on the draft EIS, the comment  
12                  period should be extended a minimum of 30 days beyond the  
13                  receipt of that information and its availability to the  
14                  public.

15                  I did not time my comments.

16                  MR. SCOTT: You've got another minute or so.

17                  DR. JACKSON: Okay. All right. I'll just pick  
18                  out another one.

19                  On page 2.51, they're talking about natural gas  
20                  liquids which -- quote -- "would then be transported on corp  
21                  rail." Most of us here are aware that Rail America had  
22                  stopped using that line some time around September 2007 and  
23                  they're applying to abandon that line.

24                  So I feel that FERC should require some  
25                  information in the final EIS -- and actually in the draft

1 EIS so that we can comment on it -- on what the emissions  
2 and changes in traffic would be if they had to use alternate  
3 transport such as trucks instead of a rail line which may  
4 not exist and is currently not in use.

5 I think I'm probably out of time, so thank you.  
6 I basically would like to request that the FERC extend the  
7 comment period for the public on the draft EIS at least 30  
8 days, preferably 90 days after the receipt of the  
9 information that they have recommended be available.

10 Thanks.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

13 Ron Sadler, and then David Osier.

14 MR. SADLER: Thank you. My name is Ron Sadler,  
15 R-o-n S-a-d-l-e-r.

16 I'm not here to speak for LNG, I'm not here to  
17 speak against LNG, I'm here to address a process, namely the  
18 environmental impact statement process. Before I retired --  
19 can you hear me okay?

20 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

21 MR. SADLER: How's that?

22 VOICE: Better.

23 MR. SADLER: Okay. Before I retired, I had a 34-  
24 year career in the federal sector, much of that time was  
25 spent on working on the implementation of the National

1 Environmental Policy Act in one form or another. So what  
2 I'd like to tell you and what I'd like to say this evening  
3 is based on that pretty broad experience the Jordan Cove  
4 draft environmental impact statement in its present form is  
5 barely recognizable as an attempt to comply with NEPA. We  
6 as a community are not being well served. Those in favor of  
7 the LNG terminal, those against the LNG terminal by law are  
8 entitled to an objective and complete analysis on which to  
9 base their decisions, and neither side is getting it. And  
10 let me give you some specific examples as to what I mean  
11 here.

12 The existing regulations for NEPA, which have  
13 been on the books now for 39 years, say a number of things  
14 about what an EIS ought to do. They say, for example, that  
15 the analysis of alternatives is the very heart of the  
16 environmental impact statement process. They say that the  
17 section in the EIS entitled environmental consequences, or  
18 in FERC's case they call it environmental analysis, that  
19 section is to be -- quote -- "the scientific and analytical  
20 basis for the comparison of all alternatives including the  
21 proposed action." In other words, this is where the  
22 analysis of all those alternatives should take place.

23 And the third thing I want to point out, and this  
24 is very important, the regulations say explicitly, and I'll  
25 read this, this is a direct quote: "The degree of analysis

1 devoted to each alternative must be similar to that devoted  
2 to the proposed action." In other words, you don't do a lot  
3 of work on your proposed action and just kind of blow off  
4 the other alternatives. The intent of the regulations is  
5 you do a balanced analysis to the same degree of detail for  
6 all the alternatives including the proposed action.

7 Now one of the outstanding parts about the draft  
8 -- Jordan Cove draft EIS is that this analysis is not to be  
9 found, it's not included, it simply does not happen in the  
10 Jordan Cove draft environmental analysis. In fact, in the  
11 segment set up to display this scientific analysis, the  
12 environmental consequences, there's no mention made of any  
13 alternative other than the proposed action. This in itself  
14 is a flagrant violation of the purpose and intent of NEPA.

15 Now it isn't that no reasonable alternatives are  
16 discussed, because earlier on in the draft EIS FERC mentions  
17 12 reasonable alternatives that could serve the same purpose  
18 as Jordan Cove. But instead of a rigorous analysis and a  
19 balanced analysis as called for in the regulations, these 12  
20 alternatives are discarded sort of out of hand with at most  
21 a few sentences. Games are played, frankly, by FERC and the  
22 contractor doing it.

23 One of the most common ways that they discarded  
24 the alternatives to the Jordan Cove project was by playing  
25 around with the target market. In other words, they say

1 that the target market that Jordan Cove is designed to serve  
2 is southern Oregon, northern Nevada, northern California.  
3 And any alternative then that doesn't readily fit that niche  
4 is simply written off in a couple of sentences saying well  
5 this alternative doesn't serve that target market.

6 What's interesting -- this makes the draft EIS  
7 almost incomprehensible -- because what's interesting is  
8 elsewhere in the draft EIS they describe the target market  
9 as described by the Jordan Cove proponents and they say, and  
10 this is a quote: "The target market includes Boise, Idaho,  
11 Spokane, Washington, Seattle, Washington and Portland,  
12 Oregon." In other words, Jordan Cove started out this whole  
13 thing saying they're going to serve this big market all the  
14 way from Boise, Idaho to California but where it serves  
15 their purpose, the purpose being to discard alternatives,  
16 they narrow that focus down to southern Oregon, northern  
17 Nevada, northern California and get rid of a whole bunch of  
18 alternatives without having to do any analysis.

19 It even gets worse. There is a pipeline project  
20 coming over from the Rockies, the Sunstone Blue Bridge  
21 alternative. FERC says in the draft EIS that this is a  
22 reasonable alternative, it could serve the target market  
23 down in southern Oregon, northern Nevada and California.  
24 And they say in the draft EIS that we have no environmental  
25 data on this project, in that many words, we have no

1 environmental data. But then they go on to say that well  
2 even though we have no data, we're sure it's not superior to  
3 the Jordan Cove so we're going to throw it away, we're not  
4 going to analyze it. In other words, on the basis of no  
5 data, they just out of hand discard the reasonable  
6 alternative. This type of process is a direct violation of  
7 the NEPA regulations.

8 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Osier, can you start to wrap up,  
9 please?

10 MR. SADLER: Well, five minutes, real quick.

11 Okay. I'd like to point out the last thing. I  
12 have never seen a draft environmental impact statement that  
13 has a section in it entitled conclusions. I have never seen  
14 that in my 34 year career. NEPA says, the regulations say  
15 that an environmental impact statement is to inform the  
16 decision maker prior to making a decision, that it is a two-  
17 step process, the draft EIS, then the final EIS and only  
18 then is the decision maker to move towards a decision. In  
19 spite of that, in spite of that now, the draft EIS has the  
20 words in it -- and this is a quote: "The Jordan Cove  
21 project has limited impacts and would be environmentally  
22 acceptable." In other words, we're at step one of this  
23 process, we haven't completed the process. Not only that  
24 but there are 32 studies and analyses and things that, by  
25 FERCs own admission, are not there yet and they expect to

1 get them by the end of the comment period. But in spite of  
2 the fact that the NEPA regulations say you can't make a  
3 decision this early, in spite of the fact that they don't  
4 have 32 studies that they need to make a decision, they're  
5 making a decision anyhow at step one saying this is an  
6 environmentally acceptable thing.

7 To sum up as succinctly as I can, the current  
8 Jordan Cove draft environmental impact statement -- and I'm  
9 trying to be nice here but it's basically a travesty and a  
10 sham if you look at the requirements of the NEPA  
11 regulations.

12 Now all of us in this community are getting short  
13 changed by FERC. If you're for the LNG terminal, you ought  
14 to be damn concerned because this draft EIS is absolutely  
15 begging to be challenged in court. And in my opinion the  
16 appellants have a very good chance of prevailing on the  
17 merits because it so far misses the market outlined under  
18 NEPA. If you're against LNG, you ought to be darned unhappy  
19 because the regulations say you are entitled to an objective  
20 rational discussion and the whole community should benefit  
21 from that. We're not getting it. We ought to join  
22 together, both the pros and cons, and go to FERC and say hey  
23 go back to the drawing board and give us what we're entitled  
24 to by the existing laws and regulations.

25 Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

3 Bill McCaffree -- actually David Osier next, I'm  
4 sorry, then followed by Bill McCaffree.

5 MR. OSIER: My name is Dave Osier, last name is  
6 O-s-i-e-r. I'm born and raised in Coos County, lived here  
7 all my life. I've seen its ups and downs. I guess if one  
8 of the speakers can speak for a couple great men earlier, I  
9 can speak for Don McCall, and he says keep Oregon green.

10 And I'm directing this directly at FERC and their  
11 analysis of this project and other projects. I'm wanting to  
12 really wonder where the common sense lies, because I've not  
13 heard one person mention our national recreation area or the  
14 South Sluice Sanctuary. This is a pristine coast. We  
15 wanted to keep it that way and it is that way. But if we  
16 let oil company greed in, you're going to end up bailing  
17 them out, just like Wall Street. Because greed is what got  
18 Wall Street --

19 (Applause.)

20 MR. OSIER: -- greed is what's going to get them.  
21 And I personally think that we should have a vote on it. It  
22 shouldn't be up to FERC to tell us what they're going to do  
23 with our country. If the citizens of our country feel that  
24 our government is no longer doing for we the people, it says  
25 right in our Constitution we can bear arms and take it back.

1 And I'll be the first one to lock and load and if we have to  
2 start the North Bend chapter of the Oregon militia, so be  
3 it.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. OSIER: And that's all I got to say to FERC,  
6 they better have wisdom in siting these projects because if  
7 they don't, we're coming after them.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. SCOTT: Bill McCaffree, and Curt Clay next.

11 MR. MC CAFFREE: My name is Bill McCaffree,  
12 spelled M-c-C-a-f-f-r-e-e. I'm a native Oregonian and I'm a  
13 lifetime resident of this area and I'm also a 30-year-plus  
14 member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical  
15 Workers. Unlike our business manager, I live here.

16 I'm here to address a gross oversight in your  
17 DEIS, the alternatives to the Jordan Cove Energy Project and  
18 the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline, and it's referenced on  
19 Section 30, page 3-8. NEPA and the Commission policy  
20 require you to consider viable alternatives and solar as  
21 being one of these.

22 Oregon leads the nation in renewable energy and  
23 solar is a huge part of that. In contrast to your weather  
24 conditions statement based on a Tacoma, Washington weather  
25 service report, the University of Oregon physics professor

1 Frank Vignola reports that two-thirds of Oregon receive more  
2 solar radiation than Florida. Even the soggy town of  
3 Astoria gets more solar energy than Germany, which leads the  
4 world in solar energy.

5 Portland, Oregon based Pacific Power, their  
6 renewable energy projects currently produce enough energy to  
7 power 143,000 homes. If you calculate that out at a minimum  
8 100-amp service for a single home, that equals 3.4 gigawatts  
9 of electricity, all from renewables.

10 In Oregon, there are abundant jobs in solar  
11 manufacturing. As of September 25th, 2008, the Salem City  
12 Council approved a ground lease and purchase agreement with  
13 Sanyo Solar of Oregon. Sanyo will pay \$1.75 million for  
14 about 20 acres southwest of Salem where it plans to build an  
15 \$80 million solar cell plant that will employ at least 200  
16 workers. Sanyo must maintain an average salary and benefit  
17 package of \$50,000 a year per worker and employ at least 200  
18 workers to receive the city tax incentives. This means  
19 permanent high-paying jobs, family wage jobs and lots of  
20 construction jobs building the plant.

21 On October 17th of 2008, just ten days ago,  
22 Hillsboro Solar World, a German-based solar cell  
23 manufacturer, opened North America's largest solar cell  
24 manufacturing plant, creating a thousand permanent jobs,  
25 manufacturing jobs, that are to be in effect by 2011.

1           Another solar manufacturer facility, the Peak Sun  
2 Silicon Corporation is currently building in Millersburg,  
3 Oregon -- which is adjacent to Albany -- will invest \$700  
4 million and employ 500 people when fully built by 2011. In  
5 addition, it will employ hundreds of construction workers  
6 and Peak Sun intends to replicate the plant as demand  
7 increases, producing more jobs and more construction jobs.

8           Solar photovoltaic systems can be used as a cost  
9 effective peak power resource. Strategic solar photovoltaic  
10 usage can serve peak demand at a negative net cost. In  
11 other words, when the peak energy is used during the day,  
12 solar systems can actually reduce the cost of power.

13           However, Chris Robertson, who is Vice-President  
14 of Public Affairs for Peak Sun, is concerned that siting  
15 proposed LNG facilities in Oregon will result in large  
16 commitments to combined and single-cycle gas turbines that  
17 will compete with solar systems and slow the growth of the  
18 solar industry in the western United States. This means  
19 hundreds, possibly thousands of jobs in manufacturing and  
20 construction that will be impacted, negatively impacted.  
21 In addition, the LNG pollutants, nitrous oxide, sulfur  
22 dioxide, carbon dioxide, and carbon monoxide will add to the  
23 pollutants in the environment and it's likely that thousands  
24 of jobs will be lost if LNG is sited in Oregon.

25           PV Powered is also a Bend, Oregon based company.

1 They've emerged recently as a quality producer of direct  
2 current inverters and former Hewlett Packard vice president  
3 and general manager Greg Patterson relates the market  
4 potential for his product as the worst forecast I've seen  
5 calls for a 30 percent growth rate in solar. PV Powered has  
6 grown from 25 to more than 60 jobs in just over a year.  
7 Solakes, a solar crystal growing operation which is in  
8 Portland, has hired 50 people and is looking to employ 180  
9 people. This is all just in the solar industry in Oregon.

10 So in conclusion, the solar industry in Oregon is  
11 thriving. Projected permanent family wage jobs from just  
12 these five companies total around 2,000 and investments of  
13 \$1.5 billion into the local economies, and that's just  
14 recently. The draft environmental impact statement that we  
15 have, it reads just like Jordan Cove and the Port of Coos  
16 Bay wrote the thing. I respectfully request that you  
17 rewrite this thing and put in some real alternatives for  
18 real jobs.

19 Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. SCOTT: Curt Clay, and then Daniel Bowman.

22 MR. CLAY: My name is Curt Clay. I'm a citizen  
23 here. I own property in Coos Bay. I'm concerned about this  
24 high school senior project here. Like everybody else that  
25 spoke that's really looked at it, it needs to go back, and

1 I'm sorry about -- you know, we had this turned so that John  
2 wouldn't have -- our backs are to you all the time. This  
3 thing needs to go back to Little Bradford or whoever  
4 presented it and we need a longer period of public comment.  
5 That's my request.

6 Most everything that I've thought of saying has  
7 been said. There's one man, Carl, he's an emergency  
8 responder, he says we don't have the equipment, the manpower  
9 or the knowledge to fight these hazardous fires, maybe.

10 Listen, I know nobody wants to talk about  
11 disasters and the possibility of it, but somebody has to  
12 think about this stuff. I've got 30 years in health care  
13 provision and I've worked in public health, I retired from  
14 public health. I'm willing to volunteer to help get  
15 together -- we need to come together as a community. We  
16 need to work together, look at the pros and cons.

17 If the primary concern is jobs, please, look,  
18 listen to what's been said here. We've got wonderful  
19 potential. This thing here is supposed to provide an  
20 analysis of reasonable alternatives. You look in here and  
21 it's not there, it's worthless in that regard. This is what  
22 the community is looking for.

23 Braddock, please take it back, wherever you are.  
24 I know you're out here. It needs to go back and be  
25 rewritten in terms of what NEPA requires, okay.

1                   Now we've had some wonderful speakers here. The  
2 physicians that talked about the health of the community.  
3 Wonderful. I want to say we're all part, we're all part of  
4 a larger community family. If I just said family, I know  
5 somebody would stand up and say oh, Al Pern's not in my  
6 family. But no, we are part of a family and we've been one  
7 before, we're one now as we go through this process with all  
8 the division, and we'll be one afterwards, even if this  
9 thing goes through; we'll deal with it.

10                   I'll volunteer to help with some of the disaster  
11 planning out there in the schools, for example. I  
12 understand there's a high school and a junior -- or high,  
13 whatever you call it. There's kids out there that need to  
14 know what to do in the event of a fireball -- sorry to  
15 mention it. You know, this stuff can explode.

16                   I have some comments here from the fire chief of  
17 Boston where they have a huge LNG facility and he says when  
18 we're looking at risk versus hazard, when someone says the  
19 risk is small, ask the following: do they mean that the  
20 probability of an event is small and the hazardous  
21 consequences are small? Do they mean that the probability  
22 of an event is small but the hazardous consequences are big?  
23 Do they mean that the probability of an event is high but  
24 the hazardous consequences are small?

25                   These kids out there -- and we all own those

1 children. I'm looking out here and I see a lot of people  
2 that their kids have probably grown -- I didn't see the  
3 hands for all those that have kids, but we own those kids.  
4 Okay.

5 So we want to know, what's going to happen to the  
6 -- the school's in a blast zone. Blast zone number two.  
7 Blast zone number one, just forget about it, if you're in  
8 the blast zone, you're the last -- I'm sorry, but you're the  
9 last french fry at the bottom of the boiling oil. You got  
10 missed. That's what you are.

11 Somewhere it says there's nobody in blast zone  
12 number one. That's incorrect. There are people that live  
13 there and work there. So anyone that cites this thing and  
14 says nobody's at risk at blast zone number one where  
15 everything gets fried, the birds, the fish, the plants, et  
16 cetera, that's incorrect. And if you cite that after being  
17 in this meeting, you're a liar, because that's the  
18 definition of a lie is to say something that you know is  
19 untrue.

20 Now let's just -- I've only got a second, but we  
21 can help these kids out there in the school, we can save  
22 children out there if we have a proper fire drill. Now I  
23 know it's a public school, the kids know what to do when  
24 their clothes are on fire, they roll on the ground, they  
25 encourage the other children to beat them with their

1 backpacks and I understand our schools out there are a cut  
2 above, they have like carpets that children can, when  
3 they're on fire can get in a carpet and the other children  
4 will roll them up in the carpet or maybe they roll  
5 themselves in the carpet, I don't know. But that's a cut  
6 above, most schools I have never heard of carpets being  
7 available for the kids to roll in. But nevertheless, we  
8 have something to build on here. We're a community, we can  
9 do this. Even if this thing goes through, we will come  
10 together and work together.

11           The other part of the fire drill is usually the  
12 children file out of the building and assemble someplace  
13 away from the building so their little heads can get counted  
14 and we make sure they're all there. Well in that case, that  
15 part of the fire drill is dead wrong. We don't want the  
16 children going out into the field in the face of a fireball.  
17 We want these kids to know what's the first thing you're  
18 gonna do when you get your alarm in the event of this.  
19 We've got 30 or 40 seconds, go. What's the second thing  
20 you're gonna do? We want these kids to know.

21           And as a community I want you to think in terms  
22 of joining or just getting in touch with the medical reserve  
23 corps of Coos County. Most counties have a medical reserve  
24 corps and you don't have to have any medical training at all  
25 to join, it's for your training.

1 Am I running out of time?

2 MR. SCOTT: Yes.

3 MR. CLAY: Sorry.

4 But we need to know. We're now going to be faced  
5 with new kinds of injuries here, maybe burn injuries. We  
6 want all the citizens to know what's the first thing you're  
7 gonna do when you come across a burn victim? What's the  
8 first thing you're gonna do when you come across somebody  
9 that's knocked out from gas? What's the first thing you're  
10 gonna think about? We need to all know this. And it's easy  
11 to learn so that we all have the basics so that we can work  
12 together, whether we disagree on this or not. We're a  
13 community, let's keep this up. Thanks for talking.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Daniel Bowman, and then Jonathan  
16 Hanson.

17 MR. BOWMAN: Hello. My name is Daniel Bowman, I'm  
18 a 13-year resident of Coos Bay. Maybe I'm going to get a  
19 little off track here, but I'm also running -- I'm opposed  
20 to it, to LNG, but I'm also a candidate for Coos Bay City  
21 Council, if that will help. Excuse me, I'm a little nervous  
22 here.

23 The reason -- if you look at today's paper,  
24 Monday, October 27th, it says Jordan Cove picks LNG  
25 contractors. I'm all for jobs, but I don't believe this is

1 the way to do it. Their contractors were Black and Veatch  
2 of Kansas City, Missouri, Kiewit Energy of Omaha, Nebraska,  
3 Vinci Construction Grands Projects of Paris, France, of all  
4 places, also Entrepose Contracting S.A. of Paris, France.

5 I believe we should have -- if they are going to  
6 go forward with this, but I urge that they don't, that we  
7 should have local contractors and local builders, whether  
8 they're from here or Oregon, because we're the ones affected  
9 by this.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. BOWMAN: Also, I'm not sure when this is  
12 dated, but it's Resolution Number 504, resolution of the  
13 City Council of the City of Canyonville expressing concerns  
14 pertaining to the proposed Jordan Cove liquefied natural gas  
15 terminal at Coos Bay and the Pacific Connector Pipeline.  
16 I'll make this quick as I can because there's a couple  
17 things here.

18 "Be it resolved that the City Council of the City  
19 of Canyonville, Oregon wishes to express the following  
20 concerns pertaining to the proposed Jordan Cove liquefied  
21 natural gas terminal at Coos Bay and the Pacific Connector  
22 Pipeline:

23 "Whereas building the terminal in Coos Bay and  
24 dredging the bay to accommodate the tankers will likely  
25 bring more pollution to the Spit and the bay and, whereas

1 liquefied natural gas tankers the size of aircraft carriers  
2 may have a deleterious effect on local boaters both private  
3 and commercial and, whereas construction of the 233-mile  
4 long 36-inch diameter Pacific Connector Pipeline will  
5 require a clearing of 100-foot side, trees will not be  
6 allowed to grow back, the easement will be sprayed with  
7 herbicides and, whereas it will cross 160 miles of private  
8 property, the builders of the pipeline will use eminent  
9 domain to gain access to this property, the rights of those  
10 Oregonians to use their property, as well as the value of  
11 the properties will be permanently impaired and, whereas the  
12 pipeline will cross five major rivers, the South Umpqua  
13 twice, as well as hundreds of small streams, there will  
14 likely be significant erosion and, whereas a great deal of  
15 effort and money has been expended to restore fish habitat  
16 over the last several years, it would be a tragedy to allow  
17 environmental disturbance and/or destruction caused by this  
18 project and, whereas the sole purpose of this project is to  
19 supply imported natural gas to California markets, even  
20 though established domestic sources as easily meeting  
21 demand, whereas from the terminal at Coos Bay along its 233-  
22 mile pipeline the potential danger to Oregonians from this  
23 project is incalculable and, be it further resolved, that  
24 the City Council of the City of Canyonville, Oregon strongly  
25 urges all local and state representatives to fully access

1 Oregon's need for the project, we also wish to remind them  
2 of their obligation to the people of Oregon concerning the  
3 impact of LNG development on their private property, the  
4 economy, public safety and the environment of southern  
5 Oregon."

6 Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

9 Jonathan Hanson, and then Jody McCaffree.

10 MR. HANSON: Jonathan, J-o-n-a-t-h-a-n, Hanson,  
11 H-a-n-s-o-n.

12 Good evening, friends and neighbors. I'm glad  
13 that you all came this evening and there's still about half  
14 of us here, but I think there were probably somewhere around  
15 300 of us when this meeting started and I don't think that's  
16 been entered into the record, even though the Federal Energy  
17 Regulatory Commission did not have the respect to show up at  
18 this meeting and they currently do not have the respect to  
19 give me their undivided attention while I'm trying to talk.  
20 Thank you.

21 Now where was I? Oh yeah, the Jordan Cove Energy  
22 Project is the product of the best efforts of the Port of  
23 Coos Bay and, what is that, economic development council and  
24 I think it's a pretty pathetic answer to the problems that  
25 we have here in terms of employment -- and that's our big

1       problem.  Because from what the fellow from the hospital was  
2       saying, there'll be an exodus of more than 90 people and  
3       more than 90 living wage jobs that are gonna leave here if  
4       this thing comes.  So I see a net loss.

5               Not only that -- a net loss -- oh, jobs, yes.  
6       I'm sorry.  You know, the fellow was saying it's hard to  
7       follow Jimi Hendrix.  I was born on the same day of the year  
8       as Jimi Hendrix, so I'm inclined to those same excitable  
9       proclivities as Jimi Hendrix.

10              I've been here for 20 years.  I came here as a  
11       refugee from urban blight.  And part of that urban blight is  
12       atmosphere which is unfit for human consumption.  And now  
13       that the mills -- oh yeah, before I came to Coos Bay, I  
14       lived in Bellingham for 11 years and the last place I lived  
15       was right across the street from a Georgia Pacific Wood  
16       Products plant where they basically had a refinery of wood  
17       products.  And thanks to Dr. Morgan, I am regaining some of  
18       my health and some of my useful function which were almost  
19       completely gone.  I'm able to breathe the air here again now  
20       and I think the environment's wonderful and it's getting  
21       better.

22              We have an opportunity here for, if you're  
23       looking for like alternatives to this project that would be  
24       evaluated would be something like, oh, I don't know, a  
25       destination for people who were looking for opportunities to

1 be in an experience and explore and do activities in  
2 someplace that was like an environmental ecotopia, which is  
3 what this is becoming now if we don't proceed with these  
4 kinds of nasty projects.

5 But sticking to the EIS here, I am one of those  
6 people who -- while not an expert like my respected  
7 neighbor, Ron Sadler, who was the only person here that's  
8 really qualified to speak exactly to an EIS and who was  
9 asked to cut his comments short -- I do have some experience  
10 with these matters. And what my experience is is that this  
11 stuff is very political and we are organizing, thanks to the  
12 Citizens Against LNG -- and the Citizens for LNG, too,  
13 that's organizing, too -- but we're talking to one another,  
14 and this is the answer, talking to one another and focusing  
15 on what do we want to do here in our community, not what do  
16 we want some experts from afar to do to us or for us, what  
17 do we want to do for ourselves, what can we do with what  
18 we've got here and what can we attract that's attractive to  
19 us and attractive to what we want to attract.

20 And now I'm talking to all of you and I'm not  
21 talking to the FERC because the FERC isn't here and the FERC  
22 didn't show us the respect to show up and so this is not,  
23 not a legitimate forum. And we are entitled to a rehearing  
24 and we are entitled to an extension of time and we need an  
25 extension of time, we need a proper EIS.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. HANSON: This is a comic book, a cartoon  
3 comic. This is a joke and it's no joke. This is serious  
4 business. This is our lives, our community, the lives of  
5 our children. We need to stick to our guns and demand what  
6 the law provides and this isn't it.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

9 Jody McCaffree, and then Mary Margaret --

10 MS. MUENCHRATH: Muenchrath.

11 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

12 MS. MC CAFFREE: Jody McCaffree, that's J-o-d-y  
13 M-c-C-a-f-f-r-e-e. I'm a lifetime resident of this area.  
14 I'm also a volunteer Executive Director of the Citizens  
15 Against LNG. And thousands of people have signed our  
16 petition and I'm representing them tonight.

17 I'm asking FERC to reconsider Wyden's request for  
18 a deadline extension. You say in your draft that Jordan  
19 Cove has limited environmental impacts, but I don't know how  
20 you can justify that because, if you look at the draft --  
21 actually in the back they give a great overview, there's 141  
22 major reports, analysis and/or requests by FERC that have  
23 yet to be completed by Jordan Cove -- that's page 5-32  
24 through 5-57.

25 Many of these are critical reports and analysis

1 that we citizens will not be able to view or comment on.  
2 They will not be available until the end of the comment  
3 period, a lot of them, or after it is long over with. This  
4 undercuts the heart of the EIS process. That's one issue.

5 The next issue with asking for an extension on  
6 the time to comment, landowners on alternative routes such  
7 as the one FERC now prefers as the preferred route around  
8 the Coos Bay area -- which is Route WC-1A, it's on page 3-63  
9 -- have not been given ample time or due process. The  
10 original preferred proposed route through the bay had over a  
11 year's scrutiny by officials. The latest preferred route  
12 alternative has not.

13 At the end of September there were public  
14 meetings that were put on by Williams and at that time they  
15 didn't have any -- they had no updated maps. And it had --  
16 actually at the end of September, they hadn't even notified  
17 landowners yet regarding the new pipeline route. They were  
18 just getting to the surveys and the draft had been out for  
19 almost a month. There are still no detailed -- well, I say  
20 this -- I guess tonight there are detailed maps finally, so  
21 we have -- people can actually look at them tonight.

22 But that still isn't fair to landowners on that  
23 route. These alternative routes should have been in place  
24 in the record when Jordan Cove and the Pacific Connector  
25 filed their FERC application last September.

1           These landowners did not get a chance to become  
2 intervenors or be active participants in the process and  
3 several bay area businesses such as Crosson's Oysters,  
4 Kentucky Golf Course are severely impacted by this new  
5 route.

6           And also I note there is some people talking  
7 about this Blue Ridge alternative and changing the route a  
8 little bit. Every time you change the route, it goes to  
9 somebody else, it gets on somebody else's land. Those  
10 landowners have a right to due process and that is not  
11 happening with this process. Everyone deserves due process.

12           There's some missing reports to date which  
13 there's many, and I'm just going to focus on a couple of  
14 them that I feel some information needs to be looked at. On  
15 page 4.1-6, the tsunami study, that study needs to include  
16 ship impacts to the berm along with other floating objects,  
17 channel modifications, and the facility itself, and I'm not  
18 so certain that this study that comes out will do that. We  
19 should have 45 days to review this study after it's  
20 complete.

21           It actually should have been a part of the  
22 process, it should have -- you guys should have reviewed it  
23 and it should have been in this draft. It's not fair to  
24 citizens in this area because if there was a tsunami it  
25 could severely impact this area, the tsunami itself, but if

1 there's a gas terminal there, you're going to have even more  
2 impacts.

3 And you have to realize, you talked about the  
4 kids at the school, the kids at North Bend High School have  
5 to march up the hill and stand on the top of the hill, an  
6 open area, not protected, in the event of a tsunami. If  
7 there's a terminal over there -- and we know what's going to  
8 happen with a ship, there's no doubt -- you could have some  
9 severely burned kids.

10 Okay. The second issue is the airport/air space  
11 review. That's page 4.9-8. I would like to request that  
12 the correct tank heights be -- if that test is done or the  
13 review, the air space review is done, that the tank heights  
14 be taken from the August 2007 GRI report, which is a data  
15 report for the Phase II geotechnical investigation.

16 This GRI -- this was actually in conjunction,  
17 Jordan Cove hired these people. And the GRI data states  
18 that tanks will be about 265 foot in diameter with a roof  
19 peak at approximately an elevation of plus 200 feet, not 180  
20 feet as the EIS insinuates. It's very -- worded very  
21 trickily in there. Actually, you should go by the GRI  
22 report on that FAA study. And we should have 45 days after  
23 that study is complete to be able to comment.

24 Another issue is the emergency response at page  
25 4.12-42. It's not even due until prior to initial site

1 preparation, that means long after the comment period.  
2 There is -- you know, they talk about the emergency  
3 responders, there's no, there's no report. So there's no --  
4 how would you know how many people's gonna be hired or what  
5 is needed. There's no report.

6 But there are maps on page 4.7-3 and 4.7-15 that  
7 show the Sandia hazard zones and the impacts to the area,  
8 and nearly 17,000 people in this area live in those zones.  
9 I am asking that those human beings be considered. I'm  
10 asking that there be appropriate fire protection gear to be  
11 provided for those people living and working in those zones.  
12 Some of those zones -- and we know up to a mile away you  
13 have 30 seconds before you will receive second-degree burns  
14 on open -- on your skin. That's not a lot of time, so the  
15 hazard protection has to be in place. You can't wait for  
16 the fire department to get there.

17 Our fire departments are being given hazard  
18 information from Jordan Cove's consultant who has no  
19 experience or expertise in LNG hazards. Professional  
20 scientists and true LNG hazard experts need to be consulted.  
21 And the LNG accident that occurred in 1987 should be  
22 released and made available for review by our local  
23 emergency responders and Coast Guard personnel. We deserve  
24 an emergency response plan that is adequate and that is  
25 based on all the facts, not the industry's slanted and

1 misleading versions.

2           The next issue is alternative renewable energy,  
3 that's page 3-4. The information in the draft EIS is  
4 completely inadequate and incomplete. FERC should consult  
5 with the Oregon Department of Energy in regards to this  
6 topic.

7           On the issue of solar alone, page 3-8, we have  
8 more photon energy than Germany, who is the world's leader  
9 in solar installations. Since studies show that LNG will  
10 compete with renewables -- and I can give you this study,  
11 it's available -- thousands of jobs in the renewable  
12 industry are at stake in Oregon if these West Coast LNG  
13 terminals are allowed to proceed.

14           And I am requesting that the recent letter from  
15 Peak Sun Silicone to FERC be taken into account and that not  
16 only the 500 employees at Peak Sun Silicone be considered,  
17 but all of the employees at all the companies in Oregon that  
18 deal in renewables be considered. Just with three alone,  
19 that's around 2000 that are just coming on, these are brand-  
20 new jobs coming into our state. These should be included  
21 and I don't feel that losing those jobs is any replacement  
22 for a few dozen jobs on the North Spit.

23           The Citizens Against LNG request that FERC  
24 provide us with a properly done draft EIS that includes  
25 complete and accurate reports and a complete and accurate

1 analysis of all the alternatives. Then and only then we  
2 request a minimum 45 days to review it. Citizens need to be  
3 given ample time for that process. FERC has not followed  
4 NEPA in regards to this issue and we are requesting that  
5 NEPA guidelines be followed and this process be done  
6 correctly.

7           Senator Wyden's recent request for a 45-day  
8 comment extension pales in comparison to what is really  
9 needed. FERC should at least consider and honor his  
10 request. The FERC Commissioner, Joseph Kelliher -- I don't  
11 know if I'm saying that right -- recently responded to  
12 Senator Wyden's letter and he denied this extension assuming  
13 that landowners have all been notified and have been given a  
14 copy of the draft EIS and our pipeline routes through their  
15 land. And I'm here to tell you, they have not been given  
16 that information. There's several here, I've already talked  
17 to them tonight, they never got a draft, they haven't --  
18 we've requested several landowners to get pipeline routes,  
19 they've never gotten them. So that's a false assumption.  
20 He's assuming everybody knows what's going on and people  
21 don't.

22           Without detailed maps being provided, it's hard  
23 to know who needs to be contacted or if landowners have been  
24 given due process. So we would like to request that the  
25 process be fair and the NEPA be followed.

1           Many of the concerns that were raised in scoping  
2           have not even been addressed in this draft. The ones I  
3           raised, a big portion of them not addressed. And that's not  
4           the way you do it. You need to -- we came to scoping two  
5           years ago, we gave you our concerns, they should all be  
6           addressed in the draft and they're not.

7           So we ask that the draft be done properly and  
8           then a proper comment period be established. And to even  
9           extend it with Senator Wyden's requested 45 days really  
10          isn't adequate but at least it would be somewhat helpful,  
11          because a lot of the reports are due at the end of the  
12          comment period, if you allowed us after those are due to be  
13          able to at least review what they have put in, that helps a  
14          little bit. But really it should be done right. The whole  
15          process is not right. So I'm asking that you do it right.

16                   Thank you.

17                   (Applause.)

18                   MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

19                   Mary Margaret? And then Bruce Follansbe up next.

20                   MS. MUENCHRATH: I'm Mary Margaret Muenchrath.

21                   Can you hear me? Okay. And that's spelled M-u-e-n-c-h-r-a-  
22                   t-h. My maiden name was Kelly --

23                   (Laughter.)

24                   -- a little easier.

25                   I'm not going to take but just a few minutes

1       because you have really sat for a long time and there's been  
2       wonderful information, factual information that has been  
3       provided and I respect that very, very much.

4               I have been against LNG since its inception here  
5       and I became even -- well, I think approximately two years  
6       after being involved with being against it, I learned at a  
7       meeting at the casino that our land was being invaded by the  
8       pipeline. And what a shock, you know, when it hits right  
9       there. But I was against it to begin with, but here it was  
10      right in our own backyard or front yard, we didn't know. We  
11      still don't know. We have never received a map. We have  
12      requested a map so we know what part of our land is really  
13      being invaded. We know that it is either going to be in the  
14      front of our house or in the back of our house. I believe  
15      there were three locations, all disastrous.

16             We never received a draft environmental impact  
17      statement. I got one tonight. These have been requested  
18      and we have not received anything. I could go on and on  
19      about the anguish that this causes people, our neighbors,  
20      our friends. Who would ever think that we would have to  
21      give up our private land for a corporation that is not  
22      necessary to Oregon, the gas is going to California -- I  
23      could go on and on but I'm not going to make you more tired.

24             This should not happen. I can't believe that  
25      living in the United States, a country of democracy, that

1 one would have to give up or have their land taken away by  
2 eminent domain for something that isn't even related to the  
3 situation. I find this to be absolutely tragic.

4 So I'm just going to make it short and let you  
5 know that I think that we have gained a lot of information  
6 tonight. I think that people have worked very hard to learn  
7 about this and I think that there are people here that maybe  
8 have learned what they didn't know and that's all very  
9 important. And we do need to work together.

10 And I wonder where we've been. Here's all these  
11 new things with energy coming and we can read about them,  
12 we're hearing about them in the other parts of the state,  
13 where are we? We've got to get on the ball and earn our  
14 jobs and our kids have to learn trades and skills and become  
15 educated to take jobs and have ambition to do them.

16 That's the end.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. SCOTT: Bruce Follansbee, and then Ruby Starr.

19 DR. FOLLANSBEE: Good evening, I'm Dr. Bruce  
20 Follansbee and I represent the Cape Arago Audubon Society.  
21 We're preparing a written response to the DEIS. The last  
22 name is F-o-l-l-a-n-s-b-e-e.

23 According to the requirements in NEPA policy, a  
24 DEIS is supposed to be between 150 and 300 pages long and  
25 it's supposed to be simple, understandable and approachable

1 by the public so they can understand the impact of any  
2 project that's being proposed in their area.

3 I haven't had time to read this 1458-page  
4 document. I don't think many of you have either, but I'm  
5 finding that it's not very approachable and if I didn't have  
6 a sound scientific background I'd have trouble understanding  
7 large parts of it.

8 The purpose of the document is to understand the  
9 process and present that process to us of giving  
10 consideration to environmental impacts during planning. We  
11 feel that this process is incomplete and that the DEIS is  
12 totally deficient for the following reasons, and I've only  
13 chosen three to keep it brief.

14 There are other 30 items with potential  
15 environmental impacts that were not considered in this DEIS,  
16 and they're presented on pages 537 to 542. We will not be  
17 allowed to analyze or comment on these because of the timing  
18 of the presentation. They're not going to give these  
19 results on these very important studies until the end of the  
20 comment process, so they're denying us our right to  
21 understand what's being proposed in this project. This is  
22 our only chance to publicly comment and analyze these  
23 potential impacts.

24 In terms of Audubon, some of the very important  
25 impacts to marbled murrelets and spotted owls, two

1 endangered species in our area, are among those 32  
2 considerations that are not going to be addressed until it's  
3 too late for us to comment on them.

4 Another important point is minimal eelgrass  
5 impacts due to dredging are claimed. We feel that these  
6 impacts are not properly considered. The channel will be  
7 dredged to accommodate ships of 148,000 cubic meters, but  
8 the berth that these ships are pulling up to is being built  
9 for ships of 217,000 cubic meters.

10 Now I don't know of any private company that will  
11 invest the extra money -- and in this case it's a  
12 considerable amount and larger environmental impacts -- to  
13 accommodate a ship that size if they're not going to bring  
14 those ships to this harbor, which means they're getting  
15 their foot in the door with small ships and then at some  
16 point they're going to claim that they have to have these  
17 environmental impacts of vastly increasing the ship channel  
18 to handle the bigger ships in order to keep the whole  
19 facility in business. So they're trying to say we're going  
20 to have a small environmental impact and then later on force  
21 a much larger impact on us.

22 Personally I worked on a mitigation project for  
23 eelgrass in Humboldt Bay and, although we were able to  
24 establish eelgrass on a mitigation site, the ships that came  
25 by subsequent to the installation of that grass washed out

1 the entire planting.

2           The proposed site for this eelgrass mitigation is  
3 next to a ship channel. I have seen no information in this  
4 DEIS that gives me any assurance that this mitigation  
5 project would be successful. I don't see any proposed  
6 bonding of the company that does it, so that if the site is  
7 not successful that they will be required to come back and  
8 replace that eelgrass somewhere else. Basically my  
9 experience with eelgrass is that it grows wherever is a good  
10 site and all those sites are currently occupied. Any  
11 further sites for this mitigation that are not currently  
12 occupied are highly suspect as to the probability of their  
13 success in a mitigation planting. And this habitat is  
14 extremely important for species such as Brandt's geese,  
15 juvenile fish and other species.

16           We also cannot yet evaluate the analysis  
17 contained in this DEIS because it includes four proposed  
18 routes for the pipeline in the first 10 miles and impacts  
19 vary by route considerably. These maps -- the maps showing  
20 these on page 3-58 does not give us sufficient information  
21 about the exact location of the route to analyze the impacts  
22 on habitat and the species along those sites. With no final  
23 route, this report cannot document the process of  
24 considering the environmental impacts because no route has  
25 been chosen and we don't know when a final route will be

1 chosen.

2 To conclude, we feel the DEIS is incomplete and  
3 premature because there can't have been analysis of the 30-  
4 plus items excluded from the report, the full dredging  
5 impacts to eelgrass, or the full impacts due to a final  
6 pipeline route. We feel that this DEIS should be withdrawn  
7 and should be resubmitted when it's complete and that, at  
8 that time, the evaluation period for comment open to the  
9 public should be initiated upon the completion of a complete  
10 DEIS, not on this incomplete product that shortchanges the  
11 public's right to have a voice on the impacts that are  
12 proposed on their community.

13 Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

16 Ruby Starr, and then Ray Penny.

17 MS. STARR: Hi. My name is Ruby Starr, R-u-b-y  
18 S-t-a-r-r. I'm an educator and a counselor and a retiree.

19 VOICE: Mike.

20 MS. STARR: Like that. Can you hear me? Is it  
21 on? Yeah, it's on.

22 Okay. A gentleman said earlier that when the  
23 construction people come in about 475 guys, when they get  
24 off work, what are they going to do, hit the bars and get  
25 drunk and be hauled off to jail possibly. I was vandalized

1 a little over a week ago and I had to call the police. The  
2 police couldn't -- I was out on a dark road out in the  
3 country, the police could not help me, I was alone, and so I  
4 asked him, I said what's going to happen when all these guys  
5 are working on this dredging and stuff and he says well  
6 we'll just have to let them tear up the town, that's all,  
7 because we can't do anything.

8 My main concern, and I've heard it a number of  
9 times, if you want your young people to stay here in this  
10 community and work, I'm wondering -- they say there's going  
11 to be 39 jobs or maybe 120 jobs. Is that all of the young  
12 people in our town? Are those jobs going to take care of  
13 our young people? I don't think so.

14 We have young people with a lot of opportunities.  
15 We have the community college, they can get their  
16 associates, they can get started, they can leave town, get  
17 their bachelors and their masters and their doctors and then  
18 come back to our community as doctors and lawyers and green  
19 energy engineering and jobs that will develop here in this  
20 town. But we have the possibility for our young people to  
21 be here to work with better than family wage jobs. So just  
22 saying that they go and never come back, let's get the jobs  
23 here, let's get their education and get them here.

24 Another way to create jobs for these young people  
25 is to do what Bellingham, Washington and other places are

1       doing. They looked at the next huge money for communities  
2       after they lose the lumber and all of that, and they looked  
3       at green energy and they looked at retirees. Almost half of  
4       the population in Coos County is over the age of 55, and so  
5       that is a lot of money into the community that we can work  
6       with.

7                       We need these young people to go get their  
8       degrees and then come back to our community to develop the  
9       community so we can use our Social Security money here, we  
10      don't have to go to Medford or Eugene or Portland to spend  
11      our money, we can use it here so the young people can come  
12      here and run these jobs. And this wouldn't damage our  
13      beautiful place. Why should we get our gas from the  
14      Communists if we have everything we need right here?

15                      Sunset magazine said that the North Spit is the  
16      fifth best beach in the country. National Geographic had a  
17      huge article on what a great surfing and ocean and view area  
18      Coos Bay is. The last three magazines I've got on budget  
19      travel, they have had articles about Coos Bay, the wonderful  
20      place to visit, the wonderful place to travel to. This is  
21      free advertising to our community for people to come here  
22      and travel and drop their money here and then they can go  
23      home. But we need to have the hotels and the restaurants  
24      and the recreation for these people. These are jobs.

25                      And another thing that is really concerning me,

1 talking about tsunamis. I talked with a geologist who --  
2 unofficially he said that I was right. In Chili, they had  
3 9-plus earthquakes and that created tsunami over 100 feet.  
4 How high is this tank going to be?

5 And what is interesting, and the geologist agreed  
6 with me, the formation of the fault on Chili is exactly the  
7 same formation and dynamics as the Juan de Fuca. So they've  
8 already had their nine-plus; we're due. And if this is  
9 going to happen like it did in Chili and the geologist says  
10 mother nature is there, what makes us think that we're more  
11 powerful than mother nature? Mother nature will have her  
12 way when she has it.

13 Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

16 Is it Ray --

17 MR. PENNY: Ray Penny, P-e-n-n-y.

18 A lot of what I wanted to say has already been  
19 said, so I'm going to try and summarize here. But I guess  
20 one of the things that bothers me more than anything are the  
21 scare tactics, the fear mongering, the gross exaggerations  
22 and the fabrications and lies, and we've heard some of that  
23 tonight, comparing the environment of New York City to what  
24 this is going to do here is a prime example of that, that  
25 just doesn't -- I'd just like to encourage, whether you're

1 for it or against it, let's stick to the facts when we're  
2 making our case. Quote factual data, don't just, you know,  
3 make up things to scare people and talk about fireballs and  
4 so on.

5 In that regard -- one of the things that I want  
6 to just point out, too, that a lot of this same stuff  
7 happened when they were talking about putting the county  
8 pipeline in and none of it came to fruition. The pipeline's  
9 there and you can drive along the county roads, cross over  
10 the pipeline, you don't even know it's there. Drive through  
11 the city, you don't know it's there.

12 Regarding the safety issues, one of the things  
13 that has happened that I don't think has been brought out  
14 yet tonight is the fact that eight of our local safety  
15 officials were taken back to Maryland and Louisiana and  
16 toured facilities there. I've talked to two of those  
17 officials -- and I'm talking about a fire chief for the City  
18 of Coos Bay was one of them, but police and fire officials,  
19 sheriff's people, eight of them toured these facilities and,  
20 in talking with those people, were reassured by officials of  
21 like mind and similar positions that they felt no hazard. I  
22 mean, there are potential, but they felt that the safety  
23 issue is adequately addressed and has been adequately  
24 addressed. One of the comments was oh, we've kind of  
25 forgotten that it's there. Even though they're intimately

1 involved in the process, it is well documented, the safety  
2 record of one fatality.

3 There was just a recent fatality of a blade  
4 coming off of a wind turbine and killing somebody. There's  
5 been nine fatalities in the wind turbine industry, and  
6 that's relatively new. LNG has been around for, you know,  
7 several decades.

8 I guess if you want to do the what if thing, I'm  
9 more scared about the four propane tanks under the North  
10 Bend -- under the McCauley Bridge. There are four propane  
11 tanks, they're 20,000 gallons apiece and if you talk about a  
12 hazard, you stop and think of the characteristics, explosive  
13 characteristics of propane versus LNG and what that would do  
14 if those should explode there.

15 That's all I really have for now. Thanks.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. SCOTT: Thank you. George Gephardt.

18 VOICE: He left.

19 MR. SCOTT: He left. Our first casualty.

20 We do have quite a long list yet of people who  
21 have signed up. So we have the room, I believe, until  
22 midnight. We will keep going. I'll be here, we'll be here.  
23 I don't know if we'll get any additional Staff here, so  
24 let's keep going I guess. George -- That's right, George  
25 Gephardt is gone. Jerry Briggs, and then after that M.A.

1 Rohner, I believe. Is Jerry Briggs here? No.

2 M.A. Rohner? How about Marvin Caldera? And then  
3 after Marvin Caldera, Sam Roth.

4 M.A., I think it's Rohner.

5 VOICE: Rohrer.

6 MR. SCOTT: I'm sorry. R-o-h-n-e-r.

7 MS. ROHRER: Hi. My name is MaryAnn Rohrer, M-a-  
8 r-y-A-n-n R-o-h-r-e-r.

9 I don't want to take up a lot of time, but I just  
10 wanted to say that I am against this LNG project. I would  
11 like to have a little more assuredness from the company that  
12 this is a safe project. Just recently we found out that  
13 there's a new route that's coming through our area and a lot  
14 of people in that area don't even know that it is going to  
15 affect them. I think that we do need to have -- FERC needs  
16 to allow us a longer period of time to respond to this draft  
17 EIS. I am very disappointed that we had such a good turnout  
18 of people and that the members of FERC are not here to hear  
19 us.

20 I think that the DEIS, from what I've been able  
21 to read of it, is deficient in its being able to let the  
22 people know exactly what kind of environmental impact is  
23 going to result from this, and I would hope that they would  
24 go back to the drawing board and do their homework.

25 Anyway, thanks everybody for coming and I do hope

1 that the citizens of this community can get together and  
2 realize that there are alternative energies that we all can  
3 participate in and make this community grow strong. We can  
4 do it if everybody just sticks together and takes a look at  
5 what's really going to protect our area and protect our land  
6 values, protect this beautiful southern Oregon coast that a  
7 lot of us came to for the reasons of clean air and all the  
8 reasons we all came here and stayed.

9 Anyway, thanks a lot.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

12 Marvin Caldera, and then Chris Hartz.

13 MR. CALDERA: M-a-r-v-i-n C-a-l-d-e-r-a.

14 Caldera, that's a volcano, part of a volcano.

15 Anyhow, I'm here to represent my longshoremen.

16 I'm Marvin Caldera, I'm president of the Local 12

17 longshoremen. And on our union meeting night, Wednesday,

18 November the 9th, 2005, the longshoremen voted for me to

19 attend the next Port meeting and give the Port our support

20 on the land purchase and the liquid natural gas valve on the

21 North Spit. So that means we're in favor of it.

22 So thank you very much.

23 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. SCOTT: Chris Hartz, and then after Chris

1 Hartz, Timothy Singlin -- Singler.

2 Chris Hartz.

3 MR. HARTZ: Yes, I'm Chris Hartz, that's C-h-r-i-  
4 s H-a-r-t-z. I'm currently the standing president of the  
5 Coos County Board of Real Estate Affiliates. And on October  
6 the 16th, we had a vote with the Coos County Board of Real  
7 Estate and they had unanimously voted consent for the LNG.  
8 And I must tell you that we do that on an economic basis.

9 When I hear the passion today from the people pro  
10 and con, I can't hardly believe that FERC or anyone else  
11 would allow this to continue without a full investigation,  
12 without a full DEIS, without hearing the voice of the people  
13 here today. I really truly believe that.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. HARTZ: I am in favor of the LNG on an  
16 economic basis, okay. We can talk about people coming and  
17 retiring. I came to this town five years ago and retired.  
18 I contribute to this community. I love this community.  
19 Okay. I know we will prosper with jobs. We need the tax  
20 base. We have children, we have wives and we have a  
21 community we're supposed to protect.

22 I don't think FERC or any other agency would  
23 allow that to happen without full disclosure. If what the  
24 opponents say -- or the proponents say or the opponents say,  
25 that we have not had a full investigation, then we need to

1 have one.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. HARTZ: I've never been to a forum where  
4 there's been so much passion. We've even heard people talk  
5 about Thomas Jefferson. I'm a Jeffersonian and I understand  
6 we're not a democracy, we're a republic. And we vote to put  
7 people in, we vote for a process, we vote for people to  
8 protect us. Okay. We don't go out and arm ourselves in  
9 opposition of our government. We're not those type of  
10 people. And heck, I own a gun store in North Bend. Okay.  
11 I'm not here to sell firearms, okay. And I don't think  
12 anybody would ever do anything to harm our country or our  
13 process. But this process is very important, not only for  
14 us but for the people that we speak to.

15 FERC doesn't have to be here. They're listening  
16 to us now. We don't need a pound of flesh to reach out and  
17 grab somebody by the throat. We just need to  
18 compassionately tell them we have concerns. We're citizens.  
19 Economically, yes, this is a wonderful thing to happen. We  
20 need these jobs. We need the economy. My gosh, \$10  
21 million, maybe we could even take North Bend -- some of you  
22 folks that are from out of town who came down here to speak,  
23 we welcome you, we thank you very much for your passion for  
24 what you believe in. We could say a lot of things in favor  
25 of the LNG like, let's see, more people have been killed in

1 the parking lot of Plenty Village than have died in LNG  
2 disasters, okay. We don't know.

3 We could all come up with great statistics. Dr.  
4 Morgan, I applaud you on your remarks. I come from a small  
5 town originally in California in Modesto, and it's cattle  
6 country. And we also have low fog in the wintertime. You  
7 get that much methane gas buildup in any area, it's not a  
8 good thing. But thank God we live by the coast.

9 I would like FERC to please consider all of us  
10 here today, both pro and con, and the passionate arguments  
11 from our scientists or our doctors. I haven't heard a lot  
12 of scientific information to stop this, but I've heard a lot  
13 of people who are intelligent people that have concerns, so  
14 I ask FERC to listen to us as a community.

15 Thank you very much.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

18 Timothy Singler, Singlin possibly? No. We can  
19 catch you again if we miss you.

20 Stephanie Messerle? And then Camby Collier after  
21 that.

22 MS. MESSERLE: My name is Stephanie Messerle M-e-  
23 s-s-e-r-l-e. I am a fifth generation Coos Bay resident. My  
24 husband and I recently chose to move back to Coos Bay and  
25 were fortunate enough to be able to move into my

1 grandparents' house where my dad was raised and next to  
2 where I grew up. I wish to speak about my opposition to the  
3 preferred pipeline route WC-1A and its adverse impact to the  
4 community I chose to move back to and deeply care about. I  
5 believe the amended Blue Bridge alternate route would be a  
6 better choice for the environment and for rural communities.

7  
8 First, I'm concerned about the pipeline's impact  
9 on my domestic water source. I believe the pipeline's  
10 proximity to my water source could have adverse impacts  
11 during the construction phase of the pipeline as well as  
12 long-term impacts from routine maintenance of the pipeline.  
13 I would like to know how Pacific Connector pipeline will  
14 prevent erosion and thus sediment from entering my water  
15 source.

16 Second, I'm concerned the pipeline would increase  
17 trespassing by ATV and motorcycles bringing with it  
18 increased theft, vandalism and increased erosion and  
19 environmental damage along the pipeline right-of-way and on  
20 private land. Also with increased trespass on private land  
21 is an increased risk of forest fires. I would like to know  
22 how Pacific Connector pipeline is going to prevent  
23 trespassing on private land via the pipeline right-of-way.

24 My third concern about the impacts of the  
25 pipeline right-of-way -- my third concern are the impacts

1 the pipeline right-of-way will have on small woodlot owners.  
2 Bisecting these forest tracts would reduce the landowner's  
3 ability to economically harvest their timber. Taking away  
4 the land and the right-of-ways from forest production would  
5 have large ramifications on the ability of the landowners to  
6 maintain viable commercial timber lots. I'm also concerned  
7 the pipeline right-of-ways would introduce non-native plants  
8 to private property, including commercial timber lands.

9 I believe the amended Blue Bridge alternate route  
10 would alleviate the concerns I've stated. The amended Blue  
11 Ridge alternate route would greatly reduce the impacts to  
12 private landowners, domestic water sources, small timber  
13 owners and communities. I'm asking FERC to re-examine the  
14 amended Blue Bridge alternate route at a more detailed level  
15 than the tabletop exercise they conducted under the draft  
16 EIS.

17 Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. SCOTT: Camby Collier, and then Terry Mills.

20 MS. COLLIER: C-a-m as in Mary b-y Collier, C-o-l-  
21 l-i-e-r.

22 And I have read the draft EIS. I will be  
23 submitting my comments. I'm just going to speak on one item  
24 tonight. Thank you for being here.

25 MR. SCOTT: You're welcome.

1 MS. COLLIER: Definitely a long night.

2 On 1-33 -- well, it's line one-dash and then the  
3 pages are 33 to 40 -- it's public review and comment. So  
4 there's like seven pages devoted to public review and  
5 comment in the draft EIS. And I thought I'd comment on the  
6 public comment -- actually lack of public comment.

7 I do know that our government does routinely need  
8 to use eminent domain for projects for the national good,  
9 you know, power lines, gas pipeline, substations, dams,  
10 interstate roads, military establishments, but this LNG  
11 project is not for our national good. I have -- since  
12 following this for almost four years, I know what's going on  
13 nationally and internationally with LNG. It has been  
14 extremely volatile, very interesting. I know about  
15 contracts between Iran and India and about the Russia gas  
16 and what they're doing and what they do in Europe. I know  
17 about Australia and Indonesia countries, their contracts.

18 And we have come up with so many domestic  
19 supplies lately, mostly in shale -- and LNG in itself is  
20 good, LNG vehicles. I wouldn't mind a peak shaving plant --  
21 storage out here like Newport. That wouldn't bother me at  
22 all.

23 But what has happened is that his proposed LNG  
24 terminal will make billions of dollars whether importing or,  
25 more likely, exporting LNG. But when something comes into

1       our area like this, I don't know where the cutoff is. I  
2       mean, with something of this magnitude, we should have a say  
3       in this, the people that live here. You know, we don't need  
4       to have a say -- we can have concerns on most businesses,  
5       but when something dramatically changes our whole dynamics  
6       and will alter our channel forever, we somehow should have a  
7       say.

8                   And immediately when I found out about this, I  
9       went, I drove to Coquille, I went to the county  
10      commissioners and I said who's in charge of this? Because  
11      once I started having questions, I wanted answers. Who's in  
12      charge of protecting us and representing us in Coos County?  
13      And they told me to go see Bob Braddock. Which I did and he  
14      is a very nice man and gave me lots of information that I  
15      did need. I have enjoyed his information over the years and  
16      coming to some forums. But that's who they sent me to.

17                   But I go no, I want an elected official. Who's  
18      representing us here in Coos County? And that started this  
19      whole thing. I mean, I have a stained glass window I  
20      started 3-1/2 years ago. I just saw it on my workbench.  
21      And that's when all this happened and I have not been able  
22      to complete that because this took my attention dramatically  
23      away.

24                   And by the way, I am with Citizens Against LNG  
25      here locally.

1           And I'm going who is representing us? And I  
2 wanted them to tell us what was going on. And I don't mind  
3 pro and con, I'm a big girl, tell me what's good about this?  
4 Tell me what's bad about it. Let us make a decision. But  
5 it should be from our county commissioners. They're our  
6 representatives. And then we should be able to get an  
7 advisory vote on this. And you know we are very depressed,  
8 maybe most of the people would say it's worth the risk. I  
9 personally don't see that, especially for taking people's  
10 land.

11           When it first came through, they were going to  
12 use our pipeline and a small ship. Then it's gone to this -  
13 - some people to this day think they're going to use our  
14 pipeline.

15           At the county level there should have been an  
16 advisory person, they should have mailed out mailers to  
17 every single person in the county about this. You know, you  
18 can't just -- a lot of people don't read maybe The World or  
19 where they put their meeting notice. Or some people that do  
20 read -- I have read people that have overlooked the meeting  
21 notice that do get The World, you know.

22           And there's other people that might want input on  
23 this, especially if they knew a vote was coming on what is  
24 this about, because this isn't like just an opinion, you  
25 know, like a casino. You're for it or against it. This you

1 had to study a bit. And you might be for it, you might be  
2 against it, but we have been taken away our rights. And  
3 according to the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, our  
4 fourth amendment says the right of the people were to be  
5 secure in their persons and houses against unreasonable  
6 seizures and that shall not be violated. And I feel with us  
7 not having a vote before FERC and Williams get involved in  
8 their public comments that it has taken away our fourth  
9 amendment rights.

10 And you know maybe everybody does want this here.  
11 From what I studied, I can't see a reason for it. But when  
12 we come to our FERC public comments, you feel like you're  
13 just talking to the wind. I know you tried to put a really  
14 good draft EIS together. I have read the whole thing. I  
15 don't know how many other people have read the whole draft  
16 EIS. I, who am not in the industry, see a lot of loopholes  
17 and if I was for this I would have wanted an airtight draft  
18 EIS nobody could poke little holes in. And if I can poke  
19 holes in it, I'm sure other people with more scientific  
20 background can see through it, too.

21 So since our draft EIS did take seven pages to  
22 talk about public review and comment, I just wanted to say  
23 what I thought should have been done. And until those  
24 things are incorporated with our vote, I do not feel that  
25 our counties of Coos, Douglas, Jackson and Klamath have been

1 served. And only after that vote can we get Jordan Cove and  
2 Williams involved. I see a lot of waste. I actually will be  
3 submitting a two-page paper on what I see as the current  
4 process and how it should be different. Not that we don't  
5 need some of these things in our country, but the process  
6 does need to be different and we hope to vote out a few  
7 people in November, too.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

11 Terry Mills, and then Jessica Bricks -- I  
12 apologize, I think I got that wrong.

13 MR. MILLS: My name is Terry Mills, T-e-r-r-y M-  
14 i-l-l-s. And I just want to mention a couple of things. I  
15 really do think that FERC needs to extend the comment  
16 period. We need to be able to see all of these things that  
17 are not provided to us that need to be provided to us to  
18 make an informed choice.

19 And I'd also like to just mention that a lot of  
20 people have taken a lot of time to inform themselves. We as  
21 a community are more educated about energy needs regionally,  
22 nationally, internationally because of this project. Ron  
23 Opitz says that we're not experts, but we have informed  
24 ourselves as citizens and I think that that's a good thing.

25 LNG needs projections cited in this EIS have been

1 furnished by JCE and PCGP, SCDC, GTN, INGAA, CEC, EIA and  
2 other natural gas representative. They're based on needs-  
3 driven data which is false and misleading. It's a sales  
4 pitch designed to establish a projected description of a  
5 need which does not exist. These partial truths must not be  
6 accepted as whole truth.

7 By shifting the approach of this and other LNG  
8 proposals away from a needs-driven to capacity-focused  
9 development, the arguments in favor of this project dissolve  
10 away like the investment scam it is. When we look at state,  
11 regional and national energy development in terms of assets,  
12 capacities and abilities, the importation of foreign LNG is  
13 exposed as a boondoggle.

14 Alternatives to this proposed LNG development  
15 contained in this draft EIS seem only to be mentioned on the  
16 briefest and most superficial level and dismissed without  
17 much consideration. Take note FERC, FERC is in violation of  
18 the law if these alternatives are not more thoroughly  
19 addressed. If we assess state, regional and national energy  
20 development needs for the west and southwest regions  
21 discussed in this EIS, namely, Washington, Oregon, northern  
22 California and northern Nevada, we'd find that Washington,  
23 Oregon and northern California don't need additional natural  
24 gas. Arguments might be made that additional natural gas  
25 might be needed for southern California and part of Nevada,

1 but even that is up for debate when these areas are assessed  
2 for their solar capacity asset base.

3 In fact, according to the American Solar Energy  
4 Society, with the appropriate public policy -- which Camby  
5 just mentioned we might actually get -- renewable energy and  
6 energy efficiency industries could generate up to \$4.5  
7 trillion in revenue and as many as 40 million jobs in the  
8 U.S. by the year 2030.

9 Dr. Ted Brekken of the OSU Wave Energy Institute  
10 has stated that 2 percent of the oceans' energy could power  
11 the world. Hydrokinetic power holds a lot of promise for  
12 the future.

13 In 2006, Washington state passed the Energy  
14 Independence Act and renewal portfolio standard requiring  
15 electric utilities to establish 15 percent power generation  
16 from renewable sources by 2020. In Oregon, similar laws  
17 have established a renewable generation goal of 25 percent  
18 by 2020. California's renewable portfolio standard calls  
19 for 33 percent renewable energy by 2020. Clearly the trend  
20 is away from fossil fuel and especially away from imported  
21 fossil fuel.

22 In May of 2006, the Portland City Council adopted  
23 Resolution 36407 establishing the Peak Oil Task Force and  
24 charged it with examining the potential economic and social  
25 consequences of peak oil in Portland. Its March 2007

1 recommendations published in Descending the Oil Peak:  
2 Navigating the Transition from Oil and Natural Gas -- which,  
3 by the way, is being used as a model for community planning  
4 throughout the word -- states that achieving a significant  
5 reduction in oil and natural gas use is a necessity for  
6 easing the transition to an energy constrained future and  
7 recommends that Portland reduce total oil and natural gas  
8 consumption by 50 percent over the next 25 years.

9           According to Energy Planning: A Guide for  
10 Northwest Indian Tribes, while energy conservation and  
11 efficiency make up the base of our energy pyramid, even the  
12 most efficient tribe building their house will have  
13 remaining energy needs. Renewable energy generation allows  
14 those needs to be met in a way that is clean and  
15 environmentally friendly. Renewable energy projects, unlike  
16 traditional fossil fuel or nuclear power, do not pollute  
17 air, water or land to meet energy needs. In addition, local  
18 renewable energy projects offer not only energy independence  
19 and security, but also jobs and other economic development  
20 opportunities.

21           Besides the multiple-megawatt solar projects  
22 currently in pre-production development in southern  
23 California, Nevada and Arizona, the City of Medford, Oregon  
24 recently entered into an agreement with Sun Energy Power  
25 Corporation of Bend to develop a 2.9 megawatt solar electric

1 power plant which will offset CO2 equivalent to taking 284  
2 cars off the road each year.

3 The Apollo Alliance, an alliance of labor,  
4 manufacturing and political leadership is calling for a  
5 commitment to renewable energy which will add more than 3.3  
6 million jobs to the economy, stimulate \$1.4 trillion in new  
7 gross domestic product, add \$953 billion in personal income  
8 and \$324 billion in retail sales. And it will provide \$284  
9 billion in net energy cost savings all within the next 10  
10 years.

11 This initiative will require national fuel  
12 consumption -- excuse me, reduce national fuel consumption  
13 by 16 percent, reduce petroleum transportation consumption  
14 1.25 to 2.55 million barrels per day, which is the  
15 equivalent of cutting Persian Gulf imports between 54 and  
16 110 percent, replace 38 percent of the current  
17 transportation fleet with 91 million advance performance  
18 vehicles, meet 15 percent of electricity demand with  
19 renewables by 2015 and 20 percent by 2020, and it will  
20 reduce sulfur dioxide by 28 percent, nitrous oxide by 13  
21 percent, and carbon dioxide by 23 percent. Investment in  
22 clean renewable energy will reduce dependence on fossil  
23 fuel, reduce demand for natural gas, restore America's  
24 leadership in technology, make our cities more efficient and  
25 our companies more profitable and competitive and rebuild

1 our aging public infrastructure.

2 MR. SCOTT: Mr. Mills, can you wrap it up,  
3 please?

4 MR. MILLS: Clearly through these few examples  
5 growth in demand for imported foreign natural gas is on a  
6 downward trend and does not support the statistics supplied  
7 by JCE and PCGP, SCDC and the numerous other natural gas  
8 salesmen cited in this EIS. And myself and others who have  
9 taken the time to review their claims recommend that the  
10 FERC Commission select option one and deny the Jordan Cove  
11 project proposal.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

14 Jesse, is it R-I-C-K-S. I apologize. And then  
15 Gary LeTellier will be next.

16 MR. RICKS: Jesse Ricks, R-i-c-k-s.

17 I'm really appalled. We were expecting to have  
18 FERC here tonight. Very disappointed, been waiting on this  
19 for years. It's been a couple of years since I was able to  
20 get up and speak. The last time I think was out at the  
21 college and I was able to address Mr. Braddock. I asked him  
22 that night when everybody throughout the state had already  
23 made their appearances throughout the state, and I asked him  
24 I said what is it that you don't understand about no, you  
25 know, we don't want LNG? No. So he gave me -- he laughed

1 it off.

2 And I told him that, you know, you can go ahead  
3 and put it in, build all your pipeline, do whatever you want  
4 to, you put it in but we will take it out. We will take it  
5 out.

6 I am a 30-year military veteran, 18 years in the  
7 Seabees, acquainted with underwater demolition and many  
8 other things. And, you know, it's not going to go through.  
9 There's enough veterans in this state that will not let this  
10 happen.

11 You know, I came in the service in 1946 and I  
12 laid my life on the line for 30 years, okay, for my country.  
13 Now I am 80 years old and I am ready to lay my life on the  
14 line in defeat of this particular project. Now I grant you  
15 I will, if necessary, along with several other veterans in  
16 this state. We don't want it, we don't need it, we're not  
17 going to have it. Okay. Okay.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. RICKS: We're not going to have it. So I  
20 don't know how else -- what other way I can express it more  
21 clearer. But you know it's not going to exist. It's not  
22 going to exist. We'll take it out.

23 Thank you very much.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

1 Gary?

2 MR. SCOTT: Okay. And then Daniel Verusien next.

3 MR. BRIGGS: I beg your indulgence. My name is  
4 John Briggs, not Gary LeTellier. I am a member of the Coos  
5 County Airport Commission. Mr. LeTellier has recently had a  
6 physical problem and this evening -- I talked to him about  
7 an hour ago and I told him to go home because he was needing  
8 to go home.

9 So I'm going to read his testimony before the  
10 FERC on the draft environmental impact statement siting of  
11 LNG. His name is Gary, G-a-r-y, capital L-e -- oh, you have  
12 it? Very good.

13 Good evening. My name is Gary LeTellier and I am  
14 the Executive Director of the Coos County Airport District.  
15 I have asked for time this evening to enter a brief  
16 statement into the public record.

17 The Coos County Airport Commission has not taken  
18 an official position on the Jordan Cove Energy Project  
19 proposal to date, nor am I here to do so this evening.  
20 Instead, I am here to address an issue involving this  
21 project and its potential for impact to the ongoing  
22 operations of the Southwest Oregon Regional Airport.

23 The airport district is charged under Federal Law  
24 14 CFR Part 139 and 49 CFR Part 1520 for the safe and secure  
25 operation of the Southwest Oregon Regional Airport. These

1 responsibilities also extend to the air space that surrounds  
2 our community, the proposed LNG facilities and the waterways  
3 that would be transited by ships serving the facility.

4           There have been statements made implying that LNG  
5 shipping traffic and even the facility itself could/would  
6 cause the closure of the airport. We have studied the draft  
7 environmental impact statement issued by FERC in August of  
8 2008, along with the Jordan Cove Energy Project Marine  
9 Traffic Suitability Study, the Emergency Response Plan,  
10 Resource List and discussed the project with the Federal  
11 Aviation Administration's Airspace and Airport Certification  
12 Branches.

13           To date we have found nothing that could affect  
14 the daily operations of the Southwest Oregon Regional  
15 Airport to the point of restrictions or closure. We do note  
16 that Jordan Cove has filed an FAA Form 7460 under FAR Part  
17 77 requesting an airspace determination for the proposed LNG  
18 plant and ships transiting the harbor. A preliminary staff  
19 opinion has found no derogation of existing airspace and/or  
20 instrument approaches to the Southwest Oregon Regional  
21 Airport.

22           We also note that the U.S. Coast Guard retains  
23 the jurisdiction for the safe and secure maritime passage of  
24 the LNG vessels. There remains the possibility of vessel  
25 over flight restrictions, but that is considered to be a

1 minor vectoring issue to be handled by local air traffic  
2 control personnel.

3 We thank you for this opportunity to enter  
4 testimony into the public record and reassure the community  
5 that the Airport District Commission will continue to  
6 monitor this project closely to ensure that there will be no  
7 compromise to the safe, secure and efficient operations of  
8 the Southwest Oregon Regional Airport.

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. SCOTT: Daniel Feruzian?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. SCOTT: Ike Lowenstein?

14 (No response.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Dennis Phillips? Okay, and then  
16 Knute Nemeth will be up next.

17 MR. PHILLIPS: Dennis Phillips, D-e-n-n-i-s P-h-  
18 i-double l-i-p-s, representing Oregon Optimal Population  
19 Society, also known as OOPS. And I'd like to get a three-  
20 minute warning, if possible, because I have a three-minute  
21 intro that I don't want to go over on. I only have about  
22 one minute of testimony.

23 MR. SCOTT: Okay.

24 MR. PHILLIPS: I'll start by giving you some good  
25 news. This has been a bad night for your corporation. My

1 environmental impact statement testimony on the Endangered  
2 Species Act I wrote 14 months ago expecting that you would  
3 neglect to survey for several species, you did it and you  
4 found one of them. So congratulations, one part of the  
5 document was done well. In my written testimony, I'm going  
6 to point out five or six other areas where you screwed up  
7 badly, though, but I'll just read one of them tonight after  
8 my introduction.

9 Oh and I'll point out also that there's been a  
10 lot of comments about the people of Citizens Against LNG  
11 being negative -- opposed to growth, here we are. I've been  
12 watching a lot of people stand up here being opposed by 40  
13 to 60 percent of the audience, I know I'm standing up here  
14 being opposed by about 98 percent, assuming there's one  
15 other person in the audience that agrees with my testimony  
16 in my introduction.

17 VOICE: Could you speak into the mike, please?

18 MR. PHILLIPS: Oh yeah, sorry about that.

19 So there's a piece by Kafka called Metamorphosis  
20 in which a character wakes up one day and finds out that  
21 he's a cockroach, and I've had the personal experience of  
22 waking up after 18 years and finding out I'm a cancer cell  
23 and the cancer has grown by a factor of two since that time  
24 when I first made that realization. We've exceeded our  
25 carrying capacity. Our ability to continue at the level

1 that we're at is not at all in existence, there's no way  
2 we're going to keep on growing. According to the Georgia  
3 Guidestones, for example, we're about 11 times above  
4 carrying capacity.

5 It's sort of like if you -- we've got the cart  
6 before the horse. If you've got the pasture and you put too  
7 many cows on it, then you start having to figure out where  
8 to get more grass, whereas if you look at how much grass  
9 you've got first, then you can figure out how many cows will  
10 fit on the pasture. We've done it backwards.

11 We need to look at our renewable sustainable  
12 alternative energy sources and figure out based on that how  
13 many people can be here instead of having so many times more  
14 than what's possible. The native people for 9000 years had  
15 a sustainable economy with 100 percent unemployment. We can  
16 do better.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. PHILLIPS: I'll just jump ahead to my --  
19 well, let's see, there may be a couple more things to throw  
20 in before my actual -- oh yes, voting rights. I think it's  
21 important that we vote and I'm disappointed that there's  
22 only species given the right to vote. I think the raccoons  
23 and the ravens should at least be included. Other species  
24 to be presented by other people with different ideas on  
25 which ones are appropriate.

1           So my testimony on the EIS is as follows. It's  
2           in the section -- my written testimony is the section on  
3           insufficient range of alternatives and arbitrary purpose and  
4           need. Reading from another document, I'll note that NEPA  
5           requires agencies to develop a range of alternatives to meet  
6           the -- quote, unquote -- purpose and need. In the range of  
7           alternative section, agencies -- quote -- "shall, a,  
8           rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable  
9           alternatives and, for alternatives which were eliminated  
10          from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their  
11          having been eliminated." That's CFR 1502.14.

12                 In the case of the Jordan Cove Energy Project and  
13          Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline EIS, far from getting a  
14          rigorous evaluation of all reasonable alternatives, we are  
15          given the travesty of only two alternatives. Now Ron  
16          Sadler, who was pretty unhappy about this EIS and who's much  
17          more knowledgeable than I was is giving you more credit than  
18          I can find. In my limited experience on dealing with EISs  
19          as a member of the staff of the Bureau of Land Management  
20          some 20 years ago, using that background, I could only find  
21          two alternatives, which is much worse than the 12 that Ron  
22          was mentioning. There's the Jordan Cove Energy Project and  
23          the no action alternative.

24                 Beginning on page 3-1 of the EIS, there is a  
25          listing of six so-called FERC alternatives, including system

1 alternatives, pipeline route alternatives, et cetera. Only  
2 however in a small section devoted to LNG terminal  
3 alternatives, site alternatives, is there discussion of what  
4 could under any definition used in NEPA or the legislation  
5 establishing the EIS process be defined as true  
6 alternatives.

7 I guess that's enough.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

10 Knute Nemeth and then George Gephardt.

11 VOICE: George left.

12 VOICE: George left.

13 MR. NEMETH: Knute Nemeth. K-n-u-t-e N-e-m-e-t-  
14 h, Charleston, Oregon. Thank you everybody for being out  
15 here. This is a community-wide event, whether you're for or  
16 against, we're all part of this community when it's all said  
17 and done.

18 Port Ordinance 129 was voted by the Port  
19 electorate in 1992. It set several limits, environmental  
20 limits on companies coming in and making deals with the  
21 Port. One of those limits is hydrogen sulfide. Nowhere in  
22 any documents of Jordan Cove that I've seen, neither  
23 Resource Report 9 or in the DEIS, have I seen any levels,  
24 figures backed by scientific data as to how much hydrogen  
25 sulfide will be coming in here with this. Hydrogen sulfide

1 is a natural-occurring component of natural gas. It varies  
2 depending on the formation you get it from.

3 The Port has made a deal with Weyerhaeuser but by  
4 law they have to show the levels of hydrogen sulfide. If we  
5 are going to exceed it, then it has to be put to the voter  
6 electorate for a vote. Neither the Port nor Jordan Cove nor  
7 the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee has shown me any of  
8 these levels. I would hope that somebody would publish  
9 these levels -- Bob Braddock can do that, the Port of Coos  
10 Bay can do that, the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee can  
11 do that.

12 This is law. It's in the law. The law needs to  
13 be respected. We're a law-abiding community. When we vote  
14 laws, we vote them to be used, respected. It's not too much  
15 to ask for these levels to be published so we can see what's  
16 going on.

17 Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

20 Frank Williams.

21 (No response.)

22 Jean Larochello.

23 (No response.)

24 No? P.J. Keizer. Okay.

25 And then Lisa -- I apologize, I'm -- Lisa --

1       okay.

2                   DR. KEIZER: I am Dr. Philip John Keizer, Junior,  
3       also known as P.J. Keizer. I'm a seventh generation  
4       Oregonian and fourth generation physician in this community.

5  
6                   In my original testimony at our scoping meeting  
7       at Southwestern Oregon Community College, I asked for an  
8       analysis of a worst-case scenario for a spill of LNG from  
9       both the ship and the terminal, as well as from a breach of  
10      the pipeline. The draft environmental impact statement does  
11      not include this. Multiple sections of the EIS state a  
12      spill of LNG is unlikely and therefore poses no impact.

13                   (Laughter.)

14                   MR. KEIZER: This is an unacceptable response.  
15      The facility poses both low consequence with higher  
16      probability and low probability with higher consequence  
17      risks. We've heard people here today -- tonight who want to  
18      discount the low probability high consequence risks. Those  
19      are risks that we also need to consider.

20                   All such risks pose environmental and public  
21      safety issues which are not addressed completely in the  
22      draft EIS. Simply stating the risk as low probability or  
23      stating that safety procedures will be developed is not an  
24      assessment of the environmental impact, it is simply an  
25      excuse not to do the work.

1           The first copy of the EIS had all blank pages  
2           which now ironically foreshadows the quality of the version  
3           with printed words.

4           (Laughter.)

5           DR. KEIZER: The design criteria accident is  
6           based upon a contained accident. Most of the calculations  
7           are based upon an assumption that only a fraction of one  
8           tank would ever leak. Unfortunately, this ship has five  
9           tanks. The worst-case scenario means what is the worst  
10          possible, not the most likely, what is the worst possible  
11          accident. That means all the LNG from all the tanks and a  
12          complete failure of the terminal with complete breach and  
13          release of all the LNG, not 10 percent of it.

14          It also means a breach of the pipeline and  
15          failure of the safety valves. It includes secondary fires.  
16          It includes multiple weather condition considerations. It  
17          includes secondary failure of adjacent facilities and  
18          restrictions upon types of facilities that can be allowed  
19          within a specific radius. It includes the impact on people,  
20          wildlife, wetland, soil, water, air, et cetera.

21          If a fraction of one tank is expected to cause  
22          second-degree burns on bare skin at 30 seconds at an  
23          incidence of 1.25 miles and to people further away with more  
24          time, then it is reasonable to assume that a worst case  
25          accident would be far worse. We need a better evaluation on

1 expected number of dead and injured.

2 Many of our physicians, allied health  
3 professionals, EMTs, firefighters and Coast Guard live and  
4 work close enough to the shipping lane, terminal and  
5 pipeline to be among the dead and severely injured. Our  
6 medical facilities are not equipped or prepared for anything  
7 close to this type of mass casualty. Evacuation of critical  
8 patients could also likely be hampered by the proximity of  
9 the airport to the LNG terminal.

10 Assessment of pipeline failure also has not been  
11 complete. Pipeline failures have been occurring. So to say  
12 it is unlikely and therefore not important is an inadequate  
13 response. Furthermore, the land route through Glasgow  
14 peninsula remains on the plan even though the public was  
15 told that route was no longer being considered. This  
16 demonstrates poor character on the part of Williams Pipeline  
17 and Jordan Cove Energy Project.

18 And in considering the environmental impact, it  
19 is important to consider all species, including homo  
20 sapiens. While we are not on the endangered species list,  
21 people are more important than marine organisms and  
22 commercial oyster beds, especially if the oysters are not  
23 even native to the area. All the proposed pipeline routes  
24 head south through additional residential areas. People  
25 live in these areas because it's nice property. Some of

1       them are right here.

2                   Well if it would be more expensive the pipeline  
3       should course east through the forest land and not go  
4       through the residential areas. The purpose of eminent  
5       domain is not to profit a foreign company at the expense of  
6       citizens.

7                   As far as the local economy, the benefit of LNG  
8       is a relatively small number of jobs. The risk benefit  
9       ratio is not favorable. We need to stimulate our local  
10      economy, but we are not this desperate. I do not see a  
11      rainbow with a pot of gold, I see unnecessary risk and loss  
12      of private property for small gain to the community and  
13      potential large gain for a foreign company at our expense.

14                  The draft EIS is incomplete. Assessment of  
15      worst-case scenario accident has not been evaluated. Low  
16      probability events do happen. The lottery has horrible  
17      odds, yet eventually someone seems to win, just not me. Who  
18      would have thought that the Rays would be in the World  
19      Series at the beginning of the baseball season? Unlikely  
20      events do happen.

21                  The public comment period should be extended with  
22      another public comment meeting like we have here tonight,  
23      only with FERC present, after the revisions have been made  
24      to the draft EIS. Furthermore, the true risk of this  
25      project has not been adequately evaluated and an appropriate

1 emergency response plan has not been proposed. The public  
2 comment period should also extend through the completion of  
3 the emergency response plan and we should have the  
4 opportunity to comment on it again in a forum like tonight.

5 If the design criteria accident is for 12,500  
6 cubic meters of LNG, then the facility should be limited to  
7 a maximum of 12,500 cubic meters at any one time. If the  
8 facility should want to increase the capacity in the future,  
9 then the environmental impact and worst-case accident for  
10 that volume should be considered with public comment.

11 Furthermore, a better Oregon alternative has  
12 already been approved. The Bradwood Landing site would have  
13 a significantly shorter pipeline requirement. In these  
14 difficult economic times, it is an expensive waste of  
15 resources to continue with this process for the Jordan Cove  
16 site when even Mr. Braddock of Jordan Cove project admits  
17 only one site could be economically viable. The real market  
18 for the natural gas is California, why even consider sites  
19 in Oregon only to require piping to California. With the  
20 increased demand for LNG in Asia, LNG may not be  
21 economically viable at all compared to domestic energy  
22 sources.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

1 Lisa Lagesse and then Beverly Signer.

2 MS. LAGESSE: My name is Lisa Lagesse. Lagesse  
3 is spelled L-a-g-e-s-s-e.

4 I'm here tonight to represent a group called  
5 Glasgow Against Pipeline. Sometimes we go by GAP. I'm the  
6 mother of three. I live in Glasgow near the proposed land  
7 route for the pipeline. This is the same route that we were  
8 told publicly would be abandoned.

9 A while back I attended one of the Jordan Cove  
10 meetings at the Mill Casino where I expressed some of my  
11 concerns with this route. I was put in contact with the  
12 engineer that was studying this particular route. At that  
13 time the engineer took quite a bit of time to explain to me  
14 why this route was too dangerous and would not be viable.  
15 The Jordan Cove engineer explained that the pipeline would  
16 need to go under 101 and then make a very sharp curve to go  
17 up into Glasgow. She said that the massive amounts of  
18 pressure it was gonna take to push the gas to Milan, when it  
19 hit this curve in the pipe, it would cause a weakness there  
20 that would be very dangerous and she saw no way that this  
21 would be a viable route. So you can imagine my surprise  
22 when I opened the environmental impact statement and that  
23 route is still in there.

24 Based on this information I was given from the  
25 engineer, I am concerned for the safety of both my family

1 and the other residents. Installing the pipeline could  
2 destabilize the side of the ridge and cause slides. A fire  
3 from a pipeline accident could burn our homes. The road  
4 access in this area is limited, with few if any alternative  
5 routes. Many trees surround the area which could easily  
6 result in secondary fires. We could be trapped very easily.  
7 Pipeline accidents may be low probability, but they do  
8 happen. There have been even recent accidents in the news.

9

10 I find it absurd that people are valued less than  
11 other animals and marine organisms. I understand it is less  
12 expensive to choose a route through residential areas and  
13 that it is easier to claim eminent domain than to fill out  
14 the paperwork to course through a marine environment or  
15 through forest land with potential endangered species, but  
16 that does not make it the right thing to do. Safeguards  
17 were placed to protect those areas. We need the same  
18 safeguards or even more strict safeguards to protect our  
19 families. Our children are our future.

20 The draft environmental impact statement does not  
21 adequately address the impact to the people living along the  
22 route. Furthermore, we do not have an adequate emergency  
23 response plan. In fact, it is unclear what that emergency  
24 response plan is, so we cannot even comment on it.

25 The draft environmental impact statement needs to

1 address these issues and the public comment period needs to  
2 be extended to allow us to comment on the changes to the  
3 document.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

6 Beverly Signer, and then Stephen Cridenbaugh.

7 MS. SIGNER: Beverly Signer, S-e-g-n-e-r.

8 First, I'd like to respectfully request that this  
9 meeting be rescheduled and have that on the record, since  
10 there is not a representative of FERC present. And also I'm  
11 concerned about the inadequacies in the public address  
12 system that were going on at the beginning of the meeting  
13 and so some of the testimony I'm concerned may not have been  
14 recorded properly, nor were people able to hear all of it.

15 Also it's a serious concern to me -- no one's  
16 brought this up -- that early in 2000 there was an Executive  
17 Order signed by the President of the United States that  
18 clearly states that to expedite the placement of natural gas  
19 pipelines and that everything all -- they listed all the  
20 agencies that should be involved in expediting these  
21 pipelines, and I don't think that people in the community  
22 are aware of that, just as the basis for the foundation of  
23 FERC and what they're required to do, which is expedite  
24 projects like this.

25 I have a -- first I want to check on something.

1 Did you say that after people would have their five minutes  
2 that there would be other opportunity for initial comments?

3 MR. SCOTT: Yup, if people want to stick around.

4 MS. SIGNER: People -- me -- do.

5 MR. SCOTT: Okay.

6 MS. SIGNER: So you can stop me at five minutes.

7 MR. SCOTT: All right.

8 MS. SIGNER: First of all, I just -- I don't want  
9 to go over things that other people have said except to echo  
10 that obviously the alternatives are not adequately addressed  
11 as required by NEPA and that included the alternative of  
12 remote sitings and other similar projects throughout the  
13 region and, quite frankly, the United States.

14 Before I go through specifics throughout the  
15 document, I want to read something on page 5-20,  
16 socioeconomics: "No appreciable changes to the local  
17 population are expected to occur as a result of the proposed  
18 project. Construction of the slip is expected to take  
19 approximately 20 months and employ an average workforce of  
20 27 people for the duration of construction." That's about  
21 the terminal.

22 When you go down to: "Jordan Cove estimates that  
23 operation of the proposed LNG terminal would require a  
24 permanent staff of 56 employees. The Port does not  
25 anticipate that additional staff would be needed to operate

1 the slip. Pacific Connector estimates that operation of the  
2 pipeline would require a permanent staff of five employees  
3 stationed and residing at different locations along the  
4 pipeline."

5 I think that in terms of investigating the  
6 alternatives that there are probably alternatives for the  
7 region that would employ more people, and many examples have  
8 come up about that tonight and I think all those examples  
9 need to be addressed in the DEIS.

10 This is just for information for -- additional  
11 information for all the people who are interested in jobs.  
12 "Once the LNG terminal is placed in service, regular  
13 operation would consist of three daily shifts with a typical  
14 shift schedule as follows: days 7AM to 3PM 28 employees,  
15 swing 1PM" -- I'm sorry -- "3PM to 11PM nine employees,  
16 graveyard 11PM to 7AM nine employees."

17 I think we could have a project that would bring  
18 more jobs to our area than that. Throughout this document,  
19 page after page after page -- and I'm happy to go through  
20 each page with you this evening -- there are many places  
21 where, before the end of the comment period on the draft  
22 EIS, Jordan Cove should document review of this, present  
23 requirements of that, the emergency response plan,  
24 mitigation for plants like the vetch. There's all these  
25 issues that we don't have the reports for that -- and I'm

1 serious, I can go through every page.

2 MR. SCOTT: You can also provide that in writing.

3 MS. SIGNER: Oh no, I don't like to write. I'd  
4 rather talk.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. SCOTT: All right.

7 MS. SIGNER: The other thing is, just as another  
8 example, when they're talking about -- people don't realize  
9 that people can be asked to leave their homes by Williams  
10 during the pipeline construction. Did you know that?

11 There's pesticides that they're going to be using  
12 to keep the 30-foot corridor for the pipeline -- and this is  
13 what it says in the DEIS about this: "2,4-D is moderately  
14 toxic to animals, but this depends on the species and  
15 formulations. For example, dogs are more sensitive than  
16 rats and humans and dogs have developed lymphoma from  
17 exposure." I think the impact of that needs to be  
18 addressed, just as another example.

19 In relationship to -- one thing that we've been  
20 talking about fires and the zones of concern, the map that's  
21 in the document about the zones of concern, it doesn't show  
22 the current population and dwellings in part of the area and  
23 also the map and the drawing of the zone of concern around  
24 the terminal itself is not -- it doesn't go out far enough  
25 from the terminal in certain directions and I think that

1 needs to be addressed in the DEIS.

2 The tests that are done need to be site specific  
3 and the report, the Sandia report that talks about the  
4 result of accidents, a low wind speed and highly stable  
5 atmospheric condition was used for that, and anyone who  
6 hangs around in Coos Bay and North Bend knows that low wind  
7 speed isn't something that we experience very often.

8 The other thing that they say about spills and  
9 low probability disasters is that we have no experience with  
10 fires this large, but we do know they could not be  
11 extinguished, they would have to burn themselves out. And I  
12 think that needs to be addressed in terms of the DEIS and  
13 effect on people in the area of a potential spill, which  
14 does include numerous children. The NEPA requires that --

15 MR. SCOTT: If you're -- you've gone over five  
16 minutes and there's others here.

17 MS. SIGNER: Okay. Can I just say this one thing  
18 and then I'll stop until later?

19 MR. SCOTT: All right.

20 MS. SIGNER: It's here, I promise.

21 It is the policy of the U.S. EPA to consider  
22 risks to infants and children consistently and explicitly as  
23 part of risk assessments generated during its decision  
24 making process. The Agency will develop a separate  
25 assessment of risk to infants and children or state clearly

1       why this is not done.

2                   In the zones of concern and also during the  
3       scoping sessions and then again Dr. Morgan reiterated his  
4       testimony tonight about the effect of pollutants on  
5       children, and other doctors testified in scoping as well  
6       about that, and I don't see it specifically and separately  
7       addressed in this document.  If it is here, I would really  
8       appreciate it if you would point it out to me.

9                   The zones of concern contain -- in zone of  
10      concern two, there's three schools and 2,056 students.  In  
11      zone three there's an additional three schools with 1582  
12      students, not to mention Southwestern Oregon Community  
13      College, which is in zone three and zone two and they have a  
14      large family center with children of all ages, not just the  
15      adults that go to the college, and there are 14,500 people  
16      involved there.

17                  The Agency must consider the environmental  
18      impacts of that action, identify unavoidable environmental  
19      impacts and make this info available to the public in the  
20      EIS.  All these conditions must be satisfied before  
21      implementing the proposed action.

22                  So I'll stop for now.

23                  (Applause.)

24                  MR. SCOTT:  Thank you.

25                  Is there a Stephen Crinderbaugh?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Jamie Forday, Faraday?

3 VOICE: He left.

4 MR. SCOTT: He left.

5 Dale Oester?

6 (No response.)

7 MR. SCOTT: George Ahuna? All right. And next up  
8 would be Suzanne Ross.

9 MR. AHUNA: By the way, I'm one of the  
10 longshoremen in opposition to this. You know, I've worked  
11 here on the waterfront 32 years -- George Ahuna, A-h-u-n-a -  
12 - and we went on strike once for 4-1/2 months but we almost  
13 lost two ships. One was blown away from central dock, it  
14 took us 10 hours to bring it back. And those are small  
15 ships compared to the ones coming in now. So I speak  
16 from experience, I've got 41, almost 41 years. And through  
17 the years, you know, I've gotten little LNG problems -- and  
18 thank you, Dr. Martin.

19 There's a lot with this eminent domain that I  
20 don't buy. It sounds like Bush and Cheney, you know.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. AHUNA: They don't give us a chance to, you  
23 know, evaluate our own life here, you know, they come and  
24 they just take over everything they want to do. And I'm  
25 saying here that we should vote for the people that make

1       these decisions for us and let them represent us properly.  
2       Like the Port commissioners that get appointed here, they  
3       just shove this down our throat without representation.

4               And then I see where Mr. Griffin is gone and I  
5       imagine whomever -- the majority of the people here don't  
6       like this project. I got my own reasons, because, you know,  
7       throughout my history on the waterfront, I've come close at  
8       times with small ships, let alone these big gigantic kites.

9               So what I'm trying to stress is that, you know,  
10       we're not buying into this one, not even me or the  
11       longshoremen. I think we can do better. Containers might  
12       be better because they're going to bring jobs. We need the  
13       freight line to come back like it was before. But this here  
14       is the last of the Mohicans that should come in here. We  
15       can do better and we will do better, if possible, but  
16       they're not giving us the chance. They're not hearing us  
17       out, they're not coming to this meeting and whoever  
18       represented us on the Port is not here. Commissioners that  
19       we elect are not doing their job.

20               So what I'm trying to say is we want to be  
21       represented and represented properly and not by these guys  
22       that come in here and just give us this like they're trying  
23       to railroad us now, right now, you know, and we don't like  
24       it. You heard a lot of us don't.

25               (Applause.)

1 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

2 Suzanne Ross, and then Karen Richardson next.

3 MS. ROSS: Suzanne Ross, S-u-z-a-n-n-e R-o-s-s.

4 I received the big books, the EIS draft and I  
5 looked at it and I went, oh, it just sounded like a report  
6 from Jordan Cove. I know that's what it was but it was like  
7 -- it looked like a done deal. It just upset me entirely  
8 because I really -- the whole thing upsets me, I'm against  
9 the LNG. And it's, you know, the pollution factor, the  
10 safety factor, you know, nobody really knows when accidents  
11 happen and that person from Abel Insurance, that's what he  
12 does, he writes insurance policies for accidents that  
13 happen. And they do happen.

14 And when they do happen, even a little accident  
15 at the LNG plant, I don't want to be like when they have the  
16 hurricanes in Louisiana and they have them and, you know, in  
17 the Gulf there and everybody has to evacuate. Even if it  
18 was a small accident or a false alarm, I don't want to live  
19 somewhere that that's gonna happen.

20 So this is really bothering me because, number  
21 one, I think that with the pollution and the safety factor,  
22 your health is your wealth. And I'm one of those people  
23 that will move out of this area and I've been here on and  
24 off since the Eighties. I had to leave for an emergency to  
25 take care of my parents when they were sick and dying. And

1 I mean I love this place. But if this place, if this LNG  
2 comes in, I'm out of here.

3 And I think we should have another hearing  
4 because I don't think it was fair not to have the FERC  
5 people -- if this is so important, we need to have  
6 representatives. And I agree with the Commissioner -- and  
7 also there's one more thing I want to point out is that -- I  
8 read the paper and I cut out all the articles on the LNG  
9 because I want to know what's going on because this affects  
10 everybody here.

11 And what was brought up was that now they're  
12 going to have people design the actual -- as far as I read  
13 it in tonight's paper The World, they're going to have them  
14 design the cement things that keep the gas in and these  
15 people are coming from Paris, France. Great, they come from  
16 Paris, France but then they leave and they're not here when  
17 something happens, you know. They don't have the  
18 responsibility that somebody that lives in the community --  
19 and that's what it all boils down to, these people don't  
20 live in the community that are building this, that are  
21 bringing it in. The Port Commissioner, he came from  
22 Seattle. When this gets built, he's probably out of here.

23 That's what's bothering me is that it's the  
24 people that live here that are gonna have to live with this  
25 thing and all the rest of the people, they're just --

1 they'll probably just set it up and then they'll go back to  
2 Texas or wherever they live, these oil people, and they  
3 don't have to live with this and we do. And my health is my  
4 wealth and I will move and I know a lot of other people that  
5 will do the same. And that's what I have to say about this  
6 EIS report, the EIS report and everything. It's a travesty.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

9 Karen Richardson?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. SCOTT: Tim Bishop?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. SCOTT: Jan Dilley.

14 (No response.)

15 MR. SCOTT: Daina Swanson -- all right. Actually  
16 -- is it Jan? Okay. Sorry. I jumped the gun.

17 MS. DILLEY: Can you hear me?

18 (Inaudible comments from audience.)

19 MS. DILLEY: Jan Dilley from North Bend,  
20 D-i-l-l-e-y.

21 I'm from North Bend. I live just outside the fry  
22 zone. But I was prepared to come and speak on the DEIS. I  
23 have a confession to make. I didn't read 1,453 pages. In  
24 fact, I never received one of the books, fortunately, and I  
25 got a bootleg CD that I put on and was able to use a search

1 engine and managed to read some 40 pages, particularly on  
2 the subject of tsunami and the related seismic activity.

3 But I was very fortunate and we were, a group of  
4 us were able to read through Ron Sadler's letter to FERC,  
5 which was a very thorough critique of the DEIS. But then I  
6 zeroed in in a small area because of what of what he had  
7 proven in his letter on the fault of the DEIS. I have, at  
8 4.1.26 it says: Based on PSHA Probabilistic Seismic Hazard  
9 Analysis with two different scenarios, and I quote: "These  
10 are megathrust earthquakes with a moment magnitude of 8.3  
11 recurrence interval of 1500 years and a megathrust  
12 earthquake with a moment magnitude of 9.0 and a recurrence  
13 interval of 500 years. Both scenarios are given equal  
14 weighting of 1.0 in PSHA."

15 What does this mean? What logic is applied here?  
16 There is no question that we've had a mega-9-pointer and  
17 we'll have it again. The only question is when. But we  
18 don't need a factoring, whatever this analysis is. We're  
19 talking again, you know, just because it happens in 500  
20 years or 1500 years, 8.9 -- or 8 and 9 pointers are still 8  
21 or 9 pointers.

22 And this 500 years is another statistic, another  
23 average number. And I've seen it at between 200 and 600  
24 years. And the last earthquake we had was in 1700. So if  
25 we look at the low end of the scale of 200 to 600, we're 108

1 years overdue. And so, you know, just because it happens in  
2 500 years doesn't make it less threatening.

3 And the on 4.11 it has based on pre-1995 and 2002  
4 maximum wave in the river is predicted about 13 -- and I  
5 quote: "about 13.5 maximum at the Empire station." And it  
6 says 13.5 is not likely to cause any damage to the tankers.

7  
8 Although allowing -- in the previous paragraph  
9 they mention the 2004 Sumatra which brought to fore the  
10 Cascadia -- the subduction zone would be our greatest  
11 tsunami threat. Why revert to studies 13 years old?  
12 Everyone knows that a lot has happened as far as our  
13 knowledge in geology. Ask any geologist. I mean, 13 years  
14 ago, that's very stale and they even mention the 2004 but  
15 yet -- but have not used that information.

16 It's accepted that the max wave expected at the  
17 site is maximum 35 feet and they're going to build a 55-foot  
18 hill on the back of it. So my question is why -- if they  
19 expect it to be 35 there that's only a few hundred yards  
20 from the edge of the river. What's going to make it do when  
21 you have unimpeded 35-foot wave coming through and it  
22 doesn't hit that 55-foot hill, how does it dissipate through  
23 a 13.5 wave when it hits the water? And even more  
24 vulnerable than the site, at the tankers? We just got  
25 through -- got rid of Clarissa.

1           And the thing they don't mention in here is  
2           because it's only eight miles from the site, the fault is.  
3           We have something like five, maybe even less, maybe  
4           instantaneous, no warning, but no more than 30 minutes'  
5           warning before the wave hits. Now the tanker, if it's very  
6           close to shore, will not have enough time to get out if it's  
7           in the channel. Of course it's trapped.

8           And the thing is that the 13.5 wave, they said  
9           it's not likely to hurt the tankers but it will slosh them  
10          around. But the 13.5 came from a 1995 study and I don't  
11          know what they were expecting, the tsunami. Because, you  
12          know, a lot of things have changed since then, even the  
13          posting of the tsunami signs. And everybody's kind of  
14          awakening to it.

15          So anyway they have not considered the  
16          vulnerability of the ship, the tanker. I mean, how much  
17          would it take to beach that thing or get stuck out in the  
18          sand like Clarissa that time.

19          So anyway, so my question is what has been done  
20          to study how are you gonna get the tank off the tarmac on  
21          the airport, which would be a better result than on top of  
22          somebody's house and shops.

23          So are they prepared to do it? And I'm glad that  
24          George Ahuna mentioned about the difficulty in getting, you  
25          know, a small ship. And so are they prepared -- you know,

1 if you beach it and then you can't get it to the terminal,  
2 you don't have the luxury that Clarissa had, which was a  
3 very non-volatile fluid whereas the high-pressure liquid gas  
4 needs to be relieved off the ship at some point, especially  
5 if there's a problem with the ship.

6           Anyway the other thing they had was because of  
7 considerable uncertainty associated with current tsunami  
8 impact prediction recommending that prior to construction  
9 Jordan Cove performs a site-specific impact hazard analysis.  
10 You're gonna analyze it after you approve it?

11           (Laughter.)

12           MS. DILLEY: My conclusion is that this draft has  
13 been contrived to justify a predisposed result and, with a  
14 deliberate noncompliance to NEPA requirements, begs to be  
15 challenged in the courts of law.

16           (Applause.)

17           MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

18           Daina Swanson -- sorry. You wrote it out for me.  
19 And Fred Clark next.

20           MS. SWANSON: My name is Daina Swanson, D-a-i-n-a  
21 Swanson, just like it sounds, with an "O." My testimony will  
22 be concerning the socioeconomic impacts.

23           The proposed Jordan Cove Energy Project and  
24 Pacific Connector gas pipeline project are in direct  
25 conflict with identified long-term priorities of the Coos-

1 Curry-Douglas six year regional investment strategy and  
2 rural action plan. Specifically, item four -- quote:  
3 "ensure that the strategies developed to enhance economic  
4 development in the region reinforce the region's long-term  
5 prosperity and livability" -- unquote -- and item 11 --  
6 quote: "improve the quality of life including recreation,  
7 health, public safety, educational, cultural, housing, human  
8 services and beautification improvement opportunity" --  
9 unquote.

10 Yet the Coos-Curry-Douglas six year regional  
11 investment strategy and rural action plan document is not  
12 even mentioned in the draft EIS section 4.8 or 5.1.8,  
13 socioeconomics. What we find instead in these brief eight  
14 paragraphs in the conclusion are whitewashed unsubstantiated  
15 and contradictory figures for temporary workers and wildly  
16 unrealistic tax revenue projections supplied by the South  
17 Coast Development Council which, to my knowledge, hasn't  
18 gotten a single projection right in its 12 year history of  
19 community -- quote -- imagining.

20 (Applause.)

21 MS. SWANSON: Furthermore, the single sentence  
22 supporting the statement that -- quote -- "the project  
23 should not adversely affect property values" -- unquote --  
24 which reads, quote: "studies of various surrounding  
25 existing LNG peak shaving plants have not found any negative

1 impacts on property values and other independent research  
2 found that the presence of a pipeline on a tract of property  
3 had little influence on its sale price" -- unquote -- and  
4 does not cite the sources from which these conclusions are  
5 based and seem counterintuitive when a coastal community  
6 which is valued for its scenic natural beauty is transformed  
7 into a fuel tanker base for California energy speculators  
8 and Canadian -- quote, unquote -- limited partners.

9 At minimum, this EIS needs to contain both a  
10 separate social impact and an economic impact section.  
11 Property value impact analysis statements in reference to  
12 the two Oregon peak shaving tanks and the previous -- quote,  
13 unquote -- previous study of 11 LNG storage facilities  
14 should be removed from the document and a true and objective  
15 property value impact study based on the operation and three  
16 under-construction terminals needs to be conducted.

17 Furthermore, Jordan Cove and South Cove's  
18 development council figures need to be re-evaluated by a  
19 truly independent third-party contractor employed by a  
20 neutral organization without a vested interest in the  
21 outcome. Among other things, a projected number of direct  
22 and indirect and induced permanent jobs and the figures  
23 stated for those jobs at an average of over \$70,000 each  
24 seems highly suspicious and intended to sway public opinion  
25 in an economically challenged community.

1           Conversely, when Ron Opitz of SCDC was asked  
2 directly about the hourly rate used to describe family wage  
3 jobs and SCDC employment projections, his response was \$12  
4 an hour, which would put the average income at less than  
5 half of the stated figures. This is typical of the  
6 statistical manipulation that this community has been  
7 subjected to by the SCDC and Jordan Cove, yet, throughout  
8 this EIS these are taken to be reliable sources of  
9 information.

10           The National Environmental Protection Act has  
11 been undermined both in word and intent by this EIS which,  
12 in the end, is simply a published promotion of another  
13 short-sighted get rich bubble scheme that our nation's  
14 economic system is already reeling from.

15           FERC has been charged with making logical  
16 decisions based on reliable information after thorough  
17 analysis, but the information conveyed by this document  
18 cannot possibly be accepted as reliable and any conclusion  
19 reached by FERC which is based upon social or economic data  
20 submitted by SCDC is meaningless and wide open to future  
21 litigation. True employment and income figures and factual  
22 social impact data need to be collected, analyzed and  
23 interpreted by truly independent third parties and made  
24 available to the public and to FERC through a NEPA-compliant  
25 EIS.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

3 Fred Clark?

4 VOICE: He left.

5 MR. SCOTT: He left.

6 Is it Andy Nasberg?

7 MR. SCOTT: He left.

8 Eldon Rollins.

9 And then Linda Gonzales next

10 MR. ROLLINS: Do you need my name spelled?

11 MR. SCOTT: Yes, please.

12 MR. ROLLINS: E-l-d-o-n R-o-l-l-i-n-s.

13 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

14 MR. ROLLINS: T. Boone Pickens is a Texas oil man  
15 of some notoriety. He's also one of the two largest wind  
16 energy developers in the nation, so I suspect he knows  
17 something about oil and natural gas and I suspect he knows  
18 something about alternative energy. He's been on television  
19 lately, on CSPAN and probably other television stations  
20 stating emphatically that the United States is the Saudi  
21 Arabia of natural gas. I don't know that much about Saudi  
22 Arabia, but I don't think Saudi Arabia imports much  
23 petroleum or natural gas.

24 So what does T. Boone Pickens mean when he says  
25 that the United States is the Saudi Arabia of natural gas?

1 I don't think he means we need to import liquid natural gas  
2 from other countries. I suspect -- I do not know for  
3 certain, but I suspect he means that we will be entirely in  
4 a position to export it.

5 So I'm going to ask you, sir, I assume you have  
6 something to do with the natural gas industry.

7 MR. SCOTT: Yup.

8 MR. ROLLINS: Is this facility going to be for  
9 the importation of liquid natural gas or is it going to be  
10 for the exportation of liquid natural gas? Do you know the  
11 answer to that question?

12 MR. SCOTT: I can tell you what's been proposed  
13 before FERC, and it's strictly import of liquefied natural  
14 gas.

15 MR. ROLLINS: And the necessity of that is why?

16 MR. SCOTT: That's -- right now the need is  
17 discussed in the draft EIS.

18 MR. ROLLINS: Okay.

19 The country of Germany has a population of 82  
20 million people. It produces 15 percent of its energy from  
21 alternative and renewable sources. That's the same thing as  
22 producing 100 percent of all of the energy for roughly 12.5  
23 million people. Currently. And the percentage goes up  
24 every year in Germany.

25 Since there are 82 million people living in

1 Germany and since the land area is 135,000 square miles, I  
2 suspect that there's probably less available land for doing  
3 much of anything in Germany right now than there is in the  
4 State of Oregon, which has 96,000 square miles but only has  
5 about 3.5 million people.

6 But Germany already produces about four times the  
7 amount of energy that Oregonians likely use in a year. So  
8 we're not talking about pie in the sky stuff, we're not  
9 talking about marginalized energy, we're talking about  
10 something that could easily produce more energy than the  
11 State of Oregon needs.

12 So thanks to the country of Germany and thanks to  
13 T. Boone Pickens and those two very basic facts, could you  
14 tell me why we're importing LNG?

15 MR. SCOTT: I can't.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. SCOTT: I'm not going to respond to that --

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. SCOTT: The proposal is explained. Thank  
20 you.

21 Linda Gonzalez and then M.A. Hansen, which is the  
22 last person on our signed up list.

23 MR. SCOTT: Yes, and then when -- we can -- don't  
24 worry. There will be another --

25 MR. SCOTT: I'm sorry?

1           MR. SCOTT: Once we get through the list, I will  
2 just ask if anybody else would like to make comments.

3           MS. HANSEN: I came here with the understanding  
4 that this meeting was called to make comments on the DES to  
5 FERC.

6           MR. SCOTT: That's correct.

7           MS. HANSEN: Am I right?

8           MR. SCOTT: Yes.

9           MS. HANSEN: All right then. I would like to say  
10 something about this meeting. I noticed that most of the  
11 speakers against the -- I'm sorry. M-period A-period  
12 Hansen. Gonzales has left. H-a-n-s-e-n.

13           And, by the way, somebody said there was only one  
14 person here that was qualified to speak about the EIS. I  
15 did mention earlier that I have a degree in planning and I  
16 am thoroughly trained in writing EISs and I think talking  
17 about them.

18           Anyway, I noticed that most of the speakers  
19 against the LNG project did speak about the EIS, which means  
20 that we are -- I really wrote this kind of all over -- that  
21 we are -- our comments are definitely being recorded and  
22 going to FERC.

23           I noticed that most of the people who are for the  
24 LNG project seemed --quite obvious to me that most of them  
25 didn't even read the DEIS because very few of them even

1 spoke about it or mentioned it.

2 So I would say that when FERC gets the reports on  
3 this meeting, about 100 percent of the people at this  
4 meeting were against this project. And I really would like  
5 to see the reports that go in, because I don't know why  
6 anybody who didn't speak about the DEIS was even allowed to  
7 speak after it was found out that they weren't going to  
8 speak on it. And several of us in this audience feel -- I  
9 forget the word, what did you say, Mary? The word you said  
10 that you felt, that we were being -- yeah. Anyway, I wrote  
11 it down here somewhere.

12 Anyhow, they were allowed to speak negatively  
13 about those who didn't believe as they did. I don't know  
14 why they were allowed to. We felt abused, that's what we  
15 felt.

16 This meeting, first of all, FERC didn't show up.  
17 I understand that there's reasons for those kind of things.  
18 But I feel very abused, very abused, by the people who were  
19 for this project that spoke when I didn't hear very many of  
20 them speak anything about the DEIS. I really don't think  
21 they said it.

22 And then they said -- one thing they said is that  
23 we didn't have the facts, these people who were negative to  
24 everything, that we don't have the facts. We read the DIS.  
25 We quite proved that we read that thing. Not a one of them

1       proved to me that they even opened the book or that they  
2       even have the thing.

3                So anyhow, I want this -- I would like this -- I  
4       want to be sure that this gets in the record of how I feel  
5       about this meeting. Okay.

6                MR. SCOTT: It will be.

7                MS. HANSEN: That's about it.

8                MR. SCOTT: All right. Thank you.

9                (Applause.)

10              MR. SCOTT: So that is 3-1/2 pages of those who  
11       signed up. But, as I promised, if anybody else would like  
12       to speak --

13              VOICE: I just want to --

14              MR. SCOTT: -- you can come forward and I'll also  
15       ask you to keep it to five minutes as well.

16              VOICE: Will all the people who signed up but  
17       couldn't stay, will they be able to give their comments?

18              MR. SCOTT: If you'd like to speak again, yes.

19              VOICE: No, no, not me. I'm speaking of all the  
20       people who signed up and left.

21              MR. SCOTT: Right now this is the only meeting  
22       that's been planned in Coos Bay. But as I mentioned  
23       earlier, anybody is welcome to file written comments on the  
24       project and those are looked at with the same weight as  
25       verbal comments.

1 VOICE: I wonder if you have a list of the people  
2 who didn't get a chance and then if they want to speak at  
3 the Roseburg meeting they could.

4 MR. SCOTT: They could do that. I mean, if they  
5 would like to go to the Roseburg meeting and speak there --

6 MR. SCOTT: I do have a list.

7 VOICE: Will the representative from FERC be  
8 there?

9 MR. SCOTT: I believe so, yes, that's the plan,  
10 if he's -- okay.

11 Just state your name again and --

12 DR. JACKSON: My name is Nicole Jackson, that's  
13 N-i-c-o-l-e J-a-c-k-s-o-n. I'm continuing from earlier  
14 comments because I was not given enough time. For those of  
15 you that are still here, I really want to encourage all of  
16 you to submit written comments, particularly in light of the  
17 fact that no representatives from FERC were here. On page  
18 four of the draft EIS there's an address, a person and an  
19 address to whom you can submit those written comments, so  
20 please do.

21 All right. I wanted to discuss as far as  
22 reasonable alternatives one that seems eminently reasonable  
23 to me would be to have -- to consider the alternative of a  
24 berth that fits the vessel. On page 2.7 it's noted that the  
25 berth is going to be adequate for vessels up to 217,000

1 cubic meter capacity, which means that they're planning to  
2 dredge and turn from upland into water more than is  
3 necessary for the ships that they are proposing to bring in.  
4 Their application is to bring in 160,000 cubic meter vessels  
5 and the waterway suitability report actually restricts the  
6 vessels to 148,000 cubic meters. So I think that there  
7 should be very serious consideration given to an  
8 appropriately sized berth, which would be one for the  
9 148,000 cubic meter vessels. And then in that, of course,  
10 should be an analysis of the environmental impact of that  
11 size berth, so the amount of dredged spoils, the conversion  
12 of ethylene to water.

13 All right. I want to go back to talking about  
14 natural gas liquids. One of the things that I found  
15 interesting was that on page 4.4-9 the project would not be  
16 considered to be a natural gas processing plant --  
17 specifically, it would not be engaged in the extraction of  
18 natural gas liquids from field gas. Elsewhere in the  
19 document, on page 2.51, we're told that it would in fact  
20 generate natural gas liquids as a byproduct of the  
21 regasification of the liquefied natural gas.

22 And then we're told that the natural gas liquids  
23 would not be stored at Jordan Cove but, rather, at a natural  
24 gas liquid storage and loadout facility, taken care of by an  
25 unspecified future third-party purchaser. So I don't see

1       how it can both be not a natural gas processing plant and a  
2       plant that produces natural gas liquids.

3               I've already discussed the transport of the MAT  
4       which will not be done by rail and so we should look at the  
5       environmental impact of having it taken out by truck.

6               On page 2.53, the document states that we deem  
7       non-jurisdictional transport of natural gas liquids to be  
8       not directly related to the liquefied natural gas terminal.  
9       It doesn't matter that it's non-jurisdictional, the draft  
10       EIS has to look at things that are a direct effect, whether  
11       or not they fall under the purview of FERC. It is, in fact,  
12       a direct effect because nobody would be shipping out natural  
13       gas liquids from the North Spit if there were no liquefied  
14       natural gas terminal. There is no current way of extracting  
15       natural gas liquids from the North Spit any other way.

16              I'll leave my comments there because I think I've  
17       probably gone over my five minutes. Sorry.

18              (Applause.)

19              MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

20              MR. PICKERING: My name is Steve Pickering, P-i-  
21       c-k-e-r-i-n-g. I wasn't going to speak tonight and I'm  
22       sorry I was an hour late so I don't know that I'm going to -  
23       - I hope I don't say anything that's already been said. I'm  
24       not going to preach to the choir. I had a meeting that I  
25       had to go to for the city and I'm running as a candidate for

1 city council; I felt that was important to go to since it  
2 dealt with our fire station.

3 I don't want to preach to you. I want to talk to  
4 Mr. Braddock, I want to speak to the people at Williams and  
5 I want to speak to the people at FERC, first about  
6 accountability and trust. The people of this area have not  
7 had a voice in this. We're not allowed to vote on it. The  
8 people who are promoting it, being the Port, we don't vote  
9 on it. They're appointed. We have no say in any part of  
10 this other than to FERC.

11 Lately in a campaign -- I'm not doing this as a  
12 campaign thing, I'm here as a citizen and representing me  
13 and me only. Lately I go to a lot of commissions and a lot  
14 of committees and a lot of councils, and I get the same  
15 thing, I get that blank stare, so you're here, so what. Any  
16 of you that have been to the Port commission meetings have  
17 seen that stare. They don't care what we think.

18 I hear about the pro-LNG people -- there still  
19 might be one or two here. Where'd they all go? It was all  
20 show. They're gone. The people who are serious about this  
21 are still here. FERC, you need to pay attention to these  
22 people. These are the people here that are being affected.

23 Many years ago I lived in Brownwood, Texas. They  
24 told us that 3M would not affect anybody's health. Within  
25 one year after they opened the doors, five members of my

1 family died of a cancer directly caused by 3M. All of them  
2 lived within about a mile and a half of the plant. That's  
3 just one instance.

4 Personally myself until recently, until 2000, I  
5 worked for a company called NeoIndustries, which is a  
6 Midwest company, they chrome plate work rolls. We happened  
7 to be owned by a company that Mr. Braddock is very familiar  
8 with, Federal Industries in Canada. Federal Industries  
9 bailed out on a plant that we owned in Gary, Indiana and it  
10 became a Superfund site because the Canadian ownership was  
11 not responsible for the cleanup and the taxpayers of that  
12 area -- of the United States, all of us had to pay through  
13 the Superfund millions of dollars to clean up the garbage  
14 left behind by Federal Industries ownership; they were not  
15 liable because they were a Canadian company. Did somebody  
16 hear something in there? Whoops. We have a Canadian  
17 company wanting to come here.

18 I happen to know that this company is paying for  
19 or has agreed to pay for an insurance policy for the Port in  
20 case there is some liability, some environmental issues or  
21 some cleanup necessary. We all know energy companies are  
22 failing. FERC knows this, we all know it, we see the news  
23 everyday. They come and they go. When you go, Mr.  
24 Braddock, are you going to clean up what you leave behind?  
25 Are you going to take that plant back out with you?

1                   I hear about jobs. Did anybody look at the  
2 people with the pro-LNG? None of them are out of work.  
3 They're all working. The people who are out of work know  
4 they're not going to get jobs over there and a lot of them  
5 are anti-LNG because they know this is a waste of their time  
6 to even go over there.

7                   I'm a very technically oriented person. I have a  
8 very long background in computer science. I don't expect  
9 I'd ever get a job over there. And if I did, I'm not sure  
10 I'd want one.

11                   We are ignoring the seniors. We've got -- how  
12 many doctors have we had here tonight that have said look at  
13 the seniors, they can't breathe this, look at the children,  
14 they can't breathe this. Oh well, it's not going to hurt  
15 you. Well, I've heard that before, too.

16                   How many doctors came forward that were for LNG?

17                   MR. PICKERING: We have tourists that come in  
18 here. A lot of us are saying we need jobs. Okay. We have  
19 a whole bunch of people. I'd say -- shall I be conservative  
20 -- 500, 600, 1000 people probably live here and work here  
21 that make a living off the tourist industry. If I'm a  
22 tourist, I'm not going to drive across that bridge, take one  
23 look at that LNG and stop here. I might just as well go on  
24 down to Bandatoo.

25                   I don't think I have a lot more to say. I wasn't

1 going to speak. Again, I just wanted to directly say -- oh,  
2 one more thing. I was at the IBL meeting and the gentleman  
3 from Williams back there said we've never had a Williams  
4 pipeline cause an accident in Oregon. Do we have a Williams  
5 pipeline in Oregon?

6 And not even two weeks before that we had a  
7 couple of houses blown up and I believe there were some  
8 people injured -- I think we got lucky and nobody got killed  
9 and that was a Williams pipeline.

10 MR. PICKERING: Now that's a fact. I've seen  
11 this chuckling and stuff going on back here. Do you people  
12 care that -- Mr. Braddock, you said if we didn't want you,  
13 you'd leave. Bye.

14 I have nothing more to say.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

17 I do want to try to get out of here by midnight,  
18 but I also want to let everybody speak that wants to. So  
19 we're kind of running out of time.

20 MR. OSIER: My name is Dave Osier, O-s-i-e-r. I  
21 spoke a little earlier and I might have got a little hot-  
22 headed.

23 But I've lived here all my life and people come  
24 here for the scenic Oregon coast. And I look at the front  
25 page of this draft environmental impact statement and it

1 looks like Long Beach, California to me. And if I wanted to  
2 live in Long Beach, I would move there. We don't want our  
3 port to look like this for 39 jobs.

4 We don't want you to run your pipeline underneath  
5 our wild and scenic Rogue River, Umpqua River or any other  
6 tributary all the way to Klamath Falls that disturbs our  
7 Chinook salmon or any other fish. We want you guys to  
8 leave. Go somewhere else where they want you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. OSIER: What do you not understand, Bob.  
11 Please leave.

12 That's all I got to say. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. SCOTT: And I think with that, I will thank  
15 everybody. I would be not following through if I didn't  
16 give you a chance to speak again, would I? And you prefer  
17 to make your verbal comments and not put them in writing.  
18 Okay.

19 Let me say that this is the last one, because I  
20 did promise that she could speak again when she was done.

21 MS. SIGNER: I have obviously read it, but I must  
22 confess that I would have done a much better job -- I did  
23 not have the hard copy. I read it on the internet so I  
24 couldn't use little stickies to go through each section.

25 One of the things -- many things concern me that

1 aren't included -- and I was just reading in areas that I  
2 hadn't read before about -- one of the things during the  
3 scoping that was mentioned is that people in the area were  
4 concerned that, because we were an economically depressed  
5 area and that many other regions in southern Oregon where  
6 the pipeline routes might go are economically depressed, and  
7 that it was one of the reasons that we were being targeted  
8 for a development of this nature. And it addresses it.

9           And I can't find the page now, but it started  
10 talking about this and then it said that in the evaluation  
11 they could find no difference in the economic structure of  
12 the areas that are going to be affected by the pipeline and  
13 the terminal and the areas that would be served by it in  
14 California. And I just really find that hard to believe and  
15 I'd like that explained more explicitly in the next draft.

16           And I kind of would like to know what's going to  
17 happen next, because obviously there's many pages in here  
18 where it says prior to construction Williams is going to  
19 have to do this, prior to the end of the comment period in  
20 the EIS Jordan Cove is going to have to do this, and the  
21 lists go on and on and on.

22           And if I need to, I will go through every page of  
23 this document and cite them if that would make a difference,  
24 because it doesn't seem to be within the guidelines of NEPA  
25 that the public doesn't have an opportunity to comment and

1 that these -- even the safety plan isn't established, and  
2 some pretty serious things.

3 It's not just like well they need to take care of  
4 this widget over here, it's page after page after page,  
5 including being in compliance with the coastal management  
6 plan, which is pretty integral to this area. I mean there's  
7 like 30,000 recreational hours of boating in this area, and  
8 it says in the report that there's no serious effect on  
9 recreation. And they talk about the beaches and there's no  
10 really serious impact on that. And it doesn't really get  
11 addressed.

12 In a report by the Donald Brenn School of  
13 Environmental Science and Management Spring 2004 they did a  
14 study of LNG siting and it said remote siting lowers safety  
15 risks, especially away from densely populated areas. We're  
16 a densely populated area. They recommend avoiding sensitive  
17 ecological areas and page after page after page, wildlife  
18 areas -- I need to find my page.

19 It's here. All about the whole -- we have a  
20 breeding area, the only breeding area in Oregon of elephant  
21 seals. We have a National Wildlife Refuge that the ships  
22 would be going by just right out here, and that seems to me  
23 to be significant ecological areas. Our eelgrass would be  
24 wiped out by this project. We have oyster beds, crabbing,  
25 and all those things, and fish. And that's not even

1 counting the impact of building the pipeline on the salmon.  
2 So all these things seem to be pretty important in terms of  
3 environmental impact.

4 It also said in this report that it was very  
5 important that there be increased technological advancements  
6 to deal with pollutants, especially for facilities close to  
7 the general population. And I don't see anything in this  
8 document about mitigation for the pollutants, including  
9 increased petroleum hydrocarbons that would be caused by  
10 this. And even things like the increased marine traffic and  
11 the impact on marine mammals.

12 There's a whole section regarding LUBA concerns  
13 on page 4.7 through 11, but they aren't identified. There's  
14 just general comments about what they were. I think the  
15 public has a right to know what those concerns were and not  
16 prior to construction but prior to the approval of this  
17 project. Not prior to the final design, but prior to the  
18 approval of this project. All these reports need to be in.  
19 Otherwise, it's incomplete.

20 And because our -- I think you've gotten the idea  
21 that people are really outraged that our ability to vote --  
22 Americans, that's how we're kind of made, that we're  
23 supposed to be able to vote on things of impact and import.  
24 And the only vehicle that's being given to us is these  
25 meetings and then here we are at midnight and you are being

1 wonderful in staying to listen to me, but FERC isn't here.  
2 The people making the decision. I mean, that's pretty  
3 insulting.

4 There's 2653 acres that would be affected by  
5 this, 9.4 acres of wetlands, permanent loss of 525 acres of  
6 forest. These seem to be significant impacts.

7 And there's one other section that I want to talk  
8 about and then I will be quiet. You did get about the map  
9 that's inaccurate and doesn't have the latest dwellings that  
10 have been completed in the report; it says they're not  
11 completed or occupied and they are and that needs to be  
12 updated. That's on page 4.7-3.

13 In the Sandia report it mentions that one way --  
14 the other thing I need to say is there is absolutely no  
15 question that the LNG industry has a really good safety  
16 record given what they deal with, and I don't want to imply  
17 that anyone involved in this project would purposefully do  
18 anything to harm any of us. But the fact of the matter is  
19 that accidents happen, that's why they call them accidents.

20 And the Sandia report from 2004 makes it very  
21 clear what kinds of things can be done to mitigate the  
22 potential dangers of this energy source. And one of them is  
23 physical separation from population areas. And that isn't  
24 really addressed in terms of again analyzing all the  
25 alternative and all the factors for each alternative:

1 socioeconomic, cultural, all that is required by NEPA and  
2 it's not here that I could see.

3 And if I'm wrong, please say lady you don't  
4 understand. But when I read about NEPA -- and this is --  
5 I've been into this for maybe two weeks at this level. But  
6 when I read the guidelines and I look at the document, I  
7 don't see it there.

8 It says in the Sandia report that one very  
9 important thing for safety is interrupted operations for  
10 aircraft and over bridges that are near the facilities. And  
11 again someone testified for the airport manager and he says  
12 oh no, we're not going to have to do that, when in fact  
13 Sandia says that appropriate control of the air space for  
14 public safety is essential.

15 There's a section about -- I just want to make  
16 sure that it's in here that NEPA requires that all the  
17 alternatives, and I can't find my exact quote, but that  
18 every alternative be given the same scrutiny.

19 Here's another one. It says in the report  
20 because of the safety measures required by the Coast Guard,  
21 it is highly unlikely that a spill would occur and impacts  
22 on parks should not be significant. And then it goes on to  
23 outline the number of vehicles and hours of park use. Even  
24 in here it says by the Coast Guard that the measures that  
25 are currently in place -- it's not suitable, our channel's

1 not suitable and can't be protected unless Jordan Cove does  
2 these mitigating measures. But again those aren't being  
3 required before the approval. And I think that needs to be  
4 -- they need to do this stuff and present it us so that we  
5 can comment on it.

6 Here it is, on the -- there's 27,000 visits, site  
7 visits per year in this area, to the parks, 200 vehicles per  
8 month in the areas around this terminal. The Oregon Islands  
9 National Wildlife Refuge, that's 320 miles. Simpson Reef is  
10 the only place in Oregon where extensive beds of giant kelp  
11 are found. And that's an area at risk, it's not addressed.

12 So I think that -- how have I done?

13 MR. SCOTT: You've hit a lot of points. And I'm  
14 not going to -- I can't begin to respond to those  
15 individually, but you asked earlier about the next step.  
16 And the next step is to take all these comments and respond  
17 to them as part of the final EIS and revise it, if  
18 appropriate. And it will also include information filed by  
19 the applicants in direct response to those conditions that  
20 you've pointed out that say prior to the close of the  
21 comment period you shall provide this, and that will be  
22 included in the final.

23 MS. SIGNER: But is it true what one of the people  
24 said, that someone could file a response the day before the  
25 comment period is over and we have no access to it?

1           MR. SCOTT: Well all that information will be  
2 part of the public record and the public will have access to  
3 that.

4           MS. SIGNER: Well no, access is -- we'll have  
5 access to it but if it's not completed and we don't get a  
6 chance to comment on it -- so we're not going to get a  
7 chance to do that, is that what you're saying?

8           MR. SCOTT: You can comment on it as part of the  
9 public record, but it will come in -- I mean, it may come in  
10 towards the end of it or at the end of the comment period,  
11 it could, and then --

12          MS. SIGNER: And are we correct that the  
13 alternatives need to be addressed at the same level? Isn't  
14 that what NEPA requires?

15          MR. SCOTT: This EIS is consistent with FERCs  
16 environmental impact statements that they have done for  
17 many, many projects for a number of years.

18          MS. SIGNER: Okay. But it doesn't -- so it  
19 doesn't have to meet NEPA?

20          MR. SCOTT: There's different ways to interpret  
21 NEPA I think is the simple answer to that and it's not  
22 necessarily an easy question, but it's safe to say that the  
23 alternatives analysis in this EIS is consistent with  
24 multiple FERC projects.

25          MS. SIGNER: Okay.

1                   MR. SCOTT: It is getting late. I want to thank  
2 everybody for staying here and hanging in. On behalf of the  
3 FERC, thank you all very much for attending and for your  
4 comments. As I said, they will be addressed in the final  
5 EIS.

6                   Thank you.

7                   (Whereupon, at 12:10 a.m., Tuesday, October 28,  
8 2008, the scoping meeting was concluded.)

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25