BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- -x

IN THE MATTER OF: : Docket Number

JORDAN COVE LIQUEFACTION PROJECT : PF12-17-000

- -x

Mill Casino Hotel

3201 Tremont Avenue

North Bend, OR 97459

Tuesday, October 9, 2012

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:35 p.m., Paul Friedman, FERC Moderator.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. FRIEDMAN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Paul Friedman and Im here from Washington, D.C., where I work for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. We call that the FERC or the Commission. Up here with me is Holly Orr of the United States Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management, and Wes Yamamoto from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. We call the Bureau of Land Management the BLM, and we call the Forest Service the USFS or the Forest Service, or the FS.

The FERC, the BLM and the Forest Service together are cooperating to produce an environmental impact statement on a proposal we have before us by Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector. One is called the Jordan Cove Liquefaction Project, and the other is the Pacific Connector Pipeline Project. Jordan Coves docket number at FERC is PF12-7-000. Pacific Connectors docket number at FERC is PF12-17-000.

On behalf of the FERC and the BLM and the Forest Service, I want to welcome you to this public scoping meeting about the environmental review process for the Jordan Cove/Pacific Connector projects. The purpose of this meeting is to take public comments about these projects so that we can determine the important issues to address during the preparation of our environmental impact statement, or

EIS.

Let the record show that this meeting began at approximately 6:35 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9, 2012, at the Mill Casino-Hotel in North Bend.

You may have noticed that theres a court reporter in the back. He is transcribing this meeting so therell be an accurate record of tonights comments. The FERC has a transcription contract with Ace-Federal Reporters, Inc., or Ace. If you wish to obtain a copy of the transcript prior to its placement in the FERC public record, you can do so by dealing directly with Ace and paying the prices that they charge for copies.

The transcript will be posted on the FERCs e-library system within seven calendar days after we receive a copy of it from Ace. I will discuss our e-library system later in todays discussion.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission was created in 1920. We were called the Federal Power Commission for many years. In the Carter administration, we were renamed the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. We are an independent agency that regulates the interstate transportation of natural gas, electricity and hydropower.

Our agency is directed by five Commissioners who are appointed by the President of the United States and approved by Congress. The FERC staff, like myself and my coworkers,

are civil servants. We are not political appointees and we do not make decisions. The five Commissioners who are political appointees, they are the decisionmakers, but staff does make recommendations to the Commissioners.

Let me introduce other people from my team who are here tonight. Steve Busch where is Steve? Here he is. Hes the assistant project manager at FERC. He is an engineer, and his specialty is LNG terminal engineering.

I also have a third-party environmental contractor. Theyre called TetraTech, and from TetraTech with me tonight is Rachel Katz. Rachel, raise your hand and John Scott. We treat our third-party contractor, along with the other cooperating agencies, as extensions of FERC staff in the production of the EIS.

While the FERC is the lead federal agency for these projects, we are not the only agency which must approve the proposals or issue a license or a permit for their construction and operation. For example, the BLM would be the lead federal agency for issuing a right-of-way grant across federal lands for the Pacific Connector pipeline, and the Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation must concur with that right-of-way grant across lands that they manage. Later, Holly will explain the role of those agencies in the environmental review process.

The BLM and the Forest Service, the Bureau of

Reclamation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have all agreed to be cooperating agencies in the production of the EIS. There was a rumor going around earlier that multiple environmental documents would be produced by different agencies. Thats just not true. There will be only one EIS produced for this project.

The BLM, FERC and the Forest Service are not proponents, nor are we advocates for these projects. Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector, which are private companies, define the purpose and need for their projects. Likewise, the companies have selected the location and the design of their facilities. The FERC and other cooperating agencies will independently review the proposals for these companies.

This is the second go-round for both Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector. They previously filed applications in Docket No. CP07-441 and CP07-444, and the Commission issued an authorization for those projects in an order on December 17, 2009. However, the Commission later vacated those authorizations in an order issued on April 16, 2012, when Jordan Cove requested use of our pre-filing process to change the purpose of its terminal for LNG export.

If you previously submitted comments for the projects under Dockets CP07-441 or CP07-444, those comments

will not be considered in the new undertaking. And so you must resubmit comments about these new proposal under Dockets PF12-7 and PF12-17.

The footprint for the LNG terminal is basically the same as the original proposal. Likewise the Pacific Connector pipeline generally follows the same route the Commission previously authorized.

We produced an EIS in May of 2009 for the CP07-441 and CP07-444. The new EIS for these projects under PF12-7 and PF12-17 will make use of the previous analyses and update information as necessary.

Now Id like to summarize the proposals. Jordan Cove proposes to construct and operate a liquefied natural gas, or LNG, export terminal on the north spit of Coos Bay in Coos County, Oregon. The terminal would have the capacity to produce about 6 million metric tons of LNG per year, or equivalent to about a billion cubic feet per day of natural gas. The components of the project consist of a 7.3 mile-long waterway for LNG traffic in Coos Bay, a .3 mile-long access channel or marine berth, three 16-inch loading arm and one vapor return arm, a 2300-foot-long 30-inch-diameter cryogenic transfer pipeline that connects the berth with the storage tanks, two 160,000 cubic meter capacity full containment LNG storage tanks, four liquefaction trains, each with a capacity of 1.5 million

cubic tons per year, and a natural gas conditioning facility consisting of two feed gas and dehydration trains with a combined throughput of about a billion cubic feet per day of natural gas, and a 350 megawatt power plant called the South Dune Power Plant.

The Pacific Connector Pipeline is designed to transmit a billion cubic feet per day of natural gas from interconnections with existing natural gas facilities at Malin coming all the way to Coos Bay to the Jordan Cove terminal. The main components include a 230-mile long, 36-inch diameter welded steel underground pipeline crossing portions of Klamath, Jackson, Douglas and Coos County, Oregon; two metering transfer station at the interconnections with the existing Gas Transmission Northwest, or GTN, and Ruby Pipelines; at the east end near Malin in Klamath County, Oregon, a 23,000 horsepower compressor station near Malin adjacent to the interconnections with GTN and Ruby; a meter station at the interconnection with the existing Northwest Pipeline system near Myrtle Creek in Douglas County, Oregon; and a meter station at the Jordan Cove LNG terminal.

Pipeline construction activities consist of the following: clearing and grading, trenching, pipestringing, welding, lowering and backfilling, cleanup and restoration. Here is a view of grading, a view of pipestringing, a view

of welding, a view of lowering in, a view of a stream crossing, and cleanup.

On February 29, 2012, Jordan Cove requested the initiation of the FERCs pre-filing process, and we accepted that on March 6. Pacific Connector requested to enter into our pre-filing process on June 4, 2012, and we approved that on June 8.

The intent of our pre-filing process is to encourage early involvement of stakeholders -- we include the public as stakeholders and identify issues to be resolved before the FERC receives a formal application from the companies. On April 4, 2012, Jordan Cove filed its first Draft Resource Report 1, which is a project description, and a summary of alternatives which we call Resource Report 10. Those resource reports were revised on July 20, and just recently the FERC issued a data request reviewing those resource reports.

Pacific Connector filed its first Draft Resource Report 1 and its summary of alternatives on July 9, 2012. We recently issued a data request to Pacific Connector with questions about those resource reports.

To date, Jordan Cove has held open houses in Coos Bay on March 27, and we did an onsite environmental review at that time. From June 25 to 28, Pacific Connector held open houses in Roseburg, Coos Bay, Klamath Falls and

Medford, and FERC staff attended those open houses and were available to discuss the projects with the public at that time.

From August 27 through 30, we held public scoping meetings previously in Coos Bay, Roseburg, Klamath Falls and Medford, and now were back doing a second round. These are basically the same kinds of meetings with the same power point slide show from me and the BLM, but its another opportunity for the public to ask additional questions or raise additional issues.

(Slide.)

This slide illustrates the FERC pre-filing environmental review process. Id like to point out where we are in the process. We are at the beginning of the process, towards the end of the scoping period. During scoping, you can file comments about the projects, and those comments should come to the FERC before the end of the scoping period, which is October 29, 2012.

Although the FERC will continue to consider comments received from the public until the time we write the EIS, its best if you file your comments during the scoping period so that we can start working on writing the EIS based on the comments we receive.

Let me point out other places in the process where the public gets more opportunities to comment on the

projects. One is in response to our Notice of Applications, and the other would be in response to the issuance of our Draft EIS.

If you want to file comments in the Commissions official record, please follow the directions given in the public participation portion of our NOI. Do not send e-mails to staff, as those comments will not get into the public record.

Despite rumors that our system is difficult to use, I will say that tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of people have been able to file comments to the FERC on thousands of projects. Our process is as easy as writing a letter and addressing it to the Secretary of the Commission. If you are filing written comments, please send it to 888 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20426, addressed to the Secretary of the Commission.

The Commission likes the use of the internet, and we urge electronic filing of comments through our internet web page, which is www.ferc.gov. Click on Documents and Filings, click on either E-comment which is a real simple way to file a comment or E-filing, and follow the directions. If you have questions about either our web page or filing electronically, or the e-library system, please contact our information technology staff. They are available, and later in my slide show I have a phone number

you can call.

In all correspondence, whether electronic or in hard copy, please reference the FERC docket numbers, which are again PF12-7 and PF12-17.

The FERC process is open and transparent. All documents that come in are put into our e-library system, and you can view them through the internet. Again, just go to www.ferc.gov, click on Documents and Filings, click on E-library. E-library holds all documents that are contained in the public record.

To be notified via e-mail of all future filings in these proceedings, you need to sign into our e-subscription service.

We will send out our draft EIS on compact disc, or CD, to the people on our environmental mailing list. This list includes elected officials; federal, state and local government agencies; landowners, environmental groups, and non-governmental organizations, interested Indian tribes, local libraries and newspapers, and other interested parties. You can sign up to be on our mailing list by going to the back table, where Ive got John and Rachel sitting. Weve got a sheet for our environmental mailing list.

If you want to be removed from the mailing list, or you if you want to receive a paper copy of the EIS instead of or in addition to the CD, you have to fill out Appendix 2

of our NOI and mail it back in to the FERC.

In accordance with FERC regulations and guidance, the companies will file the remainder of their Draft Environmental Resource Reports within 60 days after the end of the scoping period. The requirements for the environmental reports that must be included in the applications are outlined in FERC Regulation 18, Code of Federal Regulations 380. The environmental reports should include resource reports that present information about geology and soils, water resources and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, cultural resources, land use, air and noise quality, safety and reliability, and alternatives.

The FERC staff and cooperating agencies will review the draft resource reports and issue data requests to fill in gaps. Once we believe that the data are complete, and no less than six months after the start of pre-filing, Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector can file their formal applications with the FERC. At the time of application, the FERC will assign a new docket number to Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector under our CP prefix. The Notice of Application should include that new prefix so everyone can see it.

Upon receipt of the application, the FERC will issue a Notice of Applications. In response to the Notice of Applications, individuals or organizations may want to

intervene in these proceedings. Being an intervenor is a legal position. Intervenors can request rehearing of a Commission decision. They also have the obligation or burden of serving all parties with their filings. You do not have to be an intervenor to file environmental comments and have your comments considered. You cannot intervene during the pre-filing process.

Based on the applications and our own research, the FERC staff and cooperating agencies will produce an EIS in accordance with the regulations of the Council of Environmental Quality, or CEQ, Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, parts 1500 through 1508, to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The EIS will offer our independent analyses of the potential environmental impacts of the proposals and alternatives.

Generally, the EIS will discuss the current environment, identify potential project-related impacts on specific resources, and present proposed measures to avoid, reduce or mitigate adverse effects. What the EIS will not address are what we call out-of-scope issues. These are issues that have nothing to do with the actions of the BLM, the Forest Service or the FERC.

So, for example, were not going to talk about the benefits of exporting LNG or the effect exporting LNG may have on domestic natural gas prices. As our NOI has stated,

and I stated previously, it is the U.S. Department of Energy which will issue a license for the export of LNG. So if you have comments about the export of LNG, please address them to the U.S. Department of Energy, not to the FERC.

Nor does the FERC have anything to do with what some people call fracking. Fracking is the hydraulic fracturing of certain shales underground that occur when companies are drilling for natural gas. But the production and gathering of natural gas is something the FERC does not regulate. So we dont address things we dont regulate in our EISs.

Questions will be at the end.

The BLM and the Forest Service can adopt the EIS and consider whether to issue a right-of-way grant, and whether or not to amend their land management plans. To talk about the BLM and Forest Service actions is Holly Orr.

MS. ORR: Can you hear me? All right. If I start getting too quiet, let me know, and Ill speak up.

So, as Paul mentioned, FERC is the federal agency thats going to be approving the pipeline. But under the Energy Act of 2005, were the only ones the Bureau of Land Management that have an act where we can issue the right-of-way grants. So FERC is the lead agency when it comes to the EIS and for the NEPA. The BLM is the lead agency when we are trying to decide whether or not to issue a right-of-way grant.

BLM, being the deciding official on that, is doing it in cooperation with the Forest Service and the Reclamation under the Mineral Leasing Act. So weve been working on this project since 2006. In the first go-around, you guys did not see a draft right-of-way grant. In this go-around, you will, in the DEIS.

BLM and Forest Service will decide whether or not to also amend seven separate land-use plans to make provisions to cross lands managed by the BLM and the Forest Service. Reclamation does not require a land-use plan amendment.

The 2005 energy policy requires federal agencies considering authorizations for any aspect of natural gas pipeline to cooperate with FERC and comply with the FERC schedule. Its important for you to note that the Pacific Connector gas pipeline is the only one that we have a nexus to. The Jordan Cove facility doesnt have any BLM land or Forest Service land or Reclamation land. So it will just be the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline.

The BLM manages the public lands. The Forest manages the National Forest Service lands that have been withdrawn for the forest, and the Reclamation Office that works on this project manages the Klamath Project lands.

If FERC authorizes the project, the pipeline, the BLM with the concurrence of the Forest Service and the Reclamation -- will be responsible for issuing the

right-of-way grants that allows that federal land to be occupied. Both the BLM and the Forest Service may require mitigation and other conditions as part of that right-of-way grant, and they will.

Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline. The pipeline itself is not consistent with our land use plans. When our land use plans were put out, we did not consider a large project such as this.

BLM and the Forest Service have been actively involved since 2006, and weve required the company to go out and do a survey. That information will be brought forth in the DEIS. As cooperating agencies, the agencies have been and will continue to provide input on the routing to insure the project avoids and minimizes. We want to look at BLM lands, the National Forest Service lands, and those facilities associated with Reclamations Klamath Project.

We also review any information that FERC is provided by the Applicant. Currently Draft Resource Reports 1 and 10 were made available on the FERC website, and we have been reviewing that with, hopefully, a lot of you folks out there.

We provide information back to FERC and the Applicant on land management plans and our requirements, and any natural resource or agency facilities that may be affected as part of this project. We provide information

and review environmental analysis in support of the FERC NEPA process. So as that NEPA document, the DEIS, is being prepared, we are providing our input.

We consider the amendments to our land use plans to be able to authorize the project. And last, were responding to the right-of-way application thats been presented to us by the company.

So when we respond to the Applicants request for a right-of-way grant, what we get is an application, and with that application is a plan of development. That plan of development has 28 separate plans in it. Those plans range from emergency response, fish salvage, fire protection and suppression, leaf-tree protection, recreation, right-of-way clearing, marking, safety. So this plan of development is going to be part of the draft right-of-way grant and in appendices to the DEIS, and you will be able to review that and comment on it as the public.

The draft right-of-way grant also includes comprehensive mitigation plans prepared by the Applicant, with input and agreement from the BLM and the Forest Service. Currently, there is a secured mitigation plan between the company and the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management is actively working with the company at this time for mitigation projects as it relates to offsetting the effects of the right-of-way on federal land.

BLM and Forest Service will decide whether or not to amend their seven separate land-use plans to make provisions for the pipeline, and the BLM would require these amendments before we could authorize the right-of-way grants. These amendments would be specific only to the pipeline project, and would not authorize any other project.

Why are these plan amendments needed? As I said before, you can work with the company for a very long time to get mitigation plans and things put in place. But with a long corridor such as this, theres no way to get rid of all the effects. In doing so, we have to consider plan amendments to be in compliance.

The BLM and Forest Service land plan amendments are similar to a county zoning ordinance for those folks who understand the county ordinance system. Like a development proposal in a county, any project that goes forward on land administered by the BLM and Forest Service must consider whether or not its consistent with their plan, and if it is not consistent, amendments that allow the project similar to a variance in a county zoning would be required.

Amendments on an affected plan are necessary before the BLM can issue their right-of-way grant. Again, the Reclamation does not require any. Some of the land-use plan amendments that were considering are similar for both the BLM and for the Forest Service, so those plan amendments

that are common to both the BLM and the Forest Service are: one, the reallocation of matrix lands to LSR this includes backfilling of BLM-owned C matrix lands with the acquisition of commercial timber in locations that facilitate the BLM management of OMC lands.

The next one is the waiver to the survey and managed species specific to the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline and that route, and this would be with persistence evaluation. These amendments are described in more detail in the Notice of Intent, and we have obtained the survey information from the pipeline route over the last two years. And that analysis and that information will be available in our DEIS.

I see about seven or eight people that have come and listened to our show before. Everything is exactly the same, except for one map. There was one of the maps where the ownership was reversed, and we have an interested public, and shes always helping us out and giving us advice and keeping me on the straight and narrow, and called and told us about it. We made the change to the power point, we got it uploaded on the FERC site, have changed the current power point.

In the back of the room, youll see theres two tables that have the maps that are bigger, so that you can go look at those afterward. Thats manned by North State Resources. Theyre our environmental contractor to help us with the EIS

and with the analysis, and the right-of-way grant.

All right. So when we look at this illustration, you can see the checkerboard nature. Anybody that lives over here understands the checkerboard nature of the BLM lands. This is on the Coos Bay district, and were looking at the matrix to LSR reallocation.

So if you look at the route, the route is the red line. The location of the matrix lands are in yellow, and then those would be reallocated to LSR. And I know its hard to see these maps just up here, and they go by really fast, so thats why theyve made larger copies and they have them in the back, so you can take some time and have a look at them. And well have those available in the DEIS.

This slide shows the checkerboard on the BLM OMC lands in the Roseburg office. In this one its the same. The red line is the proposed route up in the north part of that. The yellow parcels are the matrix lands that we converted to LSR. And then we would be requiring backfill of the acreage allocated to LSR through acquisition of commercial timber land.

The Umpqua National Forest. They are reallocating nearly 600 acres of matrix lands to LSR, making a larger LSR bloc.

This is the Rogue River National Forest, and they are reallocating approximately 512 acres of matrix lands to

LSR.

So in addition to the ones that are common to both agencies and land use plan amendments, we also have some specific ones. The BLM would need to amend the resource management to also include site-specific exemptions to the protected marbled murrelet habitat, the MAMU, on Coos Bay and the Roseburg district. And wed also need site-specific exemptions of the requirement to retain habitat in KOA Known Owl Activity centers on the Roseburg district. This information will be analyzed in the DEIS and available for your comments and review.

This map illustrates the existing and potential MAMU habitat within a half mile of the occupied sites that would be affected if BLM issues a right-of-way grant to the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline. Although hard to see, the maps in the back are larger, and you can go up there after this and take a look at that illustration. These have been informed by extensive surveys that we have completed since 2009, 2010 and 2011. We have obtained that information, and that analysis will be a part of the DEIS.

So this one is the Known Owl Activity Centers, and theyre meant to weigh protection of habitat. And the Forest Service would need to make site-specific amendments to three of its land resource management plans related to changes in visual quality objectives in five distinct locations. Also,

thresholds for soil disturbance and locating utility corridors in riparian areas. Again, all of the site-specific amendments that would be required would only be applicable to the pipeline. They would not be changing any other future management direction at any other location.

The Forest Service would also need to amend the Rogue River National Forest Resource Management Plan to provide for energy transmission via the pipeline, and once again these amendments are also described in more detail in the Notice of Intent that was published in the BLM and the Forest Service NOI and the FERC NOI, and thats Notice of Intent.

So in this illustration, you can see the Umpqua National Forests. And the red line and the blue are the different perennial streams. So this map illustrates the locations where the Umpqua National Forests Standards and Guides related to shade on perennial streams in utility corridors in riparian areas, this would be amended if the pipeline is authorized.

This map shows the locations where the visual quality objectives established in the Rogue River National Forest LRNP would be amended if the pipeline is approved. Big Elk Road and the other one is Little Butte Creek crossing. The other two are on Highway 140. Again, those are blown up in the back with the larger map.

The Winema National Forest Land Resource Management Plan site-specific amendments would be for a utility corridor and visuals. This map illustrates the locations where visual quality objectives would be amended if the pipeline is authorized.

On August 13 FERC originally put out the Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS for the Pacific Connector and Jordan Cove in the Federal Register. It was not simultaneously published at the same time in the BLM and the Forest Service. So on August 28, FERC issued a notice to extend their comment period until October 29 to match the BLM and the Forest Services Notice of Intent. The Notice of Intent for the BLM and the Forest Service was published on September 21, and we announced the opening of the scoping process for the BLM and the Forest Service with at least 15 days of notice for our meetings on the BLM side. These are concerning the land use plan amendments and the possible issuance of the right-of-way grant. The close of the scoping period will be October 29, the same day as the FERC scoping period closes.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Holly.

We will be combining the BLM and Forest Service analyses of the significance of their proposed plan amendments into our EIS. Once the FERC staff is convinced that the applications are complete, so that we can fully

understand the potential environmental impacts the projects will have, we will issue a Notice of Schedule for our EIS. In accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005, other federal agencies would have 90 days after the FERC releases the final EIS to issue their permits or approvals.

A draft EIS will be published for public review and comment. There will be a 90-day comment period on the DEIS. The FERC will hold public meetings here in Oregon to take verbal comments on the draft EISs. We will also address comments on the draft in our final EIS.

The EIS is not a decision document. It will be prepared to advise the Commissioners and to disclose to the public the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the projects. The Commissioners would consider our environmental analyses, together with other staff material pertaining to non-environmental issues, before making an informed decision about whether or not to authorize the projects.

The Commissioners have the options of accepting the proposals in whole or in part, of approving the proposals with or without conditions, or denying the applications altogether. The decision by the Commission is issued as an order.

If the Commission decides to authorize the projects, the FERC staff will make certain that the environmental

conditions appended in the Order are satisfied. Those conditions usually include stipulations that the company has obtained all other necessary federal and state permits and authorizations prior to construction. The company must implement all of the measures they committed to in their applications and their mitigation proposals.

FERC staff and our contractors will monitor the projects through construction, restoration and completion of the mitigation programs. We will perform on-site inspections for compliance with the environmental conditions of the Order. The BLM and the Forest Service will also monitor activities on their lands.

Before we take public comments, I would like us to take a five-minute break. During this break, you can go to the back table there and sign up on our speakers list. So after youve done that, well reconvene in about five minutes, and Ill call up speakers individually. Thank you.

(Recess.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: So now is the time for public comments.

Let me emphasize that this is not a hearing on the merits of the proposal. Other Commission staff will consider economic need for these projects and the rates to be charged for service. As I said earlier, this meeting provides you, the public, the opportunity to comment on the

type of environmental issues that you want to see covered in the EIS. The more specific your comments are about the potential environmental impacts, the more useful those comments will be for staff, to focus our attention on important issues.

This is not a question and answer session. Im here to listen to your comments. We will address your questions raised during scoping in the EIS after we have conducted the appropriate research.

I will call up speakers one at a time in the order in which they have signed up. I ask that each speaker come up to the microphone here in the front, state your name and spell it for the record. If you represent an organization, tell us what it is without using an acronym. If you are a landowner along the pipeline route, please indicate where your property is located according to mile marks.

To allow adequate time for everyone to speak tonight who wants to, each speaker will be limited to no more than five minutes. As a matter of fairness, I will strictly enforce the five-minute rule, and you can submit longer, more detailed comments in writing to the Commission.

The first speaker on my list is Jean Marie and please help me with the pronunciation of your last name Frangopoulos.

MS. FRANGOPOULOS: Its F-r-a-n-g-o-p-o-u-l-o-s.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Stand a little bit closer to the mike.

MS. FRANGOPOULOS: Hi. I have three questions, one marked out, since you do not believe that fracking is a part of this pipeline.

But Ive read it, Ive seen it in your slides, and Im still a little I would just really like clarification. Why are the previous EIS analyses accepted for the pipeline, but not the public comments? So now the pipeline is bigger is that correct? It is the same size? It is not any larger. Its an export pipeline, but its the same size, so you do not have to take that. Why are you not accepting the previous public comments? I really dont understand that.

I also want to know what are the precautions Jordan Cove Pipeline is taking for the inevitable and overdue earthquake that Oregon and the entire West Coast is up for, and has already had many shakes.

On the human or man-made global climate change topic, I dont understand why this project is this far at all. But with water levels on the rise around the world, and us being on the coast, how is Jordan Cove going to work towards carbon neutrality both on land and in the water? Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

The next person on my list is Joseph Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: My name is Dr. Joseph Morgan, M-o-r-g-a-n. Im an allergist. Ive practiced in Coos Bay since 1966. I do not belong to, represent or speak on behalf of any organization either for or against the LNG terminal. My concerns are entirely for medical reasons, and are derived from many years of clinical experience.

Im concerned that the subject of air quality degradation and the potential health effects of an LNG export terminal have not been addressed in any information that I have seen so far. When an import terminal was proposed, it was estimated that the total airborne emissions would amount to 523.5 tons per year, and to that was added another 288.8 tons from approximately 60 LNG transports and sales, and from the tugboats required to bring them in and out of the port. So thats a total of 812 tons, or 1,624,000 pounds of airborne emissions, and Im concerned about what we might see from an export terminal.

Jordan Coves application, filed with the U.S. Department of Energy, consists of 30 pages of the application itself, plus 152 pages of appendices. In this total of 182 pages, there are two pages under the heading of environmental impact, and there is no mention at all of the Coos Bay-North Bend area. It deals entirely with parts of the country where the gas would originate from.

So Im concerned what the impact of an export

facility on our air quality would be. The import terminal called for a 37-megawatt power generating plant, and were told that an export terminal is more energy-intense and would need a 350-megawatt plant. But what would be released in the air from an installation of that size? Natural gas, of course, would serve as the fuel, and while the combustion products of natural gas are less visible than, for example, from coal, theyre not innocuous.

The basic reaction, assuming complete combustion, results in the methane combining with oxygen to form carbon dioxide and water. The problem is that complete combustion is almost impossible to achieve, and in reality, as actual combustion reactions come to equilibrium, a wide variety of major and minor species will be present, including carbon monoxide and carbon itself, in the form of soot or ash. Additionally, any combustion of atmospheric air, which is 78 percent nitrogen, produces several forms of nitrogen oxides.

Then there is concern about what other sources of emissions there will be. There were mentions of several types of installations for an import terminal. There are combustion turbines, vaporizers, hot oil heater, diesel generator. The import terminal would have released several hundred tons of air pollutants from a location between two and four miles directly upwind from the center of population for a large part of the year, and I think this would have

had a very serious effect on local air quality. The wind off the ocean would require many, many miles to dilute and dissipate emissions of that magnitude, and Im concerned with a larger facility that well see an even more significant degree of materials being released into the air.

The Jordan Cove application does address jobs. They estimated 99 direct jobs, and then a number of additional supporting jobs. Now, retirement is one of our major industries. Our clean air and mild climate are major factors, and many of the people who have chosen this area to retire have significant health problem allergies, sinus problems, heart and lung problems. If we lose our air quality, how many of these families would we stand to lose?

Professor Mark Fagin of Jacksonville State University in Alabama has found that every retiree household moving into an area has the impact on the economy of 3.2 to 3.4 industrial jobs. About 30 such families either moving away or not coming here in the first place would negate those 99 jobs.

Furthermore, avoidable chronic illness can be expected among the current populace. Those at highest risk are the very young, infants and children, those with allergies, sinus problems, heart and lung disease, and a variety of other chronic illnesses, and the elderly. And I do not exaggerate when I say that there are those here at

this meeting who would eventually be affected personally or have a loved one affected, either by acute or chronic illness directly attributable.

So the citizens of Coos County need to be fully informed. The notion of jobs at any cost is often not worth the final true cost. Evaluation of economic impact must consider the costs and burden of otherwise avoidable acute and chronic illness, and the social toll of needless suffering also needs to be addressed.

Its absolutely vital that air quality, as it relates to public health, be thoroughly evaluated. There needs to be an accurate quantification of projected airborne emissions, including all sources of oxides of sulfur, and whether hydrogen sulfide will be present in any quantity at all; oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds and fine particulates. These are particles less than 10 microns in size that lodge permanently in the lungs.

So there must be full consideration of any potential for adverse health effects, especially to the very susceptible segments of the population, as mentioned. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Ron Sadler?

MR. SADLER: My name is Ron Sadler, S-a-d-l-e-r.

Im here as a citizen of the area. I had previously

submitted some detailed comments based on your earlier scoping session, so my comments tonight are related to the BLM Forest Service Notice of Intent.

Speaking to that Notice of Intent, it says: The proposed action, as Holly has mentioned earlier, is to amend land-use plans to accommodate the Pacific Connector Pipeline. And under the nature of the decision to be made in the Notice of Intent, the decision will be to either amend the plans as proposed or as described in alternatives.

My concern, based primarily on NEPA grounds, is where are the alternatives? Where are the pipeline alternatives? Now we all know that the very heart of the NEPA process is an unbiased and objective analysis of alternatives. We have the proposed pipeline going across 71 miles of federal lands, which are a complex matrix of land use classifications as Holly mentioned earlier, plus topographic, geological concerns, stream crossings, et cetera, et cetera.

So we have 71 miles of pipeline right of way, and what we seem to have before us today is a kind of take it or leave it. Heres the pipeline route, and were going to amend to accommodate it. Yet as I said, the analysis of alternatives is the very heart of the process.

In order to make a rational decisional not only rational but legally defensible under NEPA we need to

address reasonable alternatives. So Im suggesting a process that goes something along these lines.

I suggest we look at the pipeline and we develop a sideboard alternative over here that is the best possible location for the pipeline, based strictly on technical and economic grounds from the perspective of the Pacific Connector operation. In other words, whats the best way to go? Forget that environmental stuff. Whats the best way to go? Where should this pipeline then go based on those criteria? Thats one side of the spectrum.

On the other side, I would suggest, how do we put this pipeline in with the absolute least environmental impacts? Where does this thing go so it has the very minimal or no environmental impacts, if thats even possible? But again, thats the other sideboard.

So you have on one side the technical-economic alternative. On the other side, the environmental alternative. Now, neither one of those is going to be selectable. But what it gives you is the sideboards, so when you look at an alternative in the middle, and you say, well, lets put the pipeline in this location, you immediately can address opportunity costs. If you put it here, okay, its going to cost you some extra money, theres going to be some problems for Pacific Connector, but were buying some environmental amenities. If you move it over

this way, youre minimizing the economic impacts for the pipeline, but youre lengthening and having greater environmental impacts.

So what Im saying is, you have the two sideboards, and you can address the impacts and the differences in any alternative you put in the middle by using the opportunity costs.

Now, the objective and systematic analysis of alternatives in this respect would lead you directly to a viable-under-NEPA and legally-defensible record of decision. Lets not forget what NEPA requires for a record of decision, and this is under 40 CFR 1505.2(b). It says, a viable record of decision under NEPA must contain the following things: the identification of all the alternatives considered. Yet here we are looking at one red line on a map.

So it requires the identification of all alternatives considered. It requires FERC in this case to specify which of these alternatives was the environmentally preferable one. It doesnt say you have to select that, but you have to identify which alternative was environmentally preferable. How do we do that if we dont have any alternative in the EIS?

Thirdly, and most important, the record of decision is to discuss how environmental, economic and technical

factors were balanced to reach the final decision, whatever that is. So you really need to address alternatives for this pipeline location if were going to end up with a viable, legally-defensible decision.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Bill Rohrer?

MR. ROHRER: My name is Bill Rohrer, R-o-h-r-e-r. Im reading from a recent news story in Chinas Hunan Province. That is October 6, 2012.

Tanker Road Blast Kills Five in Chinas Hunan Province. A tanker truck carrying liquefied natural gas exploded in central China, killing five people, including three firefighters. The blast happened on a major motorway in Hunan Province on Saturday, and was so powerful the tanker truck was still burning the following day.

Now, this is just one truck. Seven vehicles, including two fire trucks, were destroyed in the blast, and 50 people had to be evacuated from their cars, the state media reported. And this was just one truck, a tanker.

I ask the new EIS to state the extent of the damage from an explosion at the proposed Jordan Cove facilities, and that would involve LNG tanker ships leaving our harbor carrying around 37 million gallons of LNG. Thats roughly, I believe, 3 billion cubic feet of gas.

I also hereby request that this new EIS state, if

such an explosion occurs, who will be liable to pay for the consequential loss of life, cleanup, and restoration of the area caused by a Jordan Cove LNG fire and/or explosion. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Mary Ann Rohrer?

MS. ROHRER: Hi. My name is Mary Ann Rohrer, R-o-h-r-e-r. Im a citizen of the community and concerned about this pipeline and terminal.

The Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, known as ORGAMI, had some things to state about the lessons learned in Recommendations for Oregon Seismic Safety Policy Advisory Commission. The March 11, 2011 Japan earthquake was a magnitude 9.0 subduction zone earthquake and triggered a devastating tsunami. This quake had a massive societal impact. Human casualties are estimated at 29,000, plus many thousands that were missing and injured. Over 200,000 homes were damaged, and many thousands of other buildings were damaged, including 7,735 school buildings and over 300 hospitals.

So ORGAMI surmised that the scope of the damage for this Japan earthquake was likely amplified by the apparently inadequate tsunami protection, mitigation and preparedness measures that followed from a severe underestimation of the scale of an earthquake hazard and the resulting, much larger

than expected tsunami inundation flooding. At this earthquake that happened in Japan, lifeline infrastructure damage hindered the emergency response effort. Managing 25 million tons of debris is but a part of the total cleanup effort. Recovery and rebuilding efforts can take more than seven or more years. Economic damage and recovery costs have been estimated to be in excess of $600 billion.

Earthquake groundshaking and tsunami flooding resulted in damage to lifeline infrastructure, including bridges, highways, railways, ports, airports, oil and gas facilities, power plants, dams, systems involving water, waste water, electrical and telecommunications systems, as well as buildings including schools, hospitals and industrial plants not to mention the nuclear power plant that had some uncontrolled radioactive releases. Numerous coastal communities and inland areas had extensive liquefication -- talk about building a terminal on a sand dune and landslide damage.

Emergency response efforts were delayed due to--shortages, power communication disruptions, and damage to transportation systems, hospitals, and fire and police stations. And of course, there were large aftershocks that caused additional damage.

So ORGAMI and the Oregon State University scientists have stated recently that the southern Oregon coast may be

the most vulnerable in the state to such a large-scale quake as that of Japans 2011 quake. So in light of this, I request that the EIS examine and investigate, in every detail, the reliability and the reality of predicting how large an earthquake or tsunami and the damage thereof can be estimated; and therefore, how able it would be to accurately predict what would be needed to protect the safety and lives of the people of this area; and what precaution, if any, or risk assessment can actually guarantee safety in the case of an accident, earthquake, tsunami or terrorism.

I further request that this EIS look at other alternative areas, if any, in which to site such a project, in light of the seismic, environmental and economic issues concerning the Coos Bay-North Bend area. And furthermore, if such a formidable scenario would develop, who would be liable to pay for the cleanup and restoration of the area of such damage created by the proposed Jordan Cove terminal and pipeline? Id like the EIS to consider this.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Next on my list is Curt Clay.

MR. CLAY: My name is Curt Clay. I live here in Coos Bay, a property owner.

I have here a copy I brought this tonight, or actually I had a friend bring me copies of the previous

EIS. This document has been torn apart. Its been laughed at. Its inadequate. Whole sections are missing. The Oregon Attorney General called it a waste of paper.

Ive heard people here tonight wanting more information. I hope you hear this, too. But what sticks in my craw is, like some other folks here, that this piece of waste material is going to be recycled, given back to us. But the comments brought forth from the public are being rejected, disregarded, and we have to go through it all again.

Once again, Im questioning this. It reminds me I grew up with horses. One of my sisters got a Clydesdale, a huge beast. Its 17 hands. Its probably taller than anybody in this room. And when that creature had a bowel movement, it was about the size of this, and nobody present would have thought to make the horse eat that.

But Jordan Cove, with your blessing, is going to try to feed this back to the public. Its worthless. Im requesting a new one, one thats up-to-date, one thats complete, one that is what is your word for it? programmatic. Thats my request, and its got to be legible.

Theres people here who think this is a legitimate, a good plan. They need to be able to read this. It has to be in, like, high-school English. If you look through this, and I dont know whether you have, its a lot of malarkey.

Thats my request. My request is a new EIS, not a recycled one. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Ora Henderson?

MS. HENDERSON: Hello, again. My name is Ora Henderson, O-r-a H-e-n-d-e-r-s-o-n. I want to start by thanking you for coming down again. Thank you for your time, coming down and listening to our comments. I am part of Occupy Oregons South Coast, so you know youre being occupied right now.

What I would like to see in an environmental impact statement especially is the impact on the water quality. Theres a lot of water qual things going on in the creeks, and I dont think any amount of mitigation will help. The water temperature rising has a severe effect on the salmon, which are already a threatened species. It also has quite a lot to do with our economic growth around here. Salmon our fish industry is quite a large thing in this area. Salmon and the water quality and temperature, also the dredging that it would take for the not the pipeline, but the actual export center. I want to see what that would cause to the clams and the oyster population in this area, which is also another big economic boom, and food.

The tsunami hazard has, I think, already been addressed. Its a very big concern in my mind. If a tsunami

were to come, what would happen to that export center, and how would it affect us? Because I know it would not be good. It would be very, very harmful.

I would also like to bring into reference the global summit after Rio de Janeiro, 20 years later. They started putting monetary figures to natural resources that were not before calculated, because there was no market for it. But just because there isnt a market for clean air and clean water and healthy salmon there is a market for that doesnt mean that it shouldnt be taken into consideration when it comes to economic status, because I dont think any amount of money is worth our clean air or water.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Janet Stoffel?

MS. STOFFEL: Thats Janet, J-a-n-e-t, Stoffel, S-t-o-f-f-e-l. Im a 37-year resident of Coos Bay.

I was born and raised in Richland, Washington, which borders the Hanford nuclear facility. While I lived there, all the community leaders and the media claimed that everything was very safe in our community, and that there were no radiation leaks or anything we should be concerned about.

Later, with the Freedom of Information Act, it became apparent that this was a brazen lie. Family members,

classmates, neighbors and I have health consequences, including radiation-related cancers. Many of the people I know are dying or have died from radiation-related diseases.

I moved to Coos Bay, Oregon in 1975 for my first job as a high-school teacher. I taught health and home economics for 30 years, and I continue to work as a substitute teacher. The health and welfare of young people has been the primary focus of my adult life.

As I have been following the process of the possible LNG export terminal on the North Spit, I am shocked at the threats of danger this project represents to those thousands of students I have taught, and others in this community. I cant help but reflect on how I was misled about the dangers of a nuclear power plant practically in our backyard as a young woman in my home community, and I wonder what will happen to Coos Bay-North Bend community if an LNG export terminal is built here.

It is important to me that the Jordan Cove Pacific Connector FERC Environmental Impact Statement needs to, number one, explain how it could be that the results of the Sandia National Laboratory Small-Scale Test, which has determined that the zone of concern is 2.2 miles around vessels, how that can be ignored in the siting of LNG ports, and certainly export terminals, closer than 2.2 miles from local civilians. The plant siting here is closer than that

to the local high school, where I taught, and the nearby middle school, the airport, and the largest shopping center on the south coast of Oregon.

Explain how the safety zone around an LNG tanker, number two, in the bay in the event of an accident is going to prevent the fiery, instantaneous deaths of thousands of local residents, since many people live within this safety zone.

Number three, the EIS needs to explain how a construction company is going to safely install a three-foot-in-diameter pipeline through hundreds of waterways that must be crossed with this proposed route, without putting the fish, the wildlife and the humans at risk. A one-foot-in-diameter gas pipeline was installed a few years back here in this area, and the construction company made such a mess of the process that they were fired in the middle of the job and sued by the Coos County commissioners, but not until they had damaged ecosystems and damaged peoples water supplies in the process.

Number four, explain how the LNG tankers and the plant will be protected f rom possible terrorist attacks. The local airport is so near the plant that all a plane would have to do is veer off course and smash into the plant or a tanker, and it would happen so fast that the fiery explosion would happen before it was even detected. Coast

Guard boats could not stop a plane, so will an anti-aircraft missile base need to be added to this plan? And if so, how would that affect the quality of life of my past students and the rest of the people who live here?

Number five, explain how the community will be protected from a huge explosion of the plant and/or tankers after an earthquake and subsequent tsunami. As we know, Oregon State University geologists claim that an earthquake and a tsunami occur on the average on the Oregon coast every 244 years. It has now been 310 years since the last one, and in a community that practices tsunami drills, where the local students exit to a hill less than two miles from the proposed plant, all our advance preparation seems pretty futile if, after the quake, the whole area goes up in a big ball of fire.

Also, I want number six, explain how piling up dredging from the bay and then building the power plant that is imperative for keeping the LNG gas cooled so it does not explode, on top of this piled-up dredging, how that is going to respond to an earthquake and subsequent tsunami. Theres another type of liquifecation, soil, that occurs after a quake, and it needs to be explained how the proposed power plant might tilt or collapse, and what consequences that would cause for our community. Please explain how these consequences would be mitigated which seems impossible so

they will not occur and kill most of the people in this area.

Number seven: many people have moved to this area because of allergies and asthma, and depend on the ocean breezes, the cool temperatures and the fresh air for their survival. Your EIS must explain what chemicals will be exhausted into the air from venting of the storage tanks, the tankers, the exhaust from the power plant under optimal, normal and extreme conditions, as well as the tugboats and other support equipment. Also, the EIS should detail the health ramifications of breathing such chemicals. The area often has a temperature inversion, and fumes could hang around for days of buildup before the inversion lifts. These fumes will be exhausting into the classrooms of the nearby high school, the middle school, the hospital, as well as all of our homes and businesses in the entire region.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to finding your answers to my concerns in your published draft EIS.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Jonathan Hanson?

MR. HANSON: My name is Jonathan Hanson. Thats J-o-n-a-t-h-a-n- H-a-n-s-o-n. Im going to turn this way and talk, because those yahoos up there, theyre not the ones that need to hear this, and Mrs. Stoffel has covered

everything that I would like to say, except for the fact that FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, is non-compliant with NEPA, the National Energy Policy Act, which governs this process. And NEPA says that a lot of the functions which are occurring around here are not to happen until after the Commission issues the order.

And you have this piece of paper way down here, and we are way up here, and we are way up here for the second time. And the first time, as youve heard, has been nullified. And as you have seen so amply demonstrated, it was a bunch of crap. And the same contractor who did that bunch of crap has been contracted to do the same thing again, as far as Im concerned.

And FERC is non-compliant with NEPA, because FERC has not done anything to stop whats going on with the cities, doing contracts Bob Braddock back there is going to the cities, and hes making contracts for all kinds of things, services and so forth, which are going to happen as if its already a foregone conclusion that this is going to happen. And that foregone conclusion, it wont be foregone when it gets to there, and the new order is issued. And there has not yet been an order issued, even for the other way of doing it.

So what Im saying is that theres a lot of illegal activity going on around here, and the people who are

supposed to regulate this, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and as far as all of these jobs theyre talking about in here are concerned, and this has nothing to do with that. But when theyre talking about these kind of jobs, you bring in this kind of monster stuff, and youre going to see jobs flying away from here, cause nobodys going to want to live here any more definitely not me.

Im living here for my health. Things have been improving over the years here as the mills have closed and as the ships have reduced, and so forth. But more people with more money are moving in, and I would say its a much nicer place to live.

So FERC, I said the same thing at the last meeting. And I said in my statement then that FERC is non-compliant with NEPA, and I have not heard boo about that since then. What I have heard is Arnie Roblin talking about all the wonderful jobs that are going to happen, and about what a wonderful, safe thing this is going to be.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Jody McCaffree?

MS. McCAFFREE: Jody McCaffree, spelled J-o-d-y; McCaffree is M-c-C-a-f-f-r-e-e.

At the Pacific Gas Pipeline Coos County Land Use Hearings that we had they were held in May of 2010 when the issue of an emergency response plan came up, Pacific

Connector Gas Pipeline representative Rodney Gregory called up an emergency response manual, which was basically a notebook with phone numbers that our rural fire department could call in case there was an accident. This is not a sufficient emergency response plan.

Just a few months after that land use hearing, in September of 2010, we all witnessed what happened in San Bruno, California, when PG&E had one of their natural gas pipelines explode due to improper maintenance. In fact, the San Francisco Chronicle ran a front page article which said, It Looks Like A War Zone.

It took PG&E 95 minutes to shut off the valve in that San Bruno pipeline accident. And that was with paved roads and easy access to them. We dont have that luxury in most of southern Oregon, where the Pacific Connector gas pipeline is being proposed. In many places there are no roads and no easy access. Our rural fire departments are generally volunteer and lack equipment and the necessary training.

In a 2008 World newspaper article that ran about this very issue, in this article, the Coos Bay fire department had refused to respond to a fire because the house was located up the west fork of the Milliacoma, which is out of their jurisdiction. Because the Coos Forest Protection Association was not trained to fight structural

fires, since they fight forest fires, they had to just let the house burn. So there is no sufficient fire protection in many of our rural areas right now.

If there was to be a subduction earthquake and tsunami on top of or at the same time as an LNG pipeline accident, most of our roads and bridges are expected to not be passable. How will gas shutoff valves be taken care of in that scenario? What is the fire protection and evacuation plan? Most of the population living in the North Bend-Coos Bay area are landlocked by bridges. In other words, theres no way to get out of here if we have bridges impassable. How will people evacuate if there is such an event?

A fire station on the North Spit that is located in an LNG hazard and tsunami inundation zone will be of no help to most of the 30,000 to 40,000 people living in the Coos Bay area or for that matter, the rural people living in the areas along the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline route. In addition, most of our fire stations that are already located in the North Bend-Coos Bay area are in the LNG hazard zones of concern. How will this be addressed?

We need more than just an emergency response manual notebook with phone numbers. We need a viable and workable emergency response evacuation and maintenance plan for this facility that incorporates all scenarios for the terminal,

liquefaction facility, power plant, LNG tanker ships, and the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline. And it needs to be one thats doable, not just on paper. It has to be able to work. This should be a part of the FERC reliability and safety and transportation and traffic sections of the Jordan Cove-Pacific Connector EIS.

In addition to this, the LNG industry has a good safety record because they follow gas industry guidelines, such as the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators guidelines. They have one thats called Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties. Observing the industrys best practices and standards helps to preserve safety, public confidence, the industry; energy security and the economy. But unfortunately, the Jordan Cove projects violates a lot of the SIGTTO guidelines, and Ill give you some examples of those guidelines.

For one, there is no acceptable probability for a catastrophic LNG release. LNG ports must be located where LNG vapors from a spill if released cannot affect civilians. LNG ports must be located where they do not conflict with other waterway users, now and into the future. This requires long-range planning for the entire port area prior to committing to a terminal location.

Long, narrow inland waterways are to be avoided due to greater navigational risk. Waterways containing

navigation hazards are to be avoided as LNG ports. LNG ports must not be located on the outside curve in the waterway, since other transiting vessels would at some point during their transit be headed directly at the berthed LNG ship. Human error potential always exists, so it must be taken into consideration in selecting and designing an LNG port.

Theres a lot of good guidelines on this. I would like to see this in the EIS, and addressed as to why theyre not following those guidelines. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

David Petrie?

MR. PETRIE: Good evening. My name is David Petrie. The last name is spelled P-e-t-r-i-e. I am founder of Coos Water Caper and a Coos tribesman.

This evening Id like to talk about the human occupation of this landscape, to begin with. My ancestors occupied the landscape for 10,000 years. It is 159 years and one month since the arrival of the dominant culture. In that brief period of time, our ecosystem is 90 percent compromised. The fisheries are even further compromised.

So as I think about what youre proposing to do with an LNG facility, a gas-powered generation facility, and a pipeline, I cannot not look at this holistically, and what youre actually proposing to do. And I dont believe you have

the right to segment the project.

So when you think of the ship slip and the terminal development itself, thats going to be a project that will excavate 5.5 or 5.75 million cubic yards of material from a bay that has legacy pollutants that are sequestered in that sediment because of the unregulated discharge of pollutants in this bay for 159 years.

Now, we have three endangered species in this watershed: the yulecon, which is the smelt; the green sturgeon, and we have the Oregon coast coho salmon. They are going to be impacted by that dredging project. Obviously, they are going to be impacted by the laying of that pipeline to the east, as well.

So when we think of this holistically, and the fracking included because the point source is going to require fracking and the damaging of water tables where this natural gas is sourced. And then, the pipeline is already developed to Malin. It comes across the Klamath territory.

I talked with Perry Chocktoot, and I know that he has worked with the agencies and developed an MOU to avoid cultural resource sites. The same thing happened with the Cow Creek. But the Coos-Lower Umpqua-Siuslaw Tribe was provided a boilerplate MOU not even speaking to our cultural resources. That disturbs me.

The advent of cultural sites being disrupted by this

pipeline is obvious. Its going to occur. Do we trust the construction company to protect those cultural resources? I dont.

So in thinking about the process now, we took the March 27 field trip, the site visit to the mill site. That day I walked from the Transpacific Highway across the field, walking beside you, Mr. Friedman. As I was listening to you and Mr. Braddock talk about the project, it reminded me of what my ancestors probably experienced with the Indian agents coming and signing peace treaties peace treaties that were never ratified. So the lack of credibility in my opinion is huge.

It is disturbing to see this project being introduced into this ecosystem, and the support from FERC, a proponent of the project. Thats what I observe, and I believe that Coos County deserves better. I dont believe that the citizens deserve to have their health impacted by the emissions from this facility, the safety factors.

I read the City of North Bend signed an agreement with Jordan Cove to provide firemen on the site. And Im thinking, when the tsunami occurs, the bridges are going to be gone. Thats a death warrant, certainly uncalled for.

A programmatic NEPA EIS process needs to be facilitated. And dont segment the project somewhat of a personal responsibility bias, in my opinion.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Were having trouble reading this handwriting, but were going to try it. Craig Spjut? Will you correct my pronunciation when you get up here?

MR. SPJUT: Hi. My name is Craig Spjut, spelled S-p-j-u-t. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak, if I can speak into this.

I actually was once at a raffle, and they pulled my name out of the hat, and they couldnt say it. So they threw it back in.

Anyway, I used to live in Winchester Bay in the late 70s, and I worked at the Gardiner mill, a pipefitter. And I worked on the expansion of the paper machine. Anyway, you guys know, now theres a retirement community for you, for those people who live in this area. Whats there?

Now Im business agent down in the Curry County area, and I support the project, Id like to say. And some notes I made.

In my area, down in Curry County, 83 percent of the children that go to school are on subsidies. I know this doesnt have much to do with the pipeline and the EIS, but excuse me. We really need to get the economy going in this area, and I really appreciate retirement, because Id like to do that someday. But in order to retire, you have to work.

So like I said, 83 percent of the school children

are on subsidies from the government for lunch programs. Its quite a number.

I can appreciate the fear. I mean, Ive seen the devastation that can happen in an accident. But we try to live in a fail-safe society, but Im sure theres some good engineering practices that were going to be following.

As far as the cultural, I have to appreciate what the gentleman just spoke about. We also have a member who spoke in Medford. I dont know if you recall that. He spoke about his family heritage, and how long hes been in the area.

And then last, a couple things Id like to talk about, and thats the jobs that it would create and the tax base it would give this community. And then the last thing Id like to say, I actually sleep every night, almost the nights that Im at home in a tsunami zone. And that fear of a tsunami has grown more and more as the geologists tell us about the possibilities of the subduction zone. So eventually, its probably going to happen. But I think with good engineering, I think that we can overcome.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Bill Gow?

MR. GOW: My name is Bill Gow, B-i-l-l- G-o-w. Im glad its only three letters.

Okay. The one thing Id like to see addressed on

this thing is and I havent heard nobody talk about this is the roads, the yards, and all the access areas that are going to be impacting my ranch when this pipeline goes through my ranch.

Now, theyre not going to be able to make a switchback in the 95-foot construction up those steep hills and down those steep hills. So therefore, theyre going to have to go round to bring workers and equipment, to bring everything into my place to get it, which obviously I dont want. So therefore, were going to get into more eminent domain in order to get roads in there, which I dont even want on my place in the first place. And so all of a sudden, instead of just impacting a 95-foot strip through my ranch, theyre going to impact all my roads. Some places youre going to have to go two or three miles to get back in there.

I just cant imagine giving these people eminent domain to get across my property. And then for maintenance later, fires am I going to have to let them in any time I want to come in there, putting construction yards? Thats not going to fit in that 95 feet. They want to put a pump station on my place to discharge the water? I mean, theyre just going to make a total, complete disaster for a few frickin jobs.

You know, I work construction. I know how it is.

Ill bet the people of Appalachia wish they never would have gave, quote, jobs to their people with black lung in the grave, and they wish they had their ranches and their farms back, and they had some peace for their family, and their families are still together instead of scattered all over the country from being displaced from what this was, quote, supposed to be good for them. Look at the mess they made of the water. Look at the mess they made of everything.

So there is no good to come out of that. I think Ive talked to several ranchers along this route that have had, you know, a pipeline route, like the Ruby and different ones. They said the little dab of money they got, they would never do it again. And then said, Bill, fight this to the end.

Anyway, to sit here and think this thing has any good for the people along the route and you know, if this is so damn good and these people want these jobs, go build more property. Im a guy that worked and built me up some property so I would be left alone. And if they think its such a damn good deal, go buy them a ranch and run one right through the middle of their ranch, and see what they think about that.

You know, its really hard for me to sit here and watch this whole process going this way, in the middle here, talking about changing this land. Theres reasons that land

was probably put to certain different things. And now, just because big money has brought a process in, theyre going to let them come through there.

If I went to go through there to drive my cattle through, or do something else, they wouldnt let me through there, because I dont have enough damn money. And Ill tell you what, its just crazy. And I would think and I was trying to figure this out when she was talking about it if theyre going to add more land, its not going to be a zero-plus game. Because if theyre going to put that right-of-way, and theyre going to move matrix land and LSR land and all those abbreviations around, youre either going to have to go buy more ground from private citizens and put more ground into the management of the government which weve already seen what a disaster that is or theyre just going to move a shell game and move things around.

Thats not protecting anything. Thats just changing things around. So theres only one choice I could see, is theyre going to have to go buy more private land. And God knows we dont want any more private land in the hands of the government, off the tax rolls and making a mess. As a U.S. citizen, Im appalled even thinking about that.

You know, its just amazing the level that the gas and oil industry has bought into this whole process. They own the whole process from the bottom to the top. I cant

even imagine what big money has done to the process. Were just here for a dog and pony show. They own the process from the top to the bottom, and I tell you what. Ive worked hard to have a piece of ground that I want to live on for the rest of my life and be left alone. If they use eminent domain to get through my land, its just so against everything that we as American citizens believe, and I think we all really need to think about private property rights in this whole fight.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Next up is John Clarke.

MR. CLARKE: John Clarke, J-o-h-n C-l-a-r-k-e. You recognize me, Im, sure, because Ive been to just about every one of your scoping meetings.

I came here tonight primarily to talk about Jordan Cove, because of the lack of information that is available so that you can scope it. Its just non-existent. And so Im going to deviate from that point a little bit.

I filed a scoping paper and sent it to Washington. And tonight, you mentioned that we are not going to consider for scoping anything that might change the ratepayers rate. And that basically was my paper that was sent to scoping, and I didnt know that that rule was there other than tonight. Youve already got that paper.

It is my understanding, though, that you are operating under the 2005 Gas Act. In that Gas Act, it clearly states that you cannot, or a company cannot, either on purpose or inadvertently do something that will set the rate that the ratepayers pay. So well back up a little.

My point really is that Jordan Cove is way too big. The Pacific Connector pipe delivers .9 billion cubic feet of gas per day. Jordan Cove processes or has the capacity to process 1 billion cubic feet of gas per day. Now, weve got an imbalance of 100 million cubic feet per day.

So the question is, if that doesnt affect prices, where does the other gas come from? Theyre going to have a power plant at Jordan Cove. Is that tapping into the domestic gas thats in Coos Bay? This is information thats not available, and so how do you scope it?

You have in your booklet, you say, were going to have two tanks, 160,000 cubic meters of liquid gas. But you go from cubic meters to cubic feet to tons per annum. Its very difficult for a layperson to come together with these numbers.

I talked to your engineer to try and get some semblance of what were talking about, because I dont know a conversion figure which says, a cubic foot of natural gas at 1440 psi is equal to five gallons of liquid gas. But the number 160,000 times two in cubic meters, youd have to put

in a factor of 3.3 squared just to get it into cubic feet. Then you have to know that 5.6 gallons is in one cubic foot, but we cant convert it back to compressed gas. Because if one is refrigerated, then it doesnt have the pressure, and the other one isnt.

So we have a lot of problems going in. The state wants to use natural gas as a bridge fuel. Theyre talking about converting these fleets of trucks, cars everything is going to be used to lessen the carbon footprint. But they think that theres some surplus in gas because its tying in there at Round Prairie. Its tying into the I5 pipeline.

There is no extra gas. 90 percent of it is under contract for 25 years, and that isnt even the capacity of Jordan Cove. Someone needs to take a look at reducing the size of Jordan Cove. Ill see you tomorrow night.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Clarke.

J. C. Williams?

MS. WILLIAMS: J.C. Williams, spelled just the way that it usually is.

We made it into Reuters last time we did a round. Reuters used the word, idyllic, when describing our area. I knew my version of that, but check the dictionary anyway. The three following adjectives were used. It means charming, simple, picturesque. I love that about Coos Bay.

But theres a hell of a lot more going on here, such as logging, fishing and farming. None of these are simple, charming or picturesque to the logger, fisher or farmer. Those are high-stakes businesses involved in hard work, and also some of the most dangerous work.

I talked with these people, and many want to know the effect that the gas project will have on their work base, their safety and their bottom line. Traffic on the roads and shipping lanes, fire and pollution come to mind. The EIS should be specific and honest about the true cost to folks, and how the applicants plan to mitigate and protect both them and their access.

Speaking of picturesque, will a pollution-spewing gas plant add to our tourist appeal? Will it help the health of people living here currently, breathing the pristine sea air that I hope you enjoyed today? I know it wont, and I want the EIS to fully state just how much fossil fuel particulate we all get to take in daily, and what it will cost this community.

I worked, and my friends still work, near the mall that is next to the schools and the airport. When the wind blows across the spit and Old Buddy doesnt blow, whatever Jordan Cove generates will blanket North Bend.

I have connected with folks that have a great deal to lose, the landowners. Heres what I heard: a couple

bought property not knowing about the planned pipe that was going to go through that property. You would think that the real estate agent might have mentioned that. But since its public knowledge, theyre not obligated to do that. They dont have to tell the buyer.

Once the pipe is a reality, will they ever get back what they paid for their place? Will then even be able to sell it? It should be addressed in the EIS.

I just met somebody who had a family farm that is distraught about having this pipe project create havoc in the very place they use to hunt and to enjoy their land. This EIS should say what alternative routes can be used. According to NEPA, it should state clearly the need for these primarily Canadian projects that will sell fossil fuel on the world market.

I see only one side of the economic impact being sold by a certain faction in the community. But it truly will affect everyone here, all of Oregon, the whole USA and the world. This EIS must tell it, and tell it all, like it is.

What we really need is a programmatic EIS for the whole gas industry. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Dennis Koplan?

MR. KOPLAN: Good evening, everyone.

My name is Dennis Koplan. Im a member of United Association, Local 290, Plumbers and Steamfitters. We represent 4,000 members. We have over 40 members living in the Coos County area alone. Many of these members are counting on jobs. They have families to support. They have roofs to put over their heads, food to put on the table. Without these jobs we hear that they are only temporary jobs; theyre only part-time jobs.

I dont know of any carpenter, any electrician, any pipefitter, any plumber, that has anything but a temporary, part-time job. Every time they show up to a job, they are working to completion to go to their next job. So that being said, these are not temporary jobs. These are not part-time jobs. These are jobs that they count for their livelihood.

Were not talking about a small amount of jobs. Very few people understand that, in the construction of the pipeline, let alone the Jordan Cove facility, there are over 10,000 man-years of labor. A year of labor for a man is 2,000 hours. So were talking about a substantial amount of hours for people that have employment, not to mention anywhere from I think its 90 to 120, depending upon who you talk to of full-time, living wage jobs that will be produced by the people that are on the facility working in the maintenance and operation of the facilities.

So were talking about a lot of jobs and a lot of money. Were talking about $40- to $50 million in taxes to the industry or to the counties, four counties. Coos County will be the recipient of most of that money, and that will be in the taxation of the operation and in the manufacture of these facilities as well as the pipeline.

So were talking about a lot of money. Were talking another $30- to $50 million, depending on how many billion cubic feet go out of this facility a year, that is going to also go over the 30 years of life expectancy to this facility.

So were not talking about chump change here. Were not talking about a small amount of money. Thats a large amount of money, and its going to go to putting subsidies that are going to feed the children, take care of families, pay the taxes, make sure that we have schools and teachers that are being paid.

So think about it. It is good for the economy. Granted, we have some environmental issues that we have to talk to, we have to address. Im sure that most of you I was on a farm that was over 900 acres that was taken for eminent domain. Now, we didnt like it when it happened. But when it happened, it was for homes and shopping centers.

Now, that was the worst use that I can think of of eminent domain. Were talking about taxation that is going

to go into the economy from a production facility, jobs that are going to be created, as well as the reduction in the trade deficit that we all need to have. And were going to have to look at this realistically. This belief that zero growth is good for the economy is ridiculous. If everybody goes with the same feeling not in my backyard eminent domain would be applicable. But you have to understand: eminent domain has been around since the start of time. When we come into the American constitution, thats when we started it, and it is for the good of the people, the people as a whole.

Individuals will be affected. We cant help it. You cannot think of any government project, any large road, bridge, or any facility that has been constructed in the United States that hasnt had some form of eminent domain used. So to say that eminent domain, not in my backyard, is all that applies, you have to take in what is good for the whole people of the United States as well as Coos County and Oregon.

Theres a lot of jobs here. Its not one or two jobs, a few a little bit of money thats coming into the economy and its going to disappear. If we had to work on the same principle, go back to the Mayflower. Theyd still be trying to figure out how to write an environmental impact study on whether to drop the anchor.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Rachel, were there any more people signed up in the back?

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: If thats the end of my speakers list, is there anyone who did

not speak that wants an opportunity to speak? Yes? You have to come up to the microphone and tell us your name.

MS. HANSEN: My name is M.A. Hansen, H-a-n-s-e-n. I wasnt going to speak tonight because I loved what everybody was saying here, but I have to answer the last fellow up here.

I have been fighting this pipeline for seven years, and one of my main subjects is jobs. I asked the last project manager how many jobs, Oregonian jobs -- somebody who today is an Oregonian on the pipeline? He scratched his head the first time I asked him, and I asked him in front of a lot of people, because I went to every meeting there was. I traveled all over Oregon going to these meetings. And he come up with a figure of five to six jobs.

And I said, youre going to take our land, eminent domain, for five or six jobs? And I believe that in the EIS I would like to say a few things about that, because I can write EISs; I have a degree in planning, and thats one of the things we did, and everything they said about the last

one is true. Ive never seen such a terrible one.

But anyway, back to the jobs. I believe they mentioned in that that there was only 59 jobs tied to the terminal. And when I asked, I think they come up with something like 63, and they said, we cant promise theyll be Oregonians.

Also, I was told that when building the pipeline, I was told by one of the project managers, somebody who showed up every meeting for Jordan Cove and for the Pacific Connector, that they were not going to hire Oregonians to build the pipeline, because Oregonians dont know how to build pipelines. Theyre going to bring in people from Oklahoma.

So lets be realistic and listen to what theyre saying about the jobs. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

You have to come up to the microphone here and state your name.

MS. DILLEY: Jan Dilley, spelled D-i-l-l-e-y.

I just want to speak to this thing about jobs, this concept that all this imported labor is going to be bringing millions into the local area. Those are imported labor, take the tax dollars to wherever they come from, like some were Oklahoma. So they are the ones who would be reaping that.

And as far as the jobs at the terminal, which on the first EIS I believe were 60, and only two-thirds of it has been promised to Oregonians. You know, theyre fighting this thing about 40 jobs for the local people. And really, its misstated to say they would bring in jobs.

The other thing was, as far as eminent domain, before 2005, when they had that case that allowed private companies to exercise eminent domain, there wasnt. Before that, it was only the government for common good, like to put in my shopping center or something to that effect, as far as the community. But this is quite different, because first of all, Jordan Cove is a foreign corporation. There is no need for this for the community. Its a private gain just for the private company. And for that, the people of Oregon should not be asked to vacate their land or give up their land for a private interest.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Do we have someone else who wants to speak? You just need to come up to the microphone, and state your name.

MR. LEHNA: My names Irvin Lehna, last name is L-e-h-n-a, and I worked on the Ruby Pipeline in Lakeview for a year and a half.

You guys got a lot of questions, and a lot of them are good, and Ive got one. You guys ask, how safe is this pipeline going to be? Then you ask about the jobs.

The reason they bring these people in from Wyoming, all over the world, is because theyre experienced. I belong to the 701s. Were going to have classes on this. Were learning. And when we get to learn all this, we want to be safe. And with these guys come in from all over the world to put this pipeline in, its not to take our jobs away. Its to help us. Its not to do anything else; its to help us.

You guys, were all going to profit from this. Weve all lost our timber, weve all lost our fishing and everything because of environmentalists and everything. Theyve blocked against us. Thats the reason we dont have no schools no more, because we cant pay for them.

This is a welcome fight. I mean, were all going to have to learn from this. And theyre going to teach us. Theyre not going to leave us in the dark. Ive worked with these people. I worked with them for a year and a half. Ive even worked up above Lakeview on Thanksgiving. They brought up us turkey, everything else. Theyre a family. Its a family company.

Im not saying whos going to get the contract, cause I dont know. But they made us feel like family, and theyre not going to leave us out in the dark. All your questions are going to be asked. But we need to do something about the economy here. Because if we dont, its going to dwindle right away. Were not going to have nothing.

You think just once a year having tourists come in this town is going to keep this town going? No, its not. We need this. We need it for our family. We need it for the future. And if we dont take it, then you guys are just deserving what youre going to get.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Is someone else coming to speak?

MR. McGILRY: Yeah, Jeff McGilry speaking on behalf of Local 290, Plumbers and Steamfitters.

I just wanted to address the number of people on the pipeline. Its true there will be people from out of state, but theres going to be hundreds hundreds of people, as there was on the Ruby line, which is quite a bit shorter, just a year and a half ago. There will be members of the United Association, and they will be making our wages that we make here in Oregon. They will be taxed on that wage. They will be paying Oregon taxes. I just thought that needed to be brought up.

You know, as the last brother said there, you know, you cant support a tax base on retirement and service industry. You do need that money in here, and it will be a good thing. And I do believe they will, as these people are doing, theyre going to go all through the environmental stuff. The Ruby pipeline went through pretty well.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Is there anybody else who would like to speak?

MS. ROBINS: I just have to. My name is Laura Robins

MR. FRIEDMAN: Laura, please speak into the microphone.

MS. ROBINS: Okay.

My name is Laura Robins. I am a member of Local 12. Im a longshoreman. Im not representing Local 12, but Im telling you Im letting you know what my occupation is.

I came here in 1991 from Southern California with three little kids, a divorced mother, and I was a longshoreman when I transferred up here. When I came here, there were ships up and down the bay, and I thought: Oh, great. I can raise my children here as a single mother.

In 1998, we lost almost all of our work. No ships were coming here. Ive been on the road working since 1998, leaving my family because of the loss of work in the port of Coos Bay. Were now starting to get a few log ships back. I have one child left at home thats a senior this year, and Ive had to see my other kids leave this area because theres no work for them.

I support anything that comes into the terminal. They talk about the tugs. There were tugs bringing ships up

and down this bay in the early 90s. If the wind blows, it blows everything away. Its not going to affect the air quality.

Im not an expert in that area, but I am an expert in watching my kids grow up, as a mother, and watching the schools shut down. I mean, I could name several schools that have shut down because young families had to leave this area.

So I would like to say, Welcome. Build the ports, build the port dock, build the terminal, bring family wage jobs back to Coos Bay. Im hearing a lot of this, I mean my hearts beating so fast, because Im hearing a lot of, I got mine, in this room. I got mine. What about the young families that need jobs in this community, and to keep it?

I mean, 90 percent of the people in this room are retired, and they got theirs. What about the young families? Lets bring our young families back here and give them jobs so they can have some hope for a future.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Is there anybody else who wants to speak?

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: If not, then its time for us to end this meeting. On behalf of the FERC, the BLM and the Forest Service, I want to thank you all for coming here tonight to give us your comments and help us focus our environmental

review on the issues which you think are important.

Let the record show that this meeting concluded at 8:50 p.m. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 8:50 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)