

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3

4 FERC SCOPING MEETING

5

6

7 JORDAN COVE LIQUEFACTION : Docket No. PF 12-7-000

8 PROJECT AND PACIFIC : Docket No. PF 12-17-000

9 CONNECTOR :

10

11

12

October 10, 2012

13

Canyonville, Oregon

14

6:38 p.m.

15

16

17

The above-entitled meeting was held,
pursuant to notice, at 6:38 p.m.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

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

2 6:38 p.m.

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Good evening, ladies and
4 gentlemen. Please come take your seats because we're about
5 to start. Hello. I'm Paul Friedman. I work for the
6 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and we sometimes
7 abbreviate that as FERC or the Commission.

8 That's in Washington, D.C., and I'm the
9 project manager on helping to coordinate with the BLM and
10 the Forest Service on the production of an Environmental
11 Impact Statement or EIS for the proposed Jordan Cove LNG
12 Liquefaction project, and its associated Pacific Connector
13 pipeline project.

14 Up here with me today is Holly Orr. She's
15 with the U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land
16 Management, we often abbreviate that as the BLM, and Wes
17 Yamamoto, who works for the U.S. Department of Agriculture
18 Forest Service. We call it the Forest Service; We call it
19 the USFS.

20 Together, we're going to write an EIS for
21 these projects, the Jordan Cove Project Nos. FERC Docket
22 Nos. PF12-7-000 and Pacific Connector's docket number is
23 PF12-17-000.

24 On behalf of the FERC, BLM and the Forest
25 Service, welcome to this public scoping meeting about the
26

1 environmental review of the Jordan Cove and Pacific
2 Connector projects. The purpose of this meeting is to take
3 public comments about those projects, so that we can
4 determine the important issues to address when we write the
5 EIS.

6 We're also, before we have the public speaker
7 portion, describe our processes, and we're going to talk a
8 little bit about what the projects are all about. Let the
9 record show that this meeting began at approximately, I've
10 got 6:40 p.m. on Wednesday, October 10, 2010, at the Seven
11 Feathers Resort in Canyonville, Oregon.

12 You may have noticed that a court reporter,
13 who's over there, is transcribing this meeting. That's so
14 that we can have an accurate record of tonight's comments.
15 The FERC has a transcription contract with Ace Federal
16 Reporters, Inc., we call them Ace.

17 If you wish to obtain a copy of the
18 transcript prior to its placement in the FERC public record,
19 you must make arrangements directly with Ace, and you must
20 pay their prices for copies. The transcript will be posted
21 on the FERC's e-Library system within seven calendar days
22 after its receipts from Ace by the FERC, and I'll discuss
23 our e-Library system later in today's talk.

24 The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission was
25 created by Congress in 1920. We are an independent agency
26

1 that regulates the interstate transportation of natural gas,
2 electricity and hydropower. During the Carter
3 Administration, we were reorganized and renamed from the
4 Federal Power Commission to the Federal Energy Regulatory
5 Commission.

6 Our agency is directed by five Commissioners
7 who are appointed by the President of the United States and
8 approved by Congress. Three of the commissioners are of the
9 party in power, and two are in the party out of power. So
10 currently, we have three Democrats and two Republicans, and
11 they are political appointee.

12 The staff at FERC, people like myself, we are
13 civil servants. We are not political appointees, and we do
14 not make any decisions. The five commissioners are the
15 decision-makers. However, staff does make recommendations
16 that the commissioners may consider before they make their
17 decision.

18 When we write an EIS, we use a
19 multi-disciplinary team. Let me talk about some of my team
20 members who are here tonight. In the back over there is
21 Steven Busch. Steve is an LNG engineer and he is the
22 assistant FERC project manager.

23 At the table in the far back who was signing
24 people in, I had my third party contractors, Tetra Tech, and
25 that was Rachel Katz and John Scott. We treat, "we"
26

1 meaning FERC, treat our third party contractor, together
2 with the cooperating federal agencies, as an extension of
3 the FERC staff.

4 FERC is a very small, very lean organization,
5 and we have to supplement our staff to write big, complex
6 documents like these. While FERC is the lead federal agency
7 for these projects, we are not the only agency which must
8 approve proposals or issue a license or permit for their
9 construction and operation.

10 For example, the BLM will have to issue a
11 right-a-way grant to grant the pipeline a right-of-way over
12 federal lands, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Forest
13 Service would have to concur with that right-of-way grant.
14 Later, Holly will explain the rules of the Forest Service
15 and the BLM in their processes.

16 The BLM, the Forest Service, the Bureau of
17 Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department
18 of Energy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Coast
19 Guard and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have agreed to be
20 cooperating agencies in the production of the EIS.

21 That means that they're part of the overall
22 project team, and they get to write text or edit text.
23 There was a rumor going around previously that there would
24 be multiple environmental documents for this project
25 produced by different agencies.

26

1 That's just not true. There will only be one
2 EIS, and all the participating agencies will sign in on
3 that. I'll take questions at the five minute break.

4 The FERC, BLM and Forest Service are not
5 proponents or advocates for the projects. Jordan Cove and
6 Pacific Connector are private companies, and they define the
7 purpose and need for their projects. Likewise, the
8 companies have selected the location and design of their
9 facilities. The FERC and other cooperating agencies will
10 independently review those proposals.

11 This is not the first time that either Jordan
12 Cove or Pacific Connector has come to the FERC and asked for
13 our approval for these projects. Previously, in Docket No.
14 CP07-441 and in CP07-444, the Commission had authorized
15 projects for an import terminal and connecting pipeline in
16 an order issued December 17th, 2009.

17 However, once Jordan Cove came to the
18 Commission and asked to change the purpose of their project
19 to export LNG, the Commission vacated their previous
20 authorizations in an order issued on April 16th, 2012.

21 If you previously submitted comments on the
22 projects proposed in Dockets CP07-441 and 444, those
23 comments will not be considered under these new proposals.
24 Those old projects are vacated, and the record to those
25 projects are also vacated.

26

1 So if you want to submit comments about the
2 new projects, you must resubmit your comments under Dockets
3 PF12-7 and PF12-17. The footprint for the new LNG export
4 terminal is exactly the same as the footprint for the old
5 terminal. Likewise, Pacific Connector's basic route is
6 unchanged from the original proposal.

7 Nevertheless, the FERC and our cooperating
8 agencies will write and publish a new EIS. However, we will
9 use portions of the old EIS that are applicable, and updated
10 as necessary.

11 Now I'd like to summarize both Jordan Cove
12 and Pacific Connector's proposals. Jordan Cove proposes to
13 construct and operate a liquefied natural gas or LNG export
14 terminal on the north spit of Coos Bay, in Coos County,
15 Oregon.

16 The terminal would have the capacity to
17 produce about six million cubic tons of LNG per year, which
18 is equivalent to about a billion cubic feet per day of
19 natural gas.

20 The components will consist of a 7.3 mile
21 long waterway for LNG marine traffic through Coos Bay, a .3
22 mile long access channel, a marine berth, some three 16 inch
23 unloading arms and a vapor turn arm, a 2,300 foot long,
24 36-foot diameter cryogenic transfer pipeline between the
25 berth and the storage containers, two 160,000 cubic meter
26

1 capacity full containment LNG storage tanks, four liquid
2 traction trains with a capacity of 1.5 million cubic tons
3 per year, and a natural gas conditioning facility consisting
4 of two feet gas and dehydration trains, with a combined
5 throughput of one billion cubic feet per day of natural gas,
6 and a 350 megawatt South Dunes power plant.

7 Pacific Connector will design and build a
8 pipeline from Malin, Oregon to Coos Bay, to transport about
9 a billion cubic feet per day of natural gas. The pipeline
10 is 230 miles long, 36 inches in diameter. It's steel and
11 it's buried underground. It would cross portions of
12 Klamath, Jackson, Douglas and Coos Counties, Oregon.

13 There will be two meter stations and a
14 transfer station at the interconnection with the existing
15 Gas Transmission Northwest or GTN, and there will be
16 pipelines at the east end near Malin and Klamath County,
17 Oregon.

18 There will be a 23,000 horsepower compressor
19 station adjacent to the GTN and Ruby meter stations. There
20 will be a meter station at the interconnection with the
21 existing northwest pipeline system near Rebel Creek, Douglas
22 County, and a meter station at Jordan Cove.

23 Pipeline construction consists of the
24 following activities: Clearing and grading, trenching, pipe
25 stringing, welding, lowering and backfilling, cleanup and
26

1 restoration. Here's some photographs showing some typical
2 construction spreads. That's right-of-way grading, pipe
3 stringing, welding, lowering in, stream crossing,
4 backfilling and cleaning up.

5 On February 29, 2012, Jordan Cove requested
6 the initiation of FERC's pre-filing process, and we accepted
7 that on March 6th. Pacific Connector request to enter our
8 pre-filing process on June 4th, and we approved that on June
9 8th. The intent of our pre-filing process is to encourage
10 early involvement of stakeholders, and we believe the public
11 is a stakeholder, and identify issues to be resolved before
12 the FERC receives a formal application from the companies.

13 On April 4th, 2012, Jordan Cove filed its
14 first draft Resource Report 1, a project description and
15 summary of alternatives which we call Resource Report 10.
16 Those resource reports were revised on July 20th. Pacific
17 Connector filed its first draft Resource Report 1 and
18 summary of alternatives on July 9th.

19 All of those reports are in FERC's e-Library.
20 They can be viewed and read by the public, and the public
21 can comment on them. To date, Jordan Cove has held an open
22 house in Coos Bay on March 27th, and we did an onsite review
23 of the terminal at that time, with the public invited. From
24 the June 25th to 28th, Pacific Connector held open houses in
25 Roseburg, Coos Bay, Klamath Falls and Medford.

26

1 FERC staff attended those open houses, and we
2 were available to discuss questions with the audience. From
3 August 27th to the 30th, the FERC held public scoping
4 meetings with the BLM and the Forest Service in Coos Bay,
5 Roseburg, Klamath Falls and Medford.

6 This slide illustrates the FERC's pre-filing
7 environmental review process. We had a member of the public
8 who pointed out that there's an error in the decision at the
9 bottom, where it appears that the only course of action the
10 Commission can take would be to approve the projects, and of
11 course that's not true. The Commission has the ability to
12 not approve the projects.

13 Right now, we're at the beginning of the
14 process, towards the end of the scoping period. During
15 scoping, you can file comments about the projects. Those
16 comments should come to the FERC before the end of scoping
17 on October 29th, 2012.

18 Although the FERC will still consider
19 comments we receive after the scoping period ends, up until
20 the time we write the draft Environmental Impact Statement,
21 let me point out other places in the process where there is
22 public input opportunities.

23 One is in response to our Notice of
24 Application, which hasn't happened yet, and two is in
25 response to the issuance of our draft EIS, which of course
26

1 has not happened yet. If you want to file comments in the
2 Commission's official record, please follow the directions
3 given in the public participation portion of our Notice of
4 Intent.

5 Do not send emails to FERC staff. Those
6 emails will not get into the public record, and will not be
7 considered by staff. Despite rumors that our system is
8 difficult to use, it is not. It's as simple as writing a
9 letter and mailing it to the Secretary of the Commission.
10 Does someone have problems here with writing letters?

11 All right. If you have a problem about
12 writing a letter, please see me afterwards, and I'll explain
13 how to write a letter. I said please see me afterwards, and
14 we'll discuss it.

15 Okay. If you are filing written comments,
16 address your letter to the Secretary of the Commission at
17 888 First Street, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20426. The
18 Commission urges the electronic filing of comments through
19 our Internet website.

20 If you have Internet access and you know how
21 to use it, you can go to www.ferc.gov, click on Documents
22 and Filings, click on either e-Comment or e-Filing, and
23 follow the directions. If you have trouble using our
24 system, we have Information Technology staff available to
25 help you, and later I'll have their phone number on the
26

1 screen.

2 In all correspondence, whether electronic or
3 in hard copy, please reference the FERC docket numbers,
4 which are again, PF12-7 for Jordan Cove, and PF12-17 for
5 Pacific Connector.

6 The FERC process is open and transparent.
7 The public has electronic access to all documents that are
8 filed in the proceeding. You simply go to FERC's web page
9 again on the Internet, go to Documents and Filings, and
10 click on e-Library. Within e-Library, you can choose
11 General Search, select a date range, and put in the docket
12 numbers. All documents in the file will then be available
13 through the Internet.

14 To be notified via the email of all future
15 filings in these proceedings, you need to sign up for our
16 e-Subscription service, again going through the FERC web
17 page and Documents and Filings.

18 We're going to send our draft EIS on compact
19 disk or CD to the people on our environmental mailing list.
20 That list includes elected officials, federal, state and
21 local government agencies, landowners, environmental groups
22 and non-governmental agencies, interested Indian tribes,
23 local libraries and newspapers and other interested parties.

24 You can sign up for our mailing list by
25 putting your name on the list that John and Rachel have in
26

1 the back. Now if you want to receive a paper copy of the
2 EIS rather than a CD, or you want to be removed from our
3 environmental mailing list, all you have to do is mail back
4 Appendix 2 of our NOI. If you don't have a copy of the NOI
5 in hard copy, you can download it on the Internet through
6 our e-Library system.

7 In accordance with FERC regulations and
8 guidance, the companies will file the remainder of their
9 draft environmental resource reports within 60 days after
10 the end of the scoping period. The requirements for the
11 environmental resource reports that must be included in the
12 applications are outlined in FERC regulations at 18 C.F.R.
13 380.

14 The environmental reports should include
15 resource reports presenting information about geology and
16 soils, water resources and wetlands, vegetation and
17 wildlife, cultural resources, land use, air and noise
18 quality, safety and reliability and alternatives.

19 Now the companies are going to file draft
20 resource reports during pre-filing. Those will be on our
21 e-Library system. They are available through the Internet
22 and the public may comment on them.

23 The FERC staff and cooperating agencies will
24 review the draft resource reports, and issue data requests
25 to fill in gaps. Once we believe that data are complete,
26

1 and no less than six months after the start of pre-filing,
2 Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector can file their formal
3 applications with the FERC.

4 At the time of application, the FERC will
5 assign new docket numbers to those projects under our CP
6 prefix and our Notice of Application will indicate what the
7 new docket numbers are. Upon receipt of the applications,
8 the FERC will issue a Notice of Application. In response to
9 the Notice of Application, individuals or organizations may
10 want to intervene in these proceedings.

11 Being an intervenor is a legal position.
12 Intervenors can request rehearing on a Commission decision.
13 They can also have the burden of serving all parties with
14 their filings. However, you do not have to be an intervenor
15 to have your environmental concerns taken into
16 consideration. However, you cannot intervene during the
17 pre-filing period.

18 Based on the applications and our own
19 research, the FERC staff and the cooperating agencies will
20 together produce an EIS in accordance with the regulations
21 of the Council of Environmental Quality or CEQ at Title 40
22 C.F.R., Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1500 or 1508, to
23 satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental
24 Policy Act.

25 That document will offer our independent
26

1 analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the
2 proposals and alternatives. Generally, the EIS will discuss
3 the current environment, identify potential project-related
4 impacts on specific resources, and present proposed
5 mitigation measures.

6 There are a suite of issues that were raised
7 during previous scoping meetings that we consider to be out
8 of scope, meaning they do not relate to the actions of the
9 FERC, the BLM or the Forest Service. One set of questions
10 that came up earlier was about the export of LNG, and
11 perhaps the effects that export of LNG might have on natural
12 gas prices.

13 If you read our Notice of Intent, you saw
14 that we clearly stated that the U.S. Department of Energy,
15 not the FERC, is the agency which makes decisions about the
16 export of LNG. Therefore, questions about the export of LNG
17 are out of scope for the FERC action. If you have comments
18 about the export of LNG, please address them to the U.S.
19 Department of Energy.

20 Another question that came up was about
21 fracking. Now fracking is the use of liquids when
22 hydraulically fracturing certain shale kind of formations in
23 the production of natural gas, the drilling for natural gas.

24 FERC does not regulate production or drilling
25 or gathering of natural gas. Therefore, all comments on
26

1 fracking are out of scope. It has nothing to do with the
2 FERC actions.

3 Now the Commission's position on some of
4 these issues can be seen in the order the Commissioners
5 issued for the Sabine Export LNG project in Docket No.
6 CP11-72, issued April 16, 2012. In accordance with the CEQ
7 regulations, the EIS will only contain a very brief summary
8 of the purpose and need for the projects.

9 The five commissioners will make a
10 determination of public benefit for the LNG terminal, and
11 public convenience and necessity when they write their
12 decision order. In other words, that's part of the decision
13 order. It's not part of the EIS.

14 The BLM and the Forest Service can adopt our
15 EIS for their purposes, and to talk about what they do when
16 they analyze projects. I'll let Holly Orr explain that
17 process.

18 MS. ORR: Hi, good evening. Can everybody
19 hear me well? All right. Higher? Okay. All right. So my
20 name is Holly Orr. I'm working for the Bureau of Land
21 Management. Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency
22 for issuance of the right-of-way grant under the Mineral
23 Leasing Act, and we're working with the Forest Service and
24 Reclamation out of the Klamath project area.

25 Similar to FERC, we have a third party
26

1 contractor that we treat as our employee, North State
2 Resources. They're located in the back of the room, Paul
3 Uncapher and Mike Hupp. They have maps available that will
4 be in our PowerPoint presentation, which is also available
5 on the FERC website.

6 This will be all the exact same information
7 as we went over last night and we went over last month.
8 There was only one change, and that was noted by an
9 individual who helps us out and lets us know when we're not
10 providing the correct information. She got a hold of us and
11 let us know that we had reversed ownership on one of the
12 maps. So that has been corrected on the FERC website and on
13 the PowerPoint. It's also in the corrected maps in the
14 back.

15 So when we go through these and you're not
16 able to see them because they're too small, those same maps
17 are back in the back. So if you could go ahead and take a
18 look at those, and that PowerPoint is also available on the
19 FERC website.

20 Okay. So as Paul mentioned, the FERC is the
21 lead agency and they make the decision whether or not to
22 approve the pipeline in Jordan Cove. This is under the
23 Energy Policy Act of 2005. They're also the lead agency for
24 the EIS. They do not have the authority to issue the
25 right-of-way grant on federal lands.

26

1 Bureau of Land Management is the lead agency
2 and has the authority to do that under the Mineral Leasing
3 Act. Both the Forest Service and Reclamation are
4 cooperating agencies with the BLM and FERC. We will adopt
5 their EIS. But we have to make the decision whether or not
6 to issue the right-of-way.

7 The Forest Service and Reclamation will do
8 what's called a letter of concurrence on the right-of-way
9 grant. To do this, we're going to have to amend seven land
10 use plans, and the sections of the EIS, the draft EIS that
11 you guys will be looking at is what I'm going to go over
12 today.

13 The 2005 Energy Policy Act states that all
14 federal agencies will work with FERC and we will also comply
15 with FERC's schedule as we go through a pipeline and
16 application. It's also important to note that for the BLM,
17 the Forest Service and Reclamation, we don't have any lands
18 that are involved in the Jordan Cove. It's just the
19 pipeline, and you'll see those broken out when you see the
20 DEIS.

21 So BLM manages the public lands. The Forest
22 Service manages the National Forest System lands, and
23 Reclamation, on this project, will be the ones out at the
24 Klamath Project lands. FERC authorizes the project. The
25 BLM, with the concurrence with the Forest Service and
26

1 Reclamation, will be responsible for writing and issuing the
2 right-of-way grant.

3 The first time the DEIS was published in FEIS
4 on this project back in -- well, 2009 is when the decision
5 was wrote, there's not a copy of the draft right-of-way
6 grant. We currently have a copy of the draft right-of-way
7 grant with a plan of development submitted by the company,
8 that will become part of the DEIS. So you will be able to
9 look at the draft right-of-way grant and the plan of
10 development.

11 In addition, both the Forest Service and the
12 BLM may require and are requiring mitigation and other terms
13 and conditions of the right-of-way grant, where it crosses
14 federal lands. Pacific Connector gas pipeline is not
15 consistent with our current land use plans. We have to
16 amend the land use plans to be able to issue the
17 right-of-way grant, and to be in compliance.

18 The Reclamation does not need to do any land
19 use plan amendments, so the land use plan amendments that
20 are analyzed in the DEIS will refer to just the BLM and the
21 Forest Service. All three agencies have been very actively
22 involved in this project since it began in 2006, and as
23 cooperating agencies we will continue to provide input on
24 routing and to ensure the project avoids and minimizes
25 environmental impacts on the federal lands.

26

1 We will review information provided by FERC
2 and by the applicant, including the resource reports.
3 Currently, we are reviewing for Pacific Connector gas
4 pipeline draft Resource Report 1 and 10, which I'm hoping
5 you guys are looking at too.

6 We'll be looking at a wide array of our
7 technical surveys and reports. Over the last two years,
8 2010 and 2012, we have had surveys done of the area. You
9 will see that analysis and that information shared in the
10 DEIS.

11 We will provide information to FERC and the
12 applicant about our land use plan amendments and the
13 requirements, and then we will also provide and review --
14 we'll provide information to and included into the DEIS, and
15 we will support the FERC NEPA process. Then the last thing
16 is we must respond to the application for a right-of-way
17 grant.

18 So in responding to the right-of-way grant,
19 the applicant puts in a right-of-way application and with
20 the right-of-way application is a plan of development. The
21 plan of development submitted by Pacific Connector gas
22 pipeline consists of 28 individual plans.

23 Those individual plans will be available as
24 part of the draft right-of-way grant and in the DEIS.
25 They'll include such things as corrosion control, fish
26

1 salvage, hydraulic testing, right-of-way clearing, market
2 safety and security plans. When you have the DEIS, you will
3 be able to review that.

4 The draft grant will also have a
5 comprehensive mitigation plan. The mitigation plan prepared
6 and secured by the Forest Service and the company is
7 available on the FERC website. The Bureau of Land
8 Management is currently working with Pacific Connector gas
9 pipeline on the BLM mitigation plan.

10 So as I mentioned before, BLM and the Forest
11 Service will decide whether to amend seven separate land use
12 plans. The BLM will need to amend the RMPs for the Coos
13 Bay, Roseburg, Medford and Klamath Falls. Klamath Falls is a
14 resource area to the Lakeview District.

15 The Forest Service will need to amend their
16 land and resource management plans for the Rogue River, the
17 Umpqua and the Winema National Forest. All these amendments
18 would be specific only to the Pacific Connector gas
19 pipeline. It would not authorize any other project.

20 So why are these plan amendments needed? The
21 biggest reason is because although the applicant has worked
22 through the plan of development to avoid and minimize
23 impacts, this is a large project that goes straight through
24 federal lands, and it was never considered when the resource
25 management plans were put together.

26

1 These plans did not consider what a pipeline
2 project would look like, and this type of project at the
3 time was not considered as part of a right-of-way corridor.
4 BLM and Forest Service land management plans are similar to
5 county zoning ordinances for those people that are used to
6 county zoning ordinances rather than land use plans.

7 So like a development proposal in a county,
8 any project that goes forth on lands administered by the BLM
9 and the Forest Service must either be consistent with our
10 land use plan, or we would have to amend to allow the
11 project, similar to a variance to a county zoning ordinance.

12 Amendments of the effective plans are
13 necessary before the BLM could issue a right-of-way grant,
14 and the Forest Service can concur with a letter of
15 concurrence. As I mentioned before, Reclamation does not
16 have to amend any land use plans for this project.

17 Some of the plan amendments that are being
18 considered are common to both the BLM and the Forest
19 Service, and those relate to the reallocation of matrix
20 lands to LSR. This includes the backfill of ONC matrix
21 lands with the acquisition of commercial timber lands in
22 locations that facilitate the BLM management.

23 So in a few minutes, I'll be showing you some
24 slides, and what we'll be looking at is long, you know, late
25 secessional growth, old growth that is got harvestable
26

1 matrix land within it, and the proposal is to take that
2 matrix land within the LSR, and convert it from harvestable
3 matrix land to LSR, making it more complete, and then
4 backfilling under ONC, which is required. The company would
5 have to go out and purchase more harvestable lands to be
6 part of the ONC.

7 Then the second one is the waiver of survey
8 on managed species specific to the pipeline. These
9 amendments are described in more detail in the NOI that was
10 published for FERC, and the NOI that was published recently
11 for the BLM and the Forest Service. So this is where we get
12 to look at some of the reallocation of matrix to LSR. This
13 is the Coos Bay, and in this particular case, you can see
14 the redline of the proposed route, and the yellow is the
15 land that is currently matrixed that will be proposed to
16 LSR.

17 Again, this map, so that you can see it
18 closer, is located in the back of the room after the
19 presentation. This slide, also with the checkerboard BLM
20 lands, it shows the nature of the ONC lands in the Roseburg
21 District, and similar to the last slide, it has the proposed
22 pipeline that is in the Northern part of the map. Then
23 below is the matrix land that would be converted from matrix
24 to LSR.

25 The Umpqua National Forest. The Umpqua
26

1 National Forest is looking at reallocating nearly 600 acres
2 of the matrix lands to LSR, making a larger contiguous
3 block. This is the Rogue River National Forest, and it's
4 the same. Not quite 600 acres. This one is 512 acres.

5 Site-specific exemptions are also required.
6 In the Coos Bay and the Roseburg, there will have to be
7 site-specific exemptions to the requirements to protect
8 Marbled Murrelet habitat. There will be site-specific
9 exemptions to the requirement to retain habitat in known owl
10 activity centers in the Roseburg District, and those relate
11 to the BLM.

12 The occupied MAMU habitat and the known owl
13 activity centers are both considered unmapped LSR, as part
14 of the overall LSR system. It was established in the 1994
15 ROD for the Northwest Forest Plan. All the site-specific
16 amendments would be applicable only to the Pacific Connector
17 right-of-way. It would not change any future action of
18 management or direction at any other location. These
19 amendments are also described in more detail in the NOI.

20 This map illustrates the existing and
21 potential MAMU habitat within one half mile of the proposed
22 -- within a half mile of the occupied sites that would be
23 affected if the BLM issues the right-of-way grants.

24 Informed by surveys conducted by the applicant as part of
25 the previous planning process, this analysis will be
26

1 available in a DEIS.

2 This map illustrates the location of known
3 owl activity centers that would be affected if the BLM
4 issues the right-of-way grant for the Pacific Connector gas
5 pipeline. These known owl activity centers were established
6 as unmapped LSR based on locations identified again in the
7 '94 record of decision for the Northwest Forest Plan.

8 The Forest Service would also have
9 site-specific amendments. These would be involved on three
10 of its land resource management plans related to changes in
11 the visual quality objectives, and five distinct locations,
12 which we'll show on maps; thresholds for soil disturbance,
13 and locating utility corridors in riparian areas.

14 Again, all of these site-specific amendments
15 would be applicable only to the pipeline, and would not
16 change future management direction in any other location.
17 The Forest Service would also need to amend the Rogue River
18 National Forest Land Use Management Plan to provide for
19 energy transmission via the pipeline, and these amendments
20 are described in more detail in the NOI.

21 The Umpqua National Forest. This map
22 illustrates the locations where the Umpqua National Forest,
23 standards and guides related to shade and perennial streams
24 in utility corridors, and riparian areas would need to be
25 amended, if applicable, and if Pacific Connector gas
26

1 pipeline is authorized.

2 So in this particular case, you can see the
3 proposed line in red, and you can see those riparian areas,
4 the blue.

5 The Rogue River. This map illustrates the
6 locations where visual quality objectives, specific areas
7 established in the land resource management plan would be
8 amended if the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline is authorized.

9 In this case, there's two along Highway 140,
10 and there's one by Big Creek (off mic) and the third one
11 west, too small. Okay. Here we go, Pacific Crest Trail,
12 PCT. My vision is very small on this little screen up here.

13

14 Again, these maps are located in the back,
15 and they are shown in a larger scale, so that you can see
16 them more clearly. In the Winema National Forest, this map
17 illustrates the three places where visual quality objectives
18 would also need to be amended if the pipeline was
19 authorized.

20 So on August 13th, FERC published their
21 Notice of Intent, and when that was published, it was not
22 published simultaneously under the BLM and the Forest
23 Service in the National Register. So on August 28th, FERC
24 issued a Notice to Extend the Scoping Period to match the
25 BLM/Forest Service until October 29th, 2012.

26

1 On September 21st, the BLM and the Forest
2 Service issued their own NOI, announcing the opening of the
3 scoping process. Any of the land use plan amendments and
4 possible issuance of a right-of-way grant issues and things
5 that you would like us to consider in the analysis in the
6 DEIS, please let us know.

7 The close of the BLM and Forest Service
8 scoping period is October 29th, the same day as the close of
9 the FERC scoping period.

10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Holly. We will be
11 combining the BLM and Forest Service analyses of the
12 significance of the proposed plan amendments into our EIS
13 for public review and comment.

14 Once the FERC staff is convinced that the
15 applications are complete, so that we fully understand the
16 potential impacts the projects may have on the environment,
17 we will issue a Notice of Schedule for our EIS. In
18 accordance with the Energy Policy Act of 2005, other federal
19 agencies would have 90 days after the FERC releases its
20 final EIS to issue their permits and approvals.

21 The draft EIS will be published for public
22 review and comment. There will be a 90-day comment period
23 on the DEIS. The FERC will come out to Oregon again and
24 will hold more meetings to hear public comments on the DEIS
25 after it is issued. We will then address comments on the
26

1 draft in our final EIS.

2 The EIS is not a decision document. It would
3 be prepared to advise the Commissioners and to disclose to
4 the public the environmental impacts associated with the
5 construction and operation of the proposed projects. The
6 Commissioners would consider our environmental analysis,
7 together with other staff material pertaining to
8 non-environmental issues, before making an informed decision
9 about the projects.

10 The Commissioners have the options of
11 accepting the proposals, in whole or in part, approving the
12 proposals with or without conditions, or denying the
13 applications all together. The final decision by the
14 Commission is issued as an order.

15 If the Commission decides to authorize the
16 projects, the FERC staff will make certain that the
17 environmental conditions appended to the order are
18 satisfied. Those conditions usually include stipulations
19 that the companies obtain all other necessary federal and
20 state permits, and authorizations prior to construction.

21 The companies must implement all of the
22 measures they committed to in their applications, and the
23 mitigation programs outlined in the EIS. The FERC staff and
24 our contractors will monitor the projects through
25 construction, restoration and the completion of the
26

1 mitigation programs. We will perform on-site inspections
2 for compliance with the environmental conditions of the
3 order. The BLM and the Forest Service will also monitor
4 activities on their lands.

5 Before we take public comments, I'd like us
6 to take a five minute break. At that time, if you wish to
7 speak but you have not yet signed up on the list, our
8 speakers list is in the back. It's also an opportunity for
9 people who had some questions about my comments earlier, to
10 come up here and talk to me about them.

11 So let's take a five minute break and we'll
12 be back for comments in five minutes.

13 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: We will now start the most
15 important part of tonight's meeting. We're going to allow
16 the public to come up here and give their comments. I hope
17 that people who had to use that opportunity of the five
18 minute break to sign their name to the speaker's list if
19 they had something to say.

20 (Pause.)

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. We got a note from the
22 Security Department here at the resort, that they have a
23 purse belonging to Tammy Randu, and Tammy, you should
24 retrieve your purse from the resort security people.

25 Now is the time for public comments. Let me
26

1 emphasize that this is not a hearing on the merits of the
2 proposal. Other Commission staff will consider the economic
3 needs for these projects, and the rates to be charged for
4 services. As I said earlier, this meeting provides an
5 opportunity for you, the public, to comment on the type of
6 environmental issues that you would like us to cover in our
7 EIS.

8 The more specific your comments are about
9 potential environmental impacts, the more useful it will be
10 to the staff of the FERC, the BLM and the Forest Service
11 when we want to focus our analysis on the EIS. This is not
12 a question and answer session. I am here to listen to your
13 comments.

14 We will address questions raised during the
15 scoping in the EIS. So after we have done the appropriate
16 research, to answer your questions. I will call up the
17 speakers one at a time in the order in which they have
18 signed up. I ask that each speaker come up to the podium
19 right there with the microphone, state your name and spell
20 it for our court reporter.

21 If you represent an organization, tell us
22 what it is without using an acronym. If you are a landowner
23 and you happen to know where your land is by mile post, and
24 you can ask Pacific Connector if they're here in the room; I
25 see Dave in the back, and he's a lands guy, you can ask them
26

1 where you are. Then you can say I own land that crosses at
2 mile post XYZ.

3 To allow adequate time for everyone to
4 comment tonight, each speaker will be limited to no more
5 than five minutes. If you have something more detailed to
6 say that can't be expressed in the five minutes, please
7 write us a letter or use our Internet website to file
8 something electronically. The first speaker tonight is John
9 Clarke.

10 MR. CLARKE: My name is John Clarke, J-O-H-N,
11 C-L-A-R-K-E. As I mentioned last night, your mic is kind of
12 in the wrong spot if I'm going to address you.

13 (Off record comments.)

14 MR. CLARKE: That's quite all right. As I
15 mentioned last night, because I want to address Jordan Cove
16 rather than the pipeline, and because of -- I'm not privy,
17 evidently, to most of the information about Jordan Cove,
18 because I don't have a computer because I live in the woods
19 in a little cabin and, you know, I'm still permitted.

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: Actually, John, I'm going to
21 -- you just reminded me of something that I want to say to
22 the entire audience, because it relates to what you just
23 said. For people who do not have access to the Internet or
24 don't have a computer, and you want to know more about the
25 details of this project, once Pacific Connector and Jordan
26

1 Cove file their applications with FERC, they will be
2 submitting full copies of their applications in hard copy at
3 local libraries.

4 So it will be available at local libraries in
5 hard copy, for people who don't have computers.

6 MR. CLARKE: All right. I hope that comes
7 out before the end of the scoping period, because my problem
8 is that I'm trying to put together some information about
9 Jordan Cove, and it's where I'm at right now in my research,
10 and doing the numbers of the papers that you've sent me, is
11 that it appears that Jordan Cove is a little ambitious in
12 this project.

13 I state that because of the tremendous volume
14 of liquid natural gas that they need to get those four ships
15 in or those ships in every four days, and they need those
16 two tanks with that liquid gas in them. The concern comes
17 because of two major issues. Those two issues are regional
18 airport and a seismic area, and until we can get that
19 addressed, I don't think we have enough information.

20 I don't -- I've never seen a map that has
21 Coos Bay on it, North Bend and Pacific Connector, nothing
22 that identifies hospitals, health care facilities, old age
23 places, things that the citizens who can't respond to your
24 scoping, but it affects them drastically. That's what I'm
25 looking for, is to get some information, that we can, those
26

1 of us that can walk around still do things, can address them
2 for them. Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment,
5 and by the way, if I mispronounce someone's name, please
6 correct me. Derek Ball.

7 MR. BALL: Hello. My name is Derek Ball,
8 D-E-R-E-K, B-A-L-L. I live in Myrtle Creek. I work in
9 Day's Creek, and during the summer, me and my son spend a
10 lot of time hiking, playing and fishing in the Umpqua
11 National Forest. Also my family, my mother-in-law, they
12 live in Coos Bay. So this whole project affects not just me
13 and my family, but also my parents as well.

14 I guess I just really wanted to come be put
15 on the record as saying that I am very opposed to this
16 project. I worry considerably about the environmental
17 impact. In this area, we are already struggling greatly,
18 trying to figure out how to keep our fish populations going,
19 how to manage our land correctly, and adding this to it is
20 only going to make things more difficult and possibly
21 threaten a lot more of the animals and environment that we
22 have down here.

23 I know to an outside organization such as
24 Canadian Energy Company, this area may just look like a
25 place of natural resources that can be exploited. But they
26

1 need to be reminded that this is an area that people live
2 and raise their kids, and it's more than just a natural
3 resource to us.

4 This is our lives and this is our homes. So
5 I do not support this project. Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.
8 Frank Adams.

9 MR. ADAMS: Frank Adams, F-R-A-N-K,
10 A-D-A-M-S, Mile Post 55.9 and pardon?

11 (Off record comment.)

12 MR. ADAMS: There we go. Mile Post 55.9, and
13 Southern Oregon Pipeline Land Owners Against the Pipeline.
14 I wish that I could tonight come up with a profound
15 statement that would really shock you, but I have none. All
16 I have is just a few facts of how this affects me and my
17 family.

18 Exporting gas to China and benefiting oil
19 companies and use of eminent domain to obtain my property
20 and property from other landowners along the pipeline route
21 is wrong. On February 9th, 2012, in the News Review, Peter
22 DeFazio spoke out against the use of eminent domain. FERC
23 rules, eminent domain can only be used to secure land for
24 public good.

25 Where is the good to landowners with
26

1 exporting gas to foreign ports or to China? The benefit is
2 for the foreign investors and the Pacific Connector gas
3 pipeline.

4 Another issue: Extreme danger. In the area
5 in which we live, they're in Ten Mile. We have rain, a lot
6 of rain, erosion in the winter time, extreme fire danger in
7 the summer. Look at the fire danger right now that we're
8 experiencing.

9 Everything's shut down. You cant go into the
10 woods. You can't run a saw or operate your farm machinery.
11 Local and regional fire agencies have not been trained or
12 have the equipment or the personnel to fight a fire of this
13 magnitude, should an accidental leak occur. Small fires
14 occur right now with just home and farm activities. That's
15 why we implement fire closure this time of year.

16 Environmental issues. Who is Coos Bay? They
17 are a recreation and a tourist area. People go there for
18 recreation, for the dunes, fishing, crabbing, camping, clam
19 digging, beach exploration and more. Small shops line the
20 streets, where you can go to purchase numerous kinds of
21 things, seafood, crabs, oysters, clam, as well as the
22 charters and salmon fishing.

23 The pipeline and gas terminal as of now,
24 September, News Review said a power plant's to be installed.
25 Along with the dredging of the channel, the power plant and
26

1 the gas pumping station will have an extreme effect on the
2 ecosystem and recreational opportunities of that area.

3 Oh, that's what drew the people to the area
4 in the first place, was all the activities, and when these
5 ships come in, dump their bilge water into the bays, and the
6 bays are dredged, where are the people going to go to do
7 their crabbing and clamming?

8 One last comment. Forty years ago as a young
9 Marine, I fought on foreign soil for two and a half years.
10 I earned my right to have rights. Please don't let Pacific
11 Connector and the Williams Pipeline take away those rights
12 from me. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
15 Especially Mr. Adams, thank you for knowing your mile post.
16 That is very useful to us. Next, Chris Rusch.

17 MS. RUSCH: Good evening. My name is Chris
18 Rusch, C-H-R-I-S, R-U-S-C-H. I live in Tiller, Oregon, and
19 I'm representing the South Umpqua Rural Community
20 Partnership, in our community on the upper South Umpqua. I
21 have a few, a list here of concerns.

22 The major one is that this pipeline does not,
23 will not protect our natural resources, and I know we have,
24 you mentioned in your presentation, there will be seven
25 amendments to land management plans that will have to be
26

1 done in order to allow this pipeline to be installed.

2 Seven amendments that protect our natural
3 resources, and exemptions that were -- there's a whole list
4 of exemptions for the survey I manage. I just think that
5 obviously, this pipeline is going to damage our environment
6 and our national forest.

7 I also believe that the pipeline doesn't
8 comply with the Clean Water Act, as it will exceed sediment
9 loads and water temperature allowances that you mentioned in
10 your presentation, and this is really important to our river
11 and our salmon. We're doing a lot of restoration on the
12 Upper South Umpqua, and that will really affect our efforts.

13 I believe that the, that you haven't
14 adequately addressed the safety issues. There is evidence
15 that rural areas have weaker pipeline safety standards, and
16 I've read this in many accounts. Fewer welds are inspected
17 and the materials are allowed, and no internal inspections
18 are required on pipeline once it is in the ground.
19 Emergency service response time may not be adequate to
20 protect rural residents.

21 I also believe that this pipeline that will
22 take people's land against their will and without fair
23 compensation is against the American Constitution. I also
24 believe that the issue of temporary work areas that's often
25 discussed, but in everything I've read, it's never really
26

1 designated specifically where these areas might be, and what
2 type of land type that they're going to be on.

3 I think that you should address how many
4 acres, exactly how many acres will be used for these
5 temporary work areas, and how many will need to be
6 clear-cut, and how much grazing areas will be impacted on
7 ranches and farms.

8 I believe that the mitigations that I've
9 heard spoken about are not adequate. There's no backup plan
10 for failed reforestation efforts. We all know that you
11 can't just go in and replant once. It takes many, many
12 years to restore a forest. Long-term noxious weed
13 management, I've never heard any mention of that, and the
14 management for our riparian buffers.

15 I believe that, as the gentleman earlier
16 mentioned, that the pipeline could influence the spread of
17 wildfire. I think that we need -- I hope you will address
18 increased fire suppression costs, delays in fire
19 suppression, waiting for experts to arrive on the scene, for
20 example. Most of our rural areas are serviced by volunteer
21 fire departments. Are you going to offer training for our
22 rural fire departments to be able to do emergency response
23 in these situations?

24 And then lastly, I want to say that I know
25 that there's a lot of unstable areas that are included in
26

1 the pipeline route, and a lot of, especially the South
2 Umpqua, our soils there are influenced by the Klamath, by
3 the Siskiyou and by the Cascades and the coastal range, and
4 there's sort of a confluence of all of these areas, with
5 very unstable ground.

6 It's evident, as you drive around in the
7 forest, you can see a lot of landslides, especially where
8 roads have been built. I'd like to close with something I
9 read on an interpretive sign that's located near my home,
10 and this is in regard to a landslide in our area.

11 After 50 years of dormancy, the old Johnson
12 Creek Slide became alive again in 1962. "Undulating and
13 turning," that's the BLM wording, undulating and turning,
14 that moved downhill 800 feet, carrying with it 400 million
15 board feet of timber. The principle rock formation in this
16 slide is a 50-foot thick layer of tough brachia, underlying
17 a slippery serpentine rock formation. This is very common
18 in the pipeline route.

19 It's partly responsible for the slide and
20 water saturation of the ground is also responsible for this
21 landslide. Further movement of the landslide may occur, and
22 this is an interpretive sign on BLM property near my house.
23 I just want to go on record as being against this horrible
24 project. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

26

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
2 Robert Crane.

3 (Off record comments.)

4 MR. CRANE: My name is Robert Crane. I'm a
5 member of Local 701 Operating Engineers. I'm a third
6 generation union member. More importantly, I'm a fourth
7 generation Oregonian, father to a fifth, and I'm a
8 grandfather to the sixth generation.

9 If the numbers I've gotten are accurate, the
10 construction period will last nearly four years, 24 more or
11 less on the pipeline and 42 more or less on the LNG and
12 power plant facilities, with peak worker numbers running
13 around 1,500 on both projects; after construction, close to
14 100 full-time jobs.

15 In the construction trade, a three to four
16 year project is almost unheard-of. So all the trades are
17 real excited about the prospect, and the union workers that
18 will be on this project are highly skilled, trained,
19 safety-minded professionals, excited at the prospect of
20 being able to work in our home state.

21 Most of us travel extensively in order to
22 raise our families here in the state we love. In the past
23 meetings, I've already voiced my support for this project,
24 and given reasons, both environmental and economic, they
25 are, I'm positive, part of the permanent record.

26

1 Tonight, what I would really like to do is
2 thank everyone to have been given this very unique
3 opportunity to express my opinion. Since I've started on
4 these rounds of meetings, I've met politicians, doctors,
5 lawyers, union brothers and sisters, moms, dads, retirees
6 and environmentalists and landowners. We all have a
7 commonality, and that is we believe passionately enough to
8 bend our schedules, show up and speak to strangers about
9 something we have passion for.

10 This is an American right, and this process
11 is a gift of freedom that was given to us by our
12 forefathers. It has been an honor to have met so many
13 passionate, gifted and intelligent individuals. Whether
14 this project is a go or not, I wish to thank everyone here,
15 everyone here for showing me that the unique independent
16 spirit of our founding fathers still lives on, that our
17 determination to have our voices heard is never circumvented
18 by policy, greed or the removal of our civil liberties.

19 I would like to thank the audience and the
20 FERC panel for your time, and the honor to express my
21 opinion.

22 (Applause.)

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

25 MS. ETHERINGTON: Hello. My name is Frances
26

1 Etherington, and I am an impacted landowner on Mile Post 86,
2 more or less, of the pipeline route, and I'm concerned about
3 the use of eminent domain. When you sent out your Notice of
4 Intent, you said right there on the Notice of Intent letter
5 that we could be contacted any day by Pacific Connector, and
6 if we don't work out a deal, then they could condemn our
7 land.

8 I think that the EIS should put in the
9 impacts to the human environment, and should include the
10 inherent imbalance of power. When you have a multinational
11 corporation doing a deal with each individual family along
12 the pipeline, you know, the corporation does these hundreds
13 of times, and they put out their friendliest people, whereas
14 each individual family, this is their first and only time,
15 and it's a lifetime impact for these families.

16 So the EIS should consider this inherent
17 imbalance of power that eminent domain gives to the Pacific
18 Connector. You know, the construction might last four years
19 and have some jobs, but we have to live with the pipeline
20 forever, and our children have to live with it forever.

21 At that point, there's no jobs left, yet
22 we're stuck with it day-in and day-out for decades and
23 years, and the Pacific Connector has stated clear they will
24 not pay royalties or any ongoing payment for our hardship
25 over the years.

26

1 We get a one-time small payment. It goes a
2 half mile through our place. We might get \$2,000 as a
3 one-time payment. Not enough to invest and keep us going
4 forever. So I think that the small payment for huge impact
5 should be considered in the EIS, along with that imbalance
6 of power.

7 And the fact that Chris brought it up
8 earlier, is that the pipeline safety standard says that
9 because we're in a Class 1 area, there's less than ten homes
10 along each mile of the pipeline, means that the Federal
11 pipeline safety regulations deem that we can have thinner
12 walled pipes. It doesn't need to be buried as thick.
13 There's not as many turnoff valves.

14 So our safety is being sacrificed for profit
15 for the company. I mean the only reason why they get to
16 have thinner pipes is because it costs less to put the
17 pipeline in our area than it does in an urban area. This
18 pipeline is 230 miles long, and out of the 230 miles, 212
19 miles are in a Class 1 area, where we're allowed much weaker
20 safety standards for the pipeline going right by our front
21 doors.

22 And so I think that DEIS must look at this
23 clearly, and must do an alternative that says that we should
24 have as much safety in our areas as people like in San Bruno
25 had in their area, you know, have the same safety standards,
26

1 because when these safety standards were made, they were
2 made in some office somewhere, and they did not look at that
3 landslide that Chris talked about.

4 You know, they didn't look at this huge,
5 steep hill right above our house, you know, that's going to
6 be cut down, and they didn't know about the heavy rain we
7 have and the highest landslide risk areas in Oregon this
8 pipeline is going through.

9 So when those safety standards were made,
10 they didn't know about these inherent risks in our area. So
11 I think that the EIS really needs to take a look at those,
12 and consider alternatives to those.

13 Especially since they're going to be
14 increasing the pressure in the pipeline significantly from
15 when it was an import proposal; I think it was .7 billion
16 cubic feet per day, and your Notice of Intent I think said
17 it was .9, and then the slide just tonight said it was one
18 billion board feet per day.

19 But their resource report says that they plan
20 to put in 1.5 billion board feet per day. That's a lot of
21 gas. So I think you need to update your slides here, to
22 have what really they have their report is what they plan to
23 ship, is 1.5 not 1. It's quite a bit more, especially
24 through these thinner-walled pipes in our yards.

25 I was a little disappointed in the pictures

26

1 you had up here tonight. They all showed this pretty little
2 pipeline being put in on flat ground with no trees, and I
3 think that's a little deceiving for the land owners in the
4 audience here, who have this pipeline coming into their yard
5 through steep forested areas, you know.

6 And so I think it should be, show a very
7 steep and see that nice, flat. Oh, okay. You've got one
8 good slide in there. Well, good for you. And also the rest
9 of the slide showed a 12-inch pipeline, not a 36-inch
10 pipeline being installed.

11 That doesn't show any mud, you know. That's
12 still pretty clean. That doesn't show our heavy rain and
13 mud, and you know, I think I also want to bring up the issue
14 of the maps, and the last pipeline, the import terminal had
15 very poor maps. They were in a non-map format, a PDF
16 format, and they were very difficult to see the whole length
17 of the pipeline.

18 We still to this day don't know what Pacific
19 Connector plans for the access roads into the pipeline on
20 our property. There's no map showing where the access roads
21 are. Now you know what the access roads are; Pacific
22 Connector knows where the access roads are, but we don't
23 know where the access roads are.

24 That includes all the information for the
25 Forest Service and the BLM lands. We don't know where the
26

1 uncleared storage areas will be, where the cleared storage
2 areas will be, where the access roads will be, where the
3 hydrolytic discharge places will be. Perhaps we can figure
4 it out if we look at one quarter mile or one mile at a time.

5 But we can't see the whole pipeline, you
6 know, in a mapping type of software. No electronic maps,
7 nothing. You know, this is a different day than 2007.
8 We're in 2012, 2013, and it's time to really do it right,
9 you know. KMZ files, so we can look at it on Google Earth,
10 so we can see where the access roads are or the hydrolytic
11 discharge places are.

12 I know that you really reveled in the
13 sarcasm, and I felt real insulted, Paul, by your statement
14 about how we could mail in our comments, and that you
15 refused to believe -- and that you refused to believe that
16 the FERC website is difficult, you know.

17 I just want to say that your job is to listen
18 to public comments, and we tell you many times that that
19 FERC website is difficult to maneuver. No other federal
20 agency requires people to register to submit comments.

21 We submitted comments for the property we
22 live on, and we submitted it before the first deadline, and
23 we got it just in on time, and I never saw it come through
24 the e-Service. I called them up and said well, where is it?
25 They said we didn't get it. Even though we went through all

26

1 the steps to get it, you know.

2 We called up Help, but Help is never open on
3 the East Coast when we're here on the West Coast. Now the
4 Forest Service and the BLM consistently give us an email
5 address to send in comments to, and I hope that you don't
6 lower your standards to the FERC standards now, that you
7 also continue to provide an email address for the public to
8 send in comments to.

9 You sarcastically talked about writing the
10 letter. Well, email is a little easier than a letter, and
11 we should be allowed to do an email address. So thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
14 Chairman Dan Courtney.

15 CHAIRMAN COURTNEY: Hi. I'm Dan Courtney,
16 D-A-N, C-O-U-R-T-N-E-Y, and I live in Roseburg. Before I
17 read my comments, I just wanted to quickly acknowledge that
18 there's two other Tribal Board members with me here tonight,
19 Ran Van Norman and Tom Cox. I also have two Tribal staff,
20 Amy Amaroso, who is our Natural Resources director and our
21 Tribal archaeologist, Jessie Pleward.

22 Okay. This oral comment is submitted to the
23 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Williams
24 Pipeline Company on behalf of the Cattle Creek Umpqua Tribe,
25 regarding the Pacific Gas Connector Pipeline Project.

26

1 The project spans many miles in the Tribe's
2 usual and accustomed area of traditional homelands. The
3 Tribe has lived on these grounds since time immemorial.
4 This land is sacred to our people, our ancestors and future
5 generations. We have hunted, fished and gathered on these
6 lands for generations.

7 These lands and the animals and sites on them
8 are sacred to our Tribe. Spiritual and religious sites will
9 be impacted by the pipeline. Through analysis, we have
10 determined the current routes will affect 70 plus miles of
11 our usual and accustomed area, and another 50 in trade zones
12 for the Tribe.

13 Our ceded lands would be directly impacted by
14 this route. Many known cultural sites will be impacted, and
15 those listed are only the ones that were surveyed. Many
16 more exist within the current route. The current route
17 bisects traditional and sacred hunting areas, gathering
18 areas and sites in which vision quests have been conducted.

19 The current route also proposes to go through
20 tribally-owned lands, in which current, traditional and
21 sacred hunting activities take place that are of high
22 importance to the Tribe. This is concerning to the Cattle
23 Creek Umpqua Tribal Board of Directors.

24 Therefore, the Tribal Board has passed a
25 resolution to deny the pipeline access to Tribal lands for
26

1 survey, or otherwise until -- at which time they are fully
2 satisfied.

3 (Applause.)

4 CHAIRMAN COURTNEY: With a plan for
5 mitigation of impacts to the Tribes, its lands, people,
6 culture, natural and sacred resources. The construction of
7 the connector line will inhibit our people from performing
8 religious customs and sacred cultural traditions, that have
9 been passed down to us by our Creator and that have been
10 practiced by our ancestors for thousands of years. Thank
11 you.

12 (Applause.)

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

15 MR. SCOTT: Eugene Scott, E-U-G-E-N-E,
16 S-C-O-T-T. I'm a minorly affected landowner, in that
17 there's only a quarter of a mile or something of the
18 pipeline on my property. I think I'm at about Mile Post
19 73-1/2. The bigger issue on my property is the proposal of
20 a staging area at the east corner, which would take two
21 acres of agricultural land, prime bottom land.

22 There's also a creek right there near that,
23 so there's a wetlands issue there. In addition to that, I
24 am currently negotiating with the adjoining landowner to the
25 east of me to lease 15 acres of agricultural land there.

26

1 Now any time you put a staging area on agricultural land,
2 you're going to do some major damage to that agricultural
3 land beyond just one year or two year's crop issue.

4 There's the issues of compaction, the
5 disruption of top soil by dredging it all up, turning it
6 upside down, even if you backfill and try to relayer it back
7 the way it came out. You're still going to have a lot of
8 mixing of soils.

9 So between the staging area and this
10 pipeline, there's going to be considerable loss of the
11 agricultural productivity of this land that I am currently
12 farming, and hopefully about to start farming.

13 My farm is certified organic. If this is a
14 staging area, there's going to be all kinds of hazardous
15 materials brought under that property. I have never seen
16 yet a piece of equipment such as bulldozers, tractors,
17 dredgers, etcetera that did not leak some degree of
18 hydraulic oil.

19 So there's another issue there. I would want
20 to include on this Environmental Impact Statement what
21 happens in the long run if there are toxins left behind,
22 which I'm sure there will be. How is that going to be
23 mitigated and looked at? What are the requirements on the
24 company to take care of those issues?

25 The secondary issues are also right in my
26

1 area. There's a fairly good length of steep hillside that
2 the pipeline is proposed to go up, right next to a stream.
3 It will cross several streams right in that area. The
4 irrigation water that I use comes out of those streams. Any
5 additional silt in those streams is going to foul up my
6 irrigation system.

7 Another more general regional concern I have
8 is the impact on all the landowners along the road that I
9 live on, that don't necessarily hold title to the property
10 clear up the hillside where the pipeline is proposed for.
11 There's over a mile of single lane gravel road and some
12 areas with steep drop-offs above and below it.

13 If you start talking about it, as best I can
14 guess, from talking to the Pacific Connector people and
15 looking at what maps I've been able to get ahold of, it
16 looks like this staging area would be responsible for
17 building pipeline in about two to three miles west of me,
18 and at least three miles east of me.

19 I calculate that there's over a hundred
20 truckloads of 80 foot sections of pipe to be hauled on this
21 narrow road. There's going to be a major impact there, in
22 terms of dust. All the trucks, all the equipment, all the
23 workers coming and going for three plus years.

24 So there's another issue there that you
25 probably don't hear about, because most people in my
26

1 neighborhood don't even know what the impacts are going to
2 be. So I'd like to see those things included in this too.
3 And in general, I think I'd like to reiterate, as far as
4 Jordan Cove, I don't think from what the seismologist at OSU
5 have recently come out with, that plans are anywhere near
6 accurate to protect the power plant and the LNG plant at
7 Jordan Cove from the earthquake danger that we have off the
8 coast of Oregon, and a very possible resultant tsunami.

9 So those things really take a real high
10 priority. Thank you for this opportunity to come before you
11 and comment again.

12 (Applause.)

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

15 MR. CHASM: Thank you. My name is Richard
16 Chasm, R-I-C-H-A-R-D, C-H-A-S-M. I would like to take the
17 opportunity first of all to thank you, Mr. Friedman and Ms.
18 Orr and Mr. Yamamoto, for taking the time to come and listen
19 to us.

20 The question tonight is what are the issues
21 that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission needs to
22 consider for an adequate EIS, and I think Eugene stole a lot
23 of my thunder. But one of the things that I have come to
24 realize through this whole process is that there is a very
25 serious earthquake and tsunami scheduled some time in the
26

1 future off the coast of Oregon, and there are many good
2 comments made here tonight.

3 But I think that the overall, most important
4 issue that this FERC needs to clearly address is will the
5 applicants' preparation to have an LNG terminal and power
6 plant and the pipeline through the Cascade range, through
7 the coast range, be adequate to survive a gigantic
8 earthquake?

9 They don't happen very often, and we have
10 frankly been lulled into complacency, because it doesn't
11 happen. When it does happen, it's a wang-dang-doodle. It's
12 a big one. I read that in the Economist magazine about five
13 years ago, when they were discussing earthquake dangers on
14 Planet Earth. They said the plate of Juan de Fuca, when it
15 goes, it's a big one. That's us, that's us. That's here.

16 And whatever happens here with this proposal,
17 I have come away from this entire process with the
18 recognition that whether you're a liberal or a conservative,
19 whatever party, wherever you live, the people in Oregon on
20 the West Coast needs to start thinking about what we're
21 going to do when this earthquake occurs.

22 In the previous EIS, correct me if I'm wrong,
23 the applicant had their experts come forward with their
24 proposals about how their import terminal would survive a
25 tsunami of 30 feet. When we have credible people in the
26

1 state of Oregon saying this tsunami could be 60 feet or
2 greater.

3 Now I'm not a doomsday theorist, and I really
4 don't like people worrying about things that could happen.
5 But this is going to happen. Now the other thing that I
6 think is significant is that when this proposal first came
7 along, it was to import liquid natural gas, because the
8 people in California needed it.

9 The instant we found out about the Ruby
10 pipeline arriving in Malin, the people, the citizens, the
11 unpaid volunteer citizens who have been dancing on a string
12 for five or six years now immediately said this is not for
13 import; this is for export. Bob Braddock, standing at the
14 back of the room, said "that's stupid," and now they've
15 turned right around and say yeah, it's to export natural
16 gas.

17 So there's a tremendous lack of veracity on
18 the part of the applicant, and the real applicant here isn't
19 Williams Pipeline. It's Vercin Energy, a Canadian gas
20 company that plans to make hundreds of billions of dollars
21 in profit off of this project.

22 And those people need to have, need to be in
23 front, instead of hiding in the shadows, and using a straw
24 man to do the dirty work for them. If they want to build
25 this thing, it needs to be done in a way that we are safe
26

1 when an earthquake predicted to be 8 or greater on the
2 Richter scale, occurs.

3 When a 60 foot tsunami occurs, and the coming
4 over Wildcat Ridge up on the Camus Valley and through that
5 post range, that ridge was created in an earthquake.

6 This proposal needs to be done to an
7 engineering quality that can survive this event, and that
8 decision needs to be made by qualified third party experts,
9 and not the applicant. And when you buy a house, you get an
10 independent inspection, because you don't want anybody who
11 has skin in the game telling you what's going to happen
12 here. It's the same with this proposal. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
15 Normally, I don't respond to comments from the floor, but
16 Richard, afterwards come see me and I'm going to tell you
17 about something FERC is doing about getting an independent
18 evaluation of that exact issue. Roshanna Stone.

19 MS. STONE: My name is Roshanna Stone,
20 R-O-S-H --

21 (Off record comment.)

22 MS. STONE: R-O-S-H-A-N-N-A, Stone,
23 S-T-O-N-E. I'd like to file a statement of opposition to
24 the revised Pacific Connector-Jordan Cove energy project,
25 proposed by Williams and its partners. Reversing the

26

1 proposal from an import facility to an export operation is
2 outrageous.

3 Affected landowners and other Oregon
4 residents are expected to support this project that offers
5 no tangible benefits. The only benefit appears to provide
6 profits for energy company investors at our expense, while
7 affecting our personal safety, clean water, wildlife, rural
8 beauty and our solitude.

9 After many years of opposition, the lengthy
10 environmental review stated there was a purpose and a need
11 for an import facility and a pipeline. But after being beat
12 out by the other pipeline construction, proponents now have
13 the extreme audacity to profess that there is a need to
14 reverse the course, to export natural gas.

15 I don't believe there can be adequate
16 justification for the project being in the public interest.
17 Oregon does not need an LNG export terminal, or another
18 natural gas pipeline to meet our energy demands. When we
19 purchased our property in the Days Creek area, my husband
20 and I wanted to enjoy the peaceful surroundings and the
21 natural beauty.

22 Pacific Connector informed us in 2006 that
23 the pipeline would dissect through our immediate
24 neighborhood. I requested a re-route of the pipeline, to
25 non-residential parcels, and I provided a detailed map,

26

1 topographic map of a viable alternative. Even a partial
2 acceptance would have greatly increased our confidence that
3 the company was truly interested in working with the
4 affected land owners.

5 But my re-route request to move the pipeline
6 location was rejected by Pacific Connector, and
7 unfortunately, this pipeline proposal has relentlessly been
8 moving forward for years now, and it is a constant and
9 nagging weight on our shoulders.

10 The personal and the social effects and the
11 impact of eminent domain are devastating. I'd like to urge
12 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to consider the
13 environmental and, in particular, the social costs of this
14 intrusive project, and its negative impact on the lives of
15 the citizens of Southern Oregon.

16 I urge the Federal Energy Regulatory
17 Commission to reject the application.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
20 Russ Lyon.

21 MR. LYON: Russ Lyon, R-U-S-S, L-Y-O-N. I am
22 a landowner, I think around Mile Post 95. The pipeline
23 crosses the core of our property and crosses one of the
24 creeks, and there's been so many good comments so far
25 tonight I can't add much, except as far as the fish habitat.

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

We've owned the place for about 20 years, and this pipeline crosses over 200 creeks on its path. During this time, we've done quite a bit of salmon fish habitat restoration on our creek. So I think it would be important that quite a bit of the fish habitat restoration has been on private land.

8

9

10

11

I know you're talking about mitigation on BLM and forest land. But they need to take a look at this problem as far as private lands too, environmental problems there, and that that's covered. Thank you.

12

(Applause.)

13

14

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Wendy Wong Haigh.

15

16

MS. HAIGH: Hi. My name is Wendy Wong Haigh,

W-E-N-D-Y.

17

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for correcting me.

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. HAIGH: W-O-N-G, hyphen, H-A-I-G-H. I'm a landowner and the closest mile post is 86. I'm not directly affected at this point in time. I think I'm on an alternate route. But I have to say that the Pacific pipeline people were very rude and very intrusive when they first dealt with me back in 2006.

24

25

26

Luckily, I'm not easily intimidated. But I witnessed them intimidating many, many landowners, people in

1 tears, thinking they had to do. They didn't know their own
2 legal rights. So I don't know what can be put in the EIS
3 regarding the social, psychological and financial damage
4 that can occur because of this pipeline.

5 But if somehow there's some wording in there
6 that could mitigate those destructive things, for instance
7 maybe a percentage of profits should go to affected
8 landowners, and federal agencies. If somehow the pipeline
9 does go through, I think a percentage should be paid back to
10 the people of Oregon. Just like in the state of Alaska, the
11 oil companies have to pay back to the citizens of Alaska if
12 this pipeline happens to go through.

13 If the EIS could put in some wording that
14 states that a percentage should be paid back to the Oregon
15 citizens for using our resources for their profits. So I
16 would suggest at least 10 to 20 percent of their profits
17 should go back to Oregon people, to the affected landowners,
18 to the affected agencies, and to any other and maybe also
19 the public in general.

20 Also, I'm concerned about the hazards of LNG.
21 The safety of the communities of Coos Bay for the LNG
22 tankers. If there's a leakage, the main hazard is extreme
23 flammability.

24 So again, how are they going to be protected,
25 and where I live, if there's a wildfire from an accident,
26

1 according to a report in 2010, 240 reported natural gas
2 pipeline incidences occurred in the U.S., killing 21 people,
3 injuring 105. Those statistics do not include the incidence
4 in rural areas.

5 So that means if we do have a wildfire in our
6 area, it's not even reported. So we don't even know how
7 many rural accidents have happened across the U.S. So if
8 there's again, a way to protect my property, since it would
9 definitely be affected if there's a wildfire in my area.

10 I don't know how, what kind of roads. I mean
11 we can't even access those areas. So I would suggest if any
12 land owners are directly affected, to definitely contact
13 their Congress people about the Pipeline and Hazardous
14 Materials Safety Administration, PHMSA, and try to enforce
15 some regulation, because apparently in rural areas, the
16 gathering lines are not regulated at all.

17 So I wish that you could somehow put
18 something in the EIS to help regulate the pipelines in our
19 rural areas. Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.
22 Stanley Petrowski. Okay. Sometimes when people handwrite,
23 it's difficult --

24 MR. PETROWSKI: Stanley Petrowski.

25 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay, thank you sir.

26

1 MR. PETROWSKI: Thank you.
2 P-E-T-R-O-W-S-K-I. I'm currently serving as president of
3 the South Umpqua Rural Community Partnership, and I am also
4 the river steward for the South Umpqua River of the Native
5 Fish Society. I would like to go on record as being
6 adamantly, passionately opposed to this project.

7 No amount of mitigation will be able to
8 justify the amount of ecological disaster that will be
9 incurred through this pipeline, through very sensitive,
10 ecological areas. The sociological impact, the jobs, will
11 not be here. We're concerned that you're going to -- that
12 picture right there looks like death to salmon, land prey
13 and other species that are threatened.

14 I do not, I just cannot fathom how any
15 governmental agency could justify jeopardizing what's left
16 of our fisheries. Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
19 Liz Matteson.

20 MS. MATTESON: It's L-I-Z, M-A-T-T-E-S-O-N.
21 I want to start by saying I woke up this morning at 5:00
22 a.m. from a dream, where I was testifying at a scoping
23 meeting for FERC, and I just -- I'm going to read my
24 comments, but my comments came out of my dream.

25 To me, I don't remember my dreams often. To
26

1 me, it was pretty significant. I had to actually get the
2 night light on, so I didn't wake my husband up, and write
3 down what came to me, and these are the comments that came
4 to me.

5 The Jordan Cove Pacific Connector FERC
6 Environmental Impact Statement needs to take into account
7 the following, and examine the history of actual negative
8 environmental impact of similar and lesser diameter natural
9 gas pipelines as regards all of these issues.

10 Include a complete analysis, historical,
11 current and future, of all water bodies that would be
12 impacted, including impacts on fish, endangered species,
13 marine and wildlife, people and stream restoration projects.

14
15 As five major rivers would be crossed, the
16 South Umpqua twice, it is inoperative to research the impact
17 of other pipelines of this and lesser diameter on water
18 quality, and the health of fish populations and all over
19 species affected.

20 Whereas the pipeline would cross private
21 lands close to domestic wells, and the well near the Milo
22 Fire Department near where I live, what has been the
23 historic impact on wells and disruption and contamination?

24 Whereas the pipeline would cross large areas
25 of forest in Southern Oregon, what has been the consequence
26

1 of a gas leak in other pipelines? How large of an area has
2 burned? Our forests here in Douglas County become
3 tinderboxes in the summer and early fall, and one spark can
4 be devastating to our forests and our private lands.

5 Our mountains and hills in Douglas County
6 have been known to be geologically unstable, and if you
7 drive over the Tiller Trail Highway towards Shady Cove, near
8 where the pipeline will go, you will see evidence almost
9 every month, almost every month, of the shifting land and
10 the cracking pavement. How would the pipeline be able to be
11 stable and buried in such a changing land?

12 What standard for welding would be applied
13 and what have been historic flaws found in other pipelines
14 with similar standards? How often would the pipeline be
15 checked for cracks and leaks, and for places where the
16 ground has moved, exposing the pipeline?

17 This is an important, the following one is a
18 very important one to me, because I'm also an organic
19 farmer, and I'm very concerned about the health of our
20 environment and of the people that live here.

21 Whereas herbicides will be sprayed on a
22 regular basis, to maintain the corridor for the pipeline,
23 what would be the impact on the health of Oregonian
24 citizens, and on the wildlife considering the accumulated,
25 accumulated exposure to herbicides?

26

1 Quiet Mountain Road. I'm not sure of the mile post, 58, 57,
2 something like that.

3 I just want to state that we're not for or
4 against this pipeline. We are an affected landowner. We
5 own 140 acres. You go from the top to the bottom. My
6 husband and I have been self-employed for like 28 years.
7 This property we've owned since 1991, and it does affect the
8 way we do business, because we have a small little rock pit.

9 The comments that we submitted to FERC was in
10 -- we got on board in 2008. We sent it registered mail, and
11 I just learned this evening that it's all gone, that no one
12 has comments from that anymore. I want to be sure that
13 we're on record. We still have the same concerns. They
14 haven't changed a bit, even though all your paper work has
15 changed.

16 I guess we resend the same comments that we
17 had. I got some addresses. We will do that by your
18 deadline. But in saying all this, we really are concerned,
19 especially now that you've lost this document that we sent.

20 It's a document that's very concerning to us,
21 because they have direct issues to our land and how we make
22 a living and how we want to maybe give this to our
23 grandchildren or whatever. All these people in here.

24 Our state, you know, is our state going to
25 benefit from this? Because things got lost from the prior
26

1 concerns that were brought up? I'm just sad that it's all
2 new for us now, with you, FERC. So I just want to be on
3 record. I'm going to send this again, and I hope that it
4 sticks, because gosh, I sent it registered mail.

5 It took a lot of time to write it. I don't
6 do computer stuff. I drive heavy machinery, and I took a
7 lot of pride in writing it, because I felt that it was
8 important, and you just threw it away, and that bothers me.
9 So anyway, thank you very much, and good luck.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
12 Clifton Smith.

13 MR. SMITH: Good evening. My name is Clifton
14 Smith, C-L-I-F-T-O-N, S-M-I-T-H. I'm a member of Operating
15 Engineers Local 701. I'm also a property owner in Klamath
16 County and Douglas County.

17 This proposed project doesn't affect my
18 property, but I have lived across the street from the
19 Williams line that runs north and south through central
20 Oregon, and I believe my 15 years living next to that
21 right-of-way, I know of no one that has been adversely by
22 anything over there. That pipeline through miles of
23 national forest runs through miles of hay fields. The
24 farmers still farm over the pipeline out there. I know of
25 no one that's been adversely affected by it.

26

1 I'm 100 percent in favor of this project
2 because of the thousands of jobs it will provide for
3 Southern Oregon. We desperately need it. This is a
4 privately funded job. It's not a job that we're depending
5 on our government to finance. This is a \$6 billion
6 investment in Southern Oregon, and I think it's a win for
7 the people of Oregon. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
10 Suzy Evans.

11 MS. EVANS: My name is Suzy Evans, S-U-Z-Y,
12 E-V-A-N-S, and I'm a local landowner. I live about four or
13 so miles from the proposed project. I'm here to express my
14 sincere and deepest concern and agreement with many of the
15 people who have already spoken, and agreement particularly
16 with Frances, pointing out the safety standards that are so
17 unfairly weakened in rural areas like ours.

18 Great concern with the importance of fire
19 suppression, the unstable grounds that Chris was pointing
20 out evidenced by landslides, and agreement with Eugene. As
21 an organic farmer, his concerns, myself as an organic
22 farmer.

23 His concerns to, that it's impossible to
24 control the problems that would arise, the complications,
25 impossible. And particularly the earthquake tsunami
26

1 concerns that are just paramount, that Richard Chasm and
2 others have brought up, and I can -- I find it really
3 difficult to see how you can be convinced of the safety of
4 this project, with so many concerns.

5 I just want to express that mainly, and this
6 Environmental Impact Statement needs to include tsunami
7 hazard and analysis from recently-revised tsunami mapping,
8 and I really would like to point that one out. That's my
9 statement.

10 (Applause.)

11 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
12 Bob Barker.

13 MR. BARKER: So that's Bob Barker, just like
14 "The Price is Right," B-A-R-K-E-R, and I'm an affected land
15 owner at Mile Post 122.7. I'll be pretty specific in my
16 comments.

17 First of all, the land owners along Old Ferry
18 Road continue to be very much opposed to the use of that
19 road as the access point for the HDD under the Rogue River
20 and the 3,000 foot drill, and the bringing in of
21 construction pipe going up and over the hill.

22 It's a one-land dirt road for two miles.
23 Presents real problems and, you know, people came to
24 Southern Oregon to live, where they didn't have their road
25 change for them in ways that are really unacceptable. So
26

1 any -- I know this has been discussed at some length in the
2 prior EIS, and I hope that FERC will take a look at that
3 again and see if we have some other alternatives.

4 We would also like to know, since the next
5 access point is about 2.2 miles further east, are they going
6 to be bringing in pipe for that whole distance or half of
7 that distance, through Old Ferry Road as proposed? I don't
8 think that's ever been stated or if so, I'm not aware of
9 that. So that's the first point.

10 A second issue is around the Rogue River
11 crossing, the HDD, which actually is, curves from our
12 property. There's been a lot of discussion about that in
13 the prior EIS. One thing that's been left out, and HDDs are
14 not always successful, though they usually are.

15 But there clearly, as discussed in the EIS,
16 there's a lot of controversy about what would be done if in
17 fact the HDD was unsuccessful. Would there be an open cut
18 crossing, or would there been an overhead crossing. The
19 upshot of it seemed to be that it's too controversial to
20 deal with now. We just won't deal with that. We'll deal
21 with it when we get to it.

22 Personally, I think that for this HDD and
23 perhaps the other two on the pipeline route, that the
24 question of the alternative should in fact be firmly
25 addressed in the EIS. I think people have the right to
26

1 know, since it's so sensitive from an economic standpoint,
2 in terms of use of the river, if an open cut crossing were
3 required.

4 I think that we should have a specific
5 determination on that in the EIS, or if not, at least a
6 statement that would say that all work on the project will
7 stop until that particular issue is resolved, if in fact the
8 HDD is not successful.

9 My third and final point is around safety.
10 We happen to be in a Class 2 area. The general standards
11 are, you know, Class 1, Class 2, Class 3. They get
12 progressively tougher as you go to a higher class.

13 It really upsets me personally, living in a
14 spot that's about 200 feet from the pipeline that my safety
15 is not at the same level as somebody who happens to live in
16 an area that's a little more populated.

17 I would hope that Pacific Connector would
18 agree to Class 3 standards, where the pipeline passes
19 within, I believe its 943 feet, which I believe is the
20 standard for the high, what is it, the high impact area.
21 I'm not sure I have the terminology.

22 But by doing so, that would ensure that all
23 folks who live along the pipeline route have the same
24 standard. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

26

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
2 Rick Sparks.

3 MR. SPARKS: Rick Sparks, R-I-C-K,
4 S-P-A-R-K-S. What I've heard from you folks tonight is
5 about your agency's, FERC's job is to make sure that this
6 thing is done right.

7 But Holly gave me to understand that wherever
8 it's going to conflict with established standards for
9 protection of the environment or wildlife, we'll just write
10 the waiver.

11 Here are all the ones that we need to write.
12 Maybe you've already got them written. So the people that
13 run these agencies, their ankles must be getting pretty raw
14 from grabbing them so often, for the benefit of these
15 people, whose only interest is money.

16 Now when the Europeans first started coming
17 to this continent, and they saw the immense wealth of the
18 natural forests, they were really happy, because they'd
19 already clear-cut Europe. They didn't have any more wood to
20 build the ships that they came over to invade with.

21 The people that lived here at the time
22 thought of the forests as sacred, and they had lived on it
23 for 15 to 30 thousand years, and it was all still here.
24 We've lived on it for a few hundred, and 90 percent of it's
25 gone, and all of that stuff about oh, there's more timber
26

1 standing.

2 Yeah, overgrown, dog-haired stuff that is a
3 tinder box for fire, in a setting of global warming, which I
4 don't think even conservatives are continuing to deny is a
5 reality. You're going to allow this lit match to go
6 unattended, unsupervised, no requirement for the people that
7 build it, to make sure that it isn't leaking, no
8 responsibility for any damage to the forest that happens if
9 it does start a fire.

10 Now if I start a forest fire, I have to pay
11 for the cost of damage. They get a free ride? Why? I know
12 you aren't concerned with the benefit, insofar as your role
13 for FERC. But as a citizen of the planet, as an American,
14 please find it in your hearts to do whatever you can to make
15 this thing go away, or to at least make it be done in a way
16 that minimizes the dangers to this sacred land that is still
17 left to us.

18 It's not just a resource bank. It's not just
19 there to be exploited. It's there to be protected. That's
20 what we're here for. That's what you in particular are here
21 for. Now everybody that I've ever met, from the Forest
22 Service or the BLM, assures me how much they love the
23 forest.

24 When do you start showing it? When do you
25 start standing up for the trees that can't stand up for
26

1 themselves, for the rivers that can't stand up for
2 themselves? The values of being an American are not just
3 about profit. That's the value of the one percent. The
4 value of the 99 percent is we love America's forests. We
5 love the wild lands. They're some of the last wild lands
6 left in the northern part of the planet, and we need to do
7 everything we can to protect them.

8 If there's anything that you can do to put
9 the onus back on the people whose only interest is to
10 exploit it for money, please find it in your hearts to do
11 that, because we will continue to find it in our hearts to
12 meet you every chance we get, to reiterate our opposition.

13 This is a bad thing. Nothing that you can do
14 can make it good. But if you can do something to make it a
15 little bit less bad, maybe that's what we'll have to settle
16 for. Thanks.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
19 Diane Phillips.

20 MS. PHILLIPS: Hello. My name is Diane
21 Phillips, D-I-A-N-E, P-H-I-L-L-I-P-S. I live in Azalea,
22 Oregon, part of Douglas County. I've lived here for 30
23 years. My husband's a native Oregonian. He's lived in
24 Douglas County his entire life, and so has -- he's actually
25 a seventh generation Oregonian, cares very deeply for this
26

1 area that we all call home, including up to the coast. His
2 family were fisher people too.

3 Sitting here tonight and listening to Paul
4 Friedman, I got this overwhelming feeling that it's Iraq,
5 that here we are in Tribal lands, and I feel like as a
6 Southern Oregon, facing this project and the monies
7 involved, that would like to take our resources away, just
8 an overwhelming imbalance of power.

9 I'm very sad to see that my agencies that
10 I've had some faith in, that listen to public opinion, be
11 cooperating agencies, including the Forest Service and the
12 BLM and so on, because I don't feel that my interest will
13 carry the same weight as those of the economic interests.

14 Why we've lived here, we've lived here and
15 had to do whatever we could to prosper and have our children
16 and grandchildren and so on, and we are union members in the
17 construction trade. But some things, you know, a job is a
18 temporary thing. We're going to live here long-term, and
19 this is where we live because we love it here.

20 I just, it just so upsets me that we're -- I
21 think it all boils down in the scoping process as looking at
22 this and doing NEPA, right, and showing that this is in the
23 public interest. I just don't see how there's an
24 overwhelming public benefits. There are benefits, but the
25 costs are so much greater.

26

1 I feel like the take to the public trust that
2 you're asking us for is just far too great. The risk to the
3 resources in Coos Bay, to the different not just the jobs
4 that will be possibly created by this project, but the other
5 jobs that will be impacted.

6 I still have hope. I'm an optimist. I still
7 have hope that our fisheries will recover, and the News
8 Review, our local paper, did a thing that ran for quite a
9 while, where they asked people why do they live in Douglas
10 County? The overwhelming consensus was because it's a nice
11 place to live, because of the resources that we have, the
12 water, the forest, the chances to recreate.

13 That's why people come to live here. If they
14 wanted to get a better job, maybe they might go to the city
15 and live there. But we're willing to settle and make due,
16 and do what we can to live where we love it. I live on a
17 creek. It's Cohens Creek in Southern Douglas County.

18 It's a tributary of Cow Creek, which is a
19 tributary of the South Umpqua. Upper Cow Creek, which is
20 not far from where I live, will be crossed by the Pacific
21 Connector on the east fork. There's a mercury issue there.
22 That has never been dealt with in an adequate way. They
23 basically made a statement in the last Environmental Impact
24 Statement that they would address it, and it would be taken
25 care of.

26

1 But I would like to see in this case that we
2 have some concrete ways, if this is built, that that will be
3 addressed properly. Also, you're putting a pipeline.
4 You're going to be crossing hundreds of streams. Water, I
5 think, is one of our most important resources we have here.
6 It's our limiting factor, not only for fish but for people
7 in economic.

8 The impact to putting a fixed structure in an
9 ever-changing system, especially since we've been trying
10 very hard in our public agencies and other. I'm a board
11 member of the partner, the local watershed council, and
12 we've done a lot of restoration. It's created local jobs,
13 and this pipeline will actually go through, in the Days
14 Creek, some of those very mitigated, you know, improved
15 areas.

16 When I look in Azalea, the pipeline route to
17 -- is there a time limit. Oh, okay. Hmm. When I look from
18 Azalea to Shady Cove, there's quite a roadless area there
19 that this pipeline proposes to cross. This is land that
20 can't be replaced. I don't think any mitigation will
21 justify that impact. Where I live, we're a checkerboard
22 between private and public lands, particularly the BLM.

23 The BLM, it's the only place you find old
24 growth anymore, and I think we need to look at the
25 cumulative impact --

26

1 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please wrap up your comments.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: That's very sad, that we have
3 -- I'm really disappointed on that. I also -- I'll wrap
4 this up by saying I completely object to not discussing the
5 impact of exporting natural gas and opening that market up
6 to the West Coast to the world market, because in the NEPA
7 process, you have to consider public benefit.

8 That is an issue that should be addressed by
9 FERC. So I completely object, and I don't feel like my
10 interests are being represented at all. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
13 Vicki Price.

14 MS. PRICE: My name is Vicki, V-I-C-K-I,
15 Price, P-R-I-C-E. Pretty much everybody covered what I
16 wanted to say, especially Chris Rusch and Frances, about the
17 unstableness of this area. I'm a fourth generation
18 Oregonian, and I know what it's like up there, how
19 everything it just constantly moves. The asphalt cracks, it
20 subsides, and how is a pipeline going to adapt to that.

21 The other thing is, I've been with the Milo
22 Fire Department for 25 years, and the pipeline is going to
23 go about three feet from my property line, and it's going to
24 take out the well. The Fire Department has half interest in
25 a neighbor's well, and it's going to take the neighbor's

26

1 house and the well.

2 How is the Fire Department going to supply
3 water? How are they going to address that type of thing
4 that is going to affect our public wells? The Fire
5 Department is supposed to be a place where people can go in
6 an emergency. What if there's an emergency at three feet
7 from our property line? Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
10 Clarence Adams.

11 MR. ADAMS: Clarence Adams, C-L-A-R-E-N-C-E,
12 A-D-A-M-S. I'm an affected land owner and I believe my mile
13 post is about 59. The pipeline goes through miles and miles
14 of LSR, which is set aside for species habitat and their
15 protection. The Fish and Wildlife Service is charged with
16 protecting that.

17 Well, it's a foregone conclusion that they're
18 going to offer a take from it on owls, even though this is
19 going to be likely to affect. I'd like to see a full
20 rational explanation of why that's going to happen. If it
21 doesn't, that's fine. But I think it's going to, and I need
22 it explained to me.

23 The LSR is basically a no touch area. If any
24 kind of activity is planned for that area, it's a long,
25 involved process to get it done, and it usually doesn't
26

1 happen. But I feel like the agencies in this are bent over
2 backwards to let this for-profit company come through, mow
3 down the timber and it's okay. It's okay.

4 We can't even log in it, where jobs and money
5 would benefit the county, but it's okay to clear cut acres
6 and acres. Also, the pipeline will travel through a lot of
7 riparian areas, the tributary of the South Umpqua and all
8 the tributaries of that.

9 There needs to be a comprehensive cumulative
10 action analysis on the South Umpqua River for all the
11 tributaries, and the effects of sunlight on creeks, slides,
12 turbidity of the streams and that kind of stuff. If that's
13 not in there, I'm going to complain vehemently. Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
16 Is there more? Bill Gow.

17 MR. GOW: My name is Bill Gow, B-I-L-L,
18 G-O-W. I'm a rancher in the Clark's Ranch area. Well, you
19 stole some of my thunder there. Okay. I was going to talk
20 about the LSR, and the fact that I can't believe that they
21 locked this up so no loggers in the local area could have
22 jobs, but they're going to open this up to an outside
23 corporation, to cut through this property that was locked
24 away for the good of such an endangered species, and then
25 all of the sudden now, big money's coming in, they're going
26

1 to let them make a strip through it.

2 I started thinking about that. You know,
3 here we have a big block here, and I remember when all this
4 was going on. This big blocks area to maintain all this.
5 Now you can put a 95 foot strip through this block and go
6 buy a little piece of ground over here off of private
7 people, take that property off of the tax rolls to
8 compensate for that strip through this block that was
9 supposed to be protected.

10 So now you've got a block with a strip
11 through it and little hub stuck over here on it, that came
12 from private property. That don't even make sense. But
13 anyway, I can't get that through my mind. I noticed tonight
14 and last night when I went to the meeting in Coos Bay that
15 the new slides started talking about fracking, and it could
16 be addressed in this deal.

17 It started talking LNG and the effects of it
18 on the domestic market and all that's been put off limits,
19 because of what -- well, I've got some ideas why I think it
20 is. But yet the jobs issue, which I would think would be
21 right in the same category, has been left in there, and that
22 doesn't seem to add up to me.

23 This is an Environmental Impact Statement,
24 what's going on here, but yet I don't see the difference
25 between not being able to talk about fracking, not being
26

1 able to talk the effects of it, not being able to talk the
2 effects of domestic markets and what it's going to do to our
3 local economy and everything.

4 But yet we're going to talk about the loss of
5 jobs from the local economy. That doesn't make a lot of
6 sense to me.

7 You know, I'd also like the EIS to address
8 the long-term monitoring process that's going to go along on
9 this pipeline. PG&E, which is a huge company in California
10 that was supposed to be monitoring, was that San Bruno?
11 Anyway, the one that blew up down there, and they, you know,
12 we have to have a process in place that monitors this
13 underground.

14 You know, this is like -- this isn't going to
15 happen right away, but 50-100 years from now, they'll be
16 corrosion. That thing's probably going to blow up, just
17 like they thought that one wasn't going to go down there. I
18 think it's really important that that is addressed in this
19 EIS, of how -- and then the limits on the pressure and the
20 amount of pressure.

21 Because from what I understand, they were
22 putting more and more on those pipes and pretty soon they
23 couldn't take it. A real issue to me on this is, and I've
24 been tossing this around, because I was a construction
25 worker. I worked at Local 29 in Portland, and its jobs
26

1 versus property rights and eminent domain.

2 People want me to sell out my ranch, so they
3 can have a job. Well my ranch is my job, and I went out and
4 I earned money to buy a ranch, so I would have a job, so I
5 would be protected. So I have my own job so I don't have to
6 go over and work for the man and do anything else. That's
7 why I bought a ranch.

8 And now all of the sudden they want me to
9 compromise what I worked for, so they can have work. That's
10 kind of an odd concept, isn't it? They need to plan for
11 their own jobs, and not compromise me for a person that went
12 out and tried to be thinking forward, to compromise to have
13 a job that I can raise my family, my kids, my grandkids.

14 They can have jobs. They don't have to go
15 live in the cities. I don't want my kids living in the
16 cities. I don't want my grandkids living in the cities. If
17 these people want these jobs, that's where the jobs are, in
18 the cities. Go to the cities.

19 That's not -- it's important to me. If I
20 wanted to make a lot of money, I'd go somewhere else. I
21 enjoy what I do. I don't do it for the dollars. I do it
22 because I love it. I already proposed, and it's in the
23 record, and I think it would solve everybody's problem here,
24 to put the thing underneath the highway.

25 We've got Highway 140 coming over. We've got
26

1 the freeway, we've got 42. If this thing's so damn safe and
2 it's such a great deal, dig up the highway and put it
3 underneath the land of the highway, and it would be so much
4 cheaper, it would be so much everything.

5 You could get rid of it and, you know, it
6 would solve all these problems. We wouldn't be crossing
7 these rivers and going underneath this and going over these
8 hills and dales and everything else. Just dig, and look at
9 how much cheaper it would be just to pull the pavement up,
10 lay the pipe down, have a paving crew behind you, lay the
11 pipe.

12 The guys would get their jobs, it would be
13 out of all our hair, and I don't know what you're going to
14 do with that mess at Jordan Cove, but that's a whole
15 different subject. There are, okay, and there's another
16 thing that really concerns me here, and it was on that slide
17 how the BLM, the Forest Service, FERC, which I don't have a
18 lot of faith in you guys.

19 Not that I don't like you. I think you're
20 just -- I've seen the process too much -- are going to
21 monitor this situation going through the forest ground.
22 They're going to watch out for our best interest, because as
23 we all know, we own these forests, not these people. We do
24 as the citizens of the United States. We own this stuff.
25 These people work for us.

26

1 Anyway, they're going to be monitoring this
2 situation, and if they find a problem, it seems to me like
3 they kind of let it, believe that they will take care of it,
4 that we'll shut the job down and have it done right. On my
5 private property, you think they're going to listen to me
6 for one second, when I tell them to stop that job because
7 they're doing something wrong on my property?

8 Ain't going to happen, boys. I'll tell you
9 what. They're going to just tell me and they'll call the
10 sheriff and they'll haul me off in handcuffs, and that's
11 what's going to happen. So you think that you're going to
12 go out there and tell them what to do. Once they get this
13 right-of-way, they're going to do whatever they want.

14 You know what else? They're going to use all
15 the roads coming through their property, because you know,
16 on my property, they're not going to be able to do a
17 switchback, to get equipment and stuff in there. Either
18 they're going to have the crews walk in; somehow, they're
19 going to have to drag the pipe up there.

20 So in 80, they're talking about, you know,
21 dumping water out for a hydraulic test on my ranch. I don't
22 want any of that crap. I don't want any of it, and so I
23 think people that really believe that we're going to be able
24 to monitor what goes on on our land, they'll just throw
25 dollars at us. They'll take us to court.

26

1 What do you think, a little guy like me is
2 going to fight a huge, multinational corporation in court?
3 Not a chance, and it goes back -- I can't remember who
4 talked about it, about the imbalance in this deal.

5 The imbalance is tremendous. I'm a little
6 peon against a huge corporation, and the money -- we're not
7 going to be worth nothing. They'll just call the cops, haul
8 us off and run right over the top of us.

9 For Cliff Smith, I think his name was, okay.
10 For Cliff Smith, I am a person that was affected by that. I
11 wanted to build a barn right by that, on the place I've got
12 down on Bill Road. No way. You can't build it within so
13 many feet of that. So I am an example of a person that was
14 adversely affected by that pipeline. Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
17 That was everybody on who signed up on the speaker's list.
18 Is there anyone in the audience who did not have an
19 opportunity to speak, who wants to? Raise your hand now.
20 All right. This person here. Just come up and state your
21 name into the microphone.

22 MS. ESCALERA: My name is Laura Escalera,
23 L-A-U-R-A, E-S-C-A-L-E-R-A, and my one concern -- it's going
24 to be short. I've got a lot of them, but most of them were
25 addressed already tonight, is this liquefied natural gas is
26

1 going to have no smell to it. Every other gas line has got
2 that rotten egg smell. It's required in California.

3 You can't put in a gas line down there by law
4 without having that scent put into it. They said here that
5 they're not required to put that in this pipeline, and they
6 have no conditions, no -- they're not going to do it.

7 Rodney told me that when I asked him, and that concerns me.

8 You know, if there was even a slightly --
9 even the people down in San Bruno, where it did explode,
10 they did say that they were smelling something for the last
11 couple of days, and they just didn't put two and two
12 together. But they did have the smell down there.

13 We don't even have that here. It's not,
14 they're not going to put in there, and I think that, you
15 know, there's got to be something in there that you state,
16 that if this does pass and it does go through, they're
17 required to put that smell in there, so that at least if
18 there is a leak, before it explodes maybe somebody,
19 whoever's close by, will get at least a few moments to pack
20 up and get away as fast as they can.

21 Because at that size, you've got to remember
22 the size that San Bruno, that pipeline wasn't even not even
23 half the size, and it took out three football fields. Blew
24 it out. Blew out homes, caught the rest of whole area on
25 fire. There were hundreds of homes. People died. People

26

1 were injured. Some people were burned and several were in
2 burn centers, and of course you never heard anything about
3 it after that.

4 But there was a lot of damage from a pipeline
5 that wasn't even half the size. Please at least give some
6 people a chance, if you can at least put a scent in there if
7 it does pass. That if they even get a hint of it, they can
8 pack up and get out of there and report it, and hopefully it
9 won't go off, you know. They can get it taken care of.

10 That's something I really urge and ask, that
11 you make sure you put in there if it passes, they've got to
12 put some odor in there. Thank you very much.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.
15 All right. There was somebody else who wanted to talk? All
16 right.

17 MS. BUDDENHADEN: Rebecca Buddenhagen,
18 B-U-D-D-E-N-H-A-D-E-N. Okay. I just have a few brief
19 things to say. One thing, Paul, when you were talking about
20 the pipeline, explaining it to us, you said it is going to
21 be here and this is what's going to happen. So I don't know
22 if you're aware that that's how you're presenting it. It
23 doesn't sound like this is the proposal that we are
24 considering.

25 Okay. Number two is this thing about we
26

1 want, you know, the people who are pro the pipeline because
2 they want jobs, you know, we are proposing to support a
3 company to export America's natural resources, our
4 children's, our children children's potential jobs and
5 energy.

6 I think it's very funny that we don't seem to
7 know how to say hey wait a minute; we don't want this to
8 happen. That's very confusing, and okay.

9 Number three, the one thing that officially
10 fits into your question is I think the EIS statement should
11 include how, what the impact would be and how it will be
12 dealt with, when this pipeline dies. We know that all these
13 sort of things don't last forever. We can't even imagine;
14 that's a ridiculous concept.

15 So what happens? What is the process when it
16 breaks down to the point where it is not functional? How do
17 we recycle it? How do we undo it? Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
20 So once again, was anybody who did not speak previously want
21 an opportunity to speak now? All right. Then you have to
22 come to the front.

23 (Off record comment.)

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, don't do something you
25 don't want to do.

26

1 MS. M.A. HANSEN: This is seven years of my
2 life, and I'm getting pretty aggravated about this. I'm not
3 getting any taller. My name is M period, A period, there is
4 a space between those two letters, Hansen, H-A-N-S-E-N. I
5 just love the comments I've heard tonight and last night. I
6 can't imagine anybody, after hearing these comments, would
7 even consider this project. I was in Coos Bay last night.

8 I own 100 acres in Myrtle Creek. I guess I
9 should say near Myrtle Creek, two houses in Roseburg. The
10 pipeline is not touching either of my properties. Last
11 night I kept hearing "not in my backyard, not on my
12 property," and people kept saying -- I mean a few people,
13 two people who opposed it said that we were just because it
14 was on our property. We have ours, so don't touch us.
15 Many, many people.

16 As a matter of fact, the group that I've
17 belonged to for quite a long time, OCAP, Oregon Citizens
18 Against Pipeline, I think that we figured that about 80
19 percent of the people who have been fighting this for seven
20 years, it does not go across their property. We are
21 fighting it as citizens concern.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. HANSEN: I want to be sure that I get on
24 record, because I've heard a lot of people who have done a
25 lot of things here, and they're not on record. I've been to
26

1 about every meeting that's ever happened with, after the EIS
2 and all of these meetings. So I want to be on record. I am
3 very opposed to this project.

4 I want to just kind of summarize, because I
5 think most things have been touched the last two nights, on
6 why I would oppose this. Let's see. Okay. The economy. I
7 know we're not supposed to talk about the economy, but I am
8 an accountant, and I'm going to talk about the economy.

9 This proposal is bad for Oregon. It could
10 destroy the Coos Bay fishing and oyster industry, many ^^^
11 for several reasons. One is because the fishermen can't go
12 out beyond the ship when it's in the harbor, and I don't
13 know if it's the same as when we were going to export or
14 import, but we hear that ship is in the harbor for quite a
15 few days, as a matter of fact, with engines running.

16 So I think that that's an environmental
17 problem, and another reason is the dredging. So there's
18 many reasons why we might have a destroyed fishing industry.

19 Another thing is let's talk about the people
20 on the land, away from the ocean. They have less of an
21 ability to -- they don't want to live on the land.
22 Everybody I've talked to that this pipeline's going to cross
23 the land, they want to get out of there, and they're not
24 going to give you a decent price for it with the pipeline
25 under. That's just a little bit about the economy here.

26

1 Another thing is this is something that I
2 haven't heard mentioned. This pipeline in the forest, we've
3 been told that it's going to be six feet deep. That's six
4 feet from the bottom. It's three feet from the top. Now
5 you can correct me on that, and I hope you can correct me on
6 that, because I hope I'm wrong.

7 But I don't know a heck of a lot about
8 logging, but I do own 100 acres of trees, and I guess I
9 might learn some day. But I think there's some mighty big
10 machineries running around up there, and you can't tell me
11 one of them's not going to hit a three-foot buried pipe some
12 day, cause one heck of a big fire or whatever else it might
13 be causing, a big explosion, and then they're going to be
14 shut out of the forest.

15 Now I think that's affecting our economy, and
16 who knows how long they'll be shut out of the forest. When
17 they return to the forest, who's going to want to get on one
18 of those machines and go back in that forest? So I really
19 think that's going to affect the economy.

20 The environment, which I also have a degree
21 in Environmental Studies, so I can talk forever on this
22 subject. But it has been covered a lot, except we're not
23 allowed to talk about fracking. I think we better talk
24 about fracking. Pollutants, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.
25 We've got to talk about the environment.
26

1 Also, here's another thing I haven't heard
2 mentioned. I might be wrong on this, and I hope I'm wrong.
3 Safety. Well of course the tsunami. We're all pretty
4 concerned it's going to happen, that we're going to have a
5 big earthquake, and believe me, there's no way you're ever
6 going to convince me that you're prepared for it.

7 I've been involved in, I've lived all over
8 the world. I've been involved in the biggest earthquake.
9 I've been involved in tsunamis. I've seen ridiculous things
10 going on by people who are supposed to be prepared for this.
11 They're not. There's no way to prepare for them.

12 An LNG tanker in the harbor. I have heard
13 it's the biggest terror threat. It's considered by our
14 government the biggest terror threat you can have in the
15 country. This is one reason why the Port of Chicago has
16 refused an LNG project. Anyway, that's me. Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
19 There's one last one? All right.

20 MS. GORDON: My name is Joanne Gordon,
21 J-O-A-N-N-E, one word, G-O-R-D-O-N. I want to bring up this
22 topic of mitigation and bring up the fisheries, and how we
23 built all these fish hatcheries to mitigate the problems
24 that have been caused for many, many years and the depleted
25 fish populations.

26

1 Well now they're discovering that that
2 mitigation isn't perfect. They're not like the native fish.
3 They're hatchery fish. They have diseases. So how are you
4 going to mitigate things that you can't even think about,
5 that are going to happen? Nature does not explain itself to
6 us.

7 There are things that are going to happen
8 through the years that then we're going to have to mitigate
9 something else, and it's my taxpayer money that is paying
10 for those fisheries, the hatcheries, to try to fix a mistake
11 that was made many, many years ago.

12 You people are working for the citizens of
13 this country, the people in Douglas County, Klamath, Coos,
14 Josephine, Josephine Jackson. I can't remember. We're
15 paying your salaries. Take our comments to heart. Think
16 about it. Think about what is happening.

17 I'm sick and tired of the economic impact on
18 my life, fighting for six years to try to get rid of this
19 thing, donating money to educate people, spending time,
20 taking time that I should be really focused on my business.

21 I'm a self-employed business owner, and all
22 of the people here who have jobs and are spending precious
23 time away from those jobs or trying, you know, to at least
24 their energy gets depleted, and it's just been going on for
25 years and years and years.

26

1 It needs to just go away. It would save us
2 so much money and so much heartache, and psychological
3 damage to just go away. That's what the people want.

4 (Applause.)

5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
6 One last time, is there anyone else? You have to come
7 forward and to the microphone.

8 (Off record comments.)

9 MR. BAKER: In the interest, oh yeah, in the
10 interest of full disclosure, I am a private citizen in
11 Douglas County and South Douglas County --

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please state your name and
13 spell it for the record.

14 MR. BAKER: And my name is David Baker. It
15 should be pretty easy. D-A-V-I-D, B-A-K-E-R, and not only
16 am I a private citizen; I'm also an employee of the USDA FS,
17 which is the Forest Service. I work at the Tiller Ranger
18 District, and where the pipeline crosses our district is a
19 very small part of the entire pipeline project.

20 So I'm only going to address the part that I
21 know about. My concern, as I've listened to all of these
22 people; everybody's very passionate about what's going on on
23 their lands if it's private land, and a lot of people are
24 very concerned about safety; they're very concerned about
25 what's going to happen to the value of the land, the
26

1 ecosystem values, to all those things.

2 I really can't address it in terms of, in
3 those kind of terms. But I am going to be forced to address
4 it professionally when it comes across our land, in terms of
5 mitigations.

6 I'm a little bit concerned that there are
7 some values that we lose, some values that we have to give
8 up, and that we have to make some -- we're going to make
9 some compromises that I'm going to have to live with, and
10 I'm going to have to deal professionally with.

11 I'm not happy about that, and I'm forced to
12 be objective about it, at a time when I may have some
13 personal values that are being compromised. In spite, I
14 don't know if people know about things like the PP, the
15 Pacific Power stuff up at Diamond Lake, where they have a
16 huge mitigation fund to accommodate the fact that there are
17 environmental compromises that they made.

18 But they get big dollars to fix presumed
19 problems that we don't know we're going to have yet. I see,
20 in the portion of the pipeline going up over Wildcat Ridge,
21 if someone were to ask my either personal or professional
22 opinion, I would rather not see the landscape torn up.

23 Now I have colleagues in here. I actually
24 have my boss in here, so I'm probably going to suffer a
25 little grief from this. I have colleagues in here who I

26

1 consider my friends on many cases, but I will probably
2 suffer some grief.

3 One of the things is I could get dollars to
4 fund my programs, perhaps. But I'm not sure that it's worth
5 the actual grief I'm causing the landscape. I don't know
6 this yet. I may actually be asked to review your document,
7 and maybe now I'll be pulled away from that, which is
8 probably going to be helpful for me.

9 But I'm not convinced that the damage we can
10 cause in my short little length of the pipeline is worth the
11 net gain that somebody's going to get out of this. I've
12 heard many impassioned pleas. I've heard many things from
13 people that I have actually found incorrect, you know, and
14 I'm not going to go in -- I'm not going to point out.
15 That's why I don't do that.

16 MR. BAKER: But the, you know, many people
17 are incorrect in some of their assumptions, and other people
18 are very impassioned and that's private property and they
19 have very good rationales for why they don't want the
20 pipeline to go through it. But from my point of view, from
21 an environmental point of view in the very short chunk that
22 crosses the Umpqua National Forest, I am not convinced that
23 any amount of mitigation dollars is ever going to be able to
24 fix what you guys damage or what is damaged, and I can say
25 that for a number of things.

26

1 It's not like I'm an advocate for total leave
2 the world alone; I actually do advocate some kind of
3 harvest. I do advocate management. But I don't know that
4 this is exactly the way we want to go with it.

5 So I guess what I'm saying is yes, I'm a
6 professional. I do have an opinion. I'm supposed to remain
7 objective, but as a private citizen, I have to admit that I
8 am informed by the things I do know about this project, and
9 I do have my concerns.

10 I do want the people to know that I am very
11 concerned, and not totally happy with what I see happening
12 up there. I don't know that any mitigation dollars you can
13 give me will ever fix the damage that might be incurred as a
14 result of this project. Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.
17 Anyone else who has not spoken who would like an opportunity
18 to speak?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. FRIEDMAN: If not, then we have come to
21 the end of this program. On behalf of the FERC, the BLM and
22 the Forest Service, I want to thank you all for coming here
23 tonight, and speaking up and giving us your comments, so
24 that we can focus our analysis in the EIS. Let the record
25 show that the meeting is coming to a close at 9:37.

26

1 (Whereupon, at 9:37 p.m., the meeting was
2 adjourned.)
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25