

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3

4 FERC SCOPING MEETING

5

6

7 WASHINGTON EXPANSION : Docket No. PF12-20-000

8 PROJECT :

9

10

11 Monday, October 15, 2012

12

13

14 Sedro-Woolley High School

15 1235 Third Street

16 Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284

17

18 6:13 p.m.

19

20

21 The above-entitled meeting was held,

22 pursuant to notice, at 6:13 p.m.

23

24

25

26

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

2 6:13 p.m.

3 MR. KOPKA: Good evening everyone. On behalf
4 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, referred to as
5 FERC or the F-E-R-C, I would like to welcome all of you here
6 tonight. My name is Bob Kopka. I am an environmental
7 project manager with the Commission's Office of Energy
8 Projects.

9 This is an environmental scoping meeting for
10 the Washington Expansion Project proposed by Northwest
11 Pipeline GP. Let the record show that the public scoping
12 meeting in Central Washington began at 6:13 p.m. on October
13 15th. The primary purpose of this meeting is to provide you
14 an opportunity to comment on the project, or on the scope of
15 the environmental analysis being prepared for the project.

16 This project is intended to supply the Oregon
17 LNG Export Project with natural gas. Northwest is also
18 exploring the additional needs in Washington. Although my
19 discussion will mostly focus on the Washington Expansion
20 Project, because those of you here will be most affected by
21 it, you are welcome to provide comments relating to the
22 Oregon LNG Export Project as well.

23 Also with me tonight is Anthony Rana with
24 FERC. Tony? We also have members of our third party
25 contractor assisting us preparing the Environmental Impact
26

1 Statement or EIS, covering both the Washington Expansion
2 Project and the Oregon LNG Export Project, and they were out
3 at the table as you came in.

4 We also have representatives, a
5 representative from the Washington Utilities Transportation
6 Commission, David Leiken, over here, who's happy to answer
7 any questions you might have regarding safety after the
8 formal part of the meeting this evening.

9 If there are any other agency representatives
10 here this evening who will be working on the project and
11 would like to make themselves available at the meeting, or
12 would like to address the audience, please raise your hand.

13 A little about the FERC. The FERC is an
14 independent agency that regulates interstate transmission of
15 electricity, natural gas, oil and hydropower. FERC reviews
16 proposals and authorizes construction of interstate natural
17 gas pipelines, storage facilities and liquefied natural gas
18 LNG terminals, as well as licensing and inspection of
19 hydroelectric projects.

20 As a federal licensing agency, the FERC has a
21 responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act
22 to consider the potential environmental impact associated
23 with the project, which is under its consideration. With
24 regard to Northwest's project, the FERC is the lead federal
25 agency for the National Environmental Policy Act review and
26

1 the preparation of EIS.

2 The U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Army Corps of
3 Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have been
4 the cooperating agencies on the pending Oregon LNG project
5 under Docket No. CP09-06 and CP09-07, and we anticipate that
6 these agencies will continue to participate as cooperating
7 agencies in the preparation of the EIS for the current LNG
8 export project and Northwest Washington Expansion Project.

9 These agencies plan to use this EIS to meet
10 their respective NEPA responsibilities, associated with
11 issuing their permits. As I said earlier, the primary
12 purpose of this meeting tonight is to give you an
13 opportunity to comment on the project, or on the
14 environmental issues that you would like to see covered in
15 the EIS.

16 It will help us most if your comments are as
17 specific as possible, regarding the potential environmental
18 impacts, and reasonable alternatives to the proposed
19 Washington Expansion Project. These issues generally focus
20 on the potential for environmental effects, but may also
21 address construction issues, mitigation and the
22 environmental review process.

23 In addition, this meeting is designed to
24 provide you an opportunity to meet with Northwest
25 representatives, to ask them questions, and to obtain more
26

1 detailed information about the proposed facility locations
2 and construction plans. Please keep in mind that this
3 project is still early in its development, with the intent
4 that Northwest will use the comments made here tonight to
5 better accommodate affected land owners in designing the
6 project, and protecting the environment.

7 So tonight's agenda is a simple one. First,
8 I'm going to describe the environmental review process, and
9 the FERC's role in this process. At this point, I'd like to
10 take a few questions, if anyone has any, about the FERC
11 process. Anyone?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. KOPKA: I also will be available after
14 the meeting, so if you have additional questions later, feel
15 free to track me down and ask.

16 After that, we're going to let the project
17 sponsor, Northwest, give a more complete description of the
18 proposal. Then we will hear from those of you who have
19 signed up to speak. If you would like to present comments
20 tonight, please be sure to sign the speaker's list at the
21 sign-in table.

22 Once those speakers have signed up to speak
23 and commented, and time allows, I will ask if there are any
24 additional comments.

25 Now I'd like to briefly describe our
26

1 environmental review process for you. To illustrate how our
2 process works, we've prepared a flow chart, which was also
3 in the NOI. This was appended to the Notice, and we also
4 have copies of the Notice available at the sign-in table if
5 you did not get one.

6 Currently, we are near the beginning of our
7 environmental review process, and the pre-filing process.
8 Northwest requested to enter FERC pre-filing process on
9 July 10th, 2012, which began our review of the Washington
10 Expansion Project facilities.

11 The purpose of the pre-filing process is to
12 encourage involvement by all interested stakeholders, in a
13 manner that allows for the early identification and
14 resolution of environmental issues. As of today, no formal
15 application has been filed with FERC. However, the FERC,
16 along with other federal, state and local agency staffs,
17 have begun or are starting to review the project.

18 On September 24th, FERC issued a Notice of
19 Intent or NOI to prepare an EIS for this project, along with
20 Oregon LNG Project, and initiated a scoping period. This
21 scoping or comment period will end on November 8th.

22 Even though the formal scoping period will
23 close, additional project information will continue to be
24 filed by Northwest, and you may continue to file comments,
25 the directions of which are in the NOI. During our review
26

1 of the project, we will assemble information from a variety
2 of sources, including Northwest, the public, other state,
3 local and federal agencies, and our own independent analysis
4 and field work.

5 We will analyze this information and prepare
6 a draft EIS that will be distributed to the public for
7 comment. Once scoping is finished, our next step will be to
8 begin analyzing the company's proposals, and the issues that
9 have been identified during the scoping period.

10 This will include an examination of the
11 proposed facility locations, as well as alternative sites.
12 We will assess the project's effects on water bodies and
13 wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, endangered species,
14 cultural resources, soils, land use, air quality and safety.

15 When complete, our analysis of the potential
16 impacts will be published as a draft EIS, and presented to
17 the public for a 45-day comment period. This draft EIS will
18 be mailed to all interested parties, and posted on FERC's
19 e-Library, where it can be publicly accessed as well.

20 During the 45-day comment period on the draft
21 EIS, we will hold more public scoping meetings, to gather
22 feedback on our analysis and findings. After making any
23 necessary changes or additions to the draft EIS, a final EIS
24 will be mailed to all interested parties, as well as being
25 posted on e-Library.

26

1 Please note that because of the size of the
2 mailing list, the mail version of the EIS is often on a CD.
3 That means unless you tell us otherwise, the EIS that you
4 will find in your mailbox will be a CD. If you prefer to
5 have a hard copy mailed to you, you must indicate that
6 choice on the return mailer attached to the NOI, but you can
7 also indicate that you would like a hard copy on the
8 attendance sheet at the sign-in table.

9 As I mentioned earlier, our issuance of the
10 NOI opened a formal comment period that will close on
11 November 8th. The NOI encourages you to submit your
12 comments as soon as possible, in order to give us an
13 opportunity to analyze and research the issues.

14 If you received the NOI in the mail, you are
15 on our mailing list, and will remain on our mailing list to
16 receive the EIS and any other supplemental notices we may
17 issue about this project, unless you return the mailer
18 attached to the back of the NOI, and indicate that you wish
19 to be removed from the mailing list. In fact, there are
20 copies of the NOI available at the sign-in table if you did
21 not get one.

22 The mailing list for this project is large,
23 and undergoing constant revision. You can be added to our
24 mailing list by signing up at the sign-in table in the back,
25 or by submitting comments on the project. I would like to
26

1 add that the FERC encourages electronic filing of all
2 comments and other documents.

3 The NOI describes electronic filing on how to
4 file a comment on it through the regular mail as well.
5 Also, instructions for this are located on our website,
6 www.ferc.gov, under the e-Filing link. It is very important
7 that any comments you send, either electronically or by
8 traditional mail, include our internal docket number for
9 this project.

10 The docket number is on the cover of the NOI,
11 and is also available at the sign-in table. If you decide
12 to send us a comment letter, please put that number on it.
13 That will ensure that members of our staff evaluating the
14 project will get your comments as soon as possible.

15 The docket number for the Washington
16 Expansion Project is PF12-20-000. The docket number for the
17 Oregon LNG Export Project is PF12-18-000.

18 Now I want to explain the rules of the FERC
19 Commission and the FERC environmental staff. The
20 five-member Commission is responsible for making a
21 determination on whether or not to issue a Certificate of
22 Public Convenience and Necessity to the applicant. In this
23 case, that is Northwest.

24 The EIS is prepared by the environmental
25 staff, which I am part of, which would describe the project
26

1 facilities and associated environmental impacts,
2 alternatives to the project, mitigation to avoid or reduce
3 impacts, and our conclusions and recommendations.

4 The EIS is not a decision document. It is
5 being prepared to disclose to the public and to the
6 Commission the environmental impact of constructing and
7 operating the proposed project.

8 When it is completed, the Commission will
9 consider the environmental information from the EIS, along
10 with the non-environmental issues, such as engineering,
11 markets and rates, in its decision-making to approve or deny
12 Northwest's request for a certificate.

13 There is no review of FERC decisions by the
14 President or Congress, maintaining FERC's independence as a
15 regulatory agency, and providing for fair and unbiased
16 decisions.

17 Before we start taking comments from you, I
18 have asked Northwest to provide a brief overview of the
19 project. George Angerbauer from Northwest will briefly
20 describe the project. George.

21 MR. ANGERBAUER: Thank you. Good evening,
22 everyone. On behalf of Williams, we appreciate the
23 opportunity to present this brief overview of the Washington
24 Expansion Project to you tonight. My name is George
25 Angerbauer, that's G-E-O-R-G-E, A-N-G-E-R-B-A-U-E-E-R.

26

1 You'll all be asked to spell your name if you comment
2 tonight, and I'm responsible for public outreach for the
3 program.

4 Northwest Pipeline, which is a subsidiary of
5 Williams, is a major transporter of energy, delivering about
6 80 percent of the Pacific Northwest's natural gas, and about
7 88 percent of natural gas consumed in Washington.

8 Northwest Pipeline is an open access
9 transportation company, meaning we consider all potential
10 customer requests for natural gas transportation service,
11 without discriminating by the type of business or industry
12 they represent.

13 We do not own the natural gas that we
14 transport; we simply move it for the customers who contract
15 with us. We own and safely operate all the facilities
16 required to transport the natural gas, including pipeline.

17 Northwest Pipeline is developing the proposed
18 Washington Expansion Project to provide transportation of
19 natural gas to Oregon LNG's proposed terminal in Warrenton,
20 Oregon. The project consists of increasing the capacity of
21 our existing pipeline system by 750,000 decotherms per day
22 between Sumas and Woodland, Washington, where Northwest will
23 connect to Oregon LNG's pipeline, which will transport gas
24 to the proposed terminal.

25 This increase in capacity requires the
26

1 installation of pipeline and compression on our existing
2 system in Washington state. Our existing system in
3 Washington is partially looped, meaning we have one
4 continuous 30-inch diameter pipeline starting at the
5 Canadian border, Sumas, and extending south to Woodland and
6 beyond, and at several locations we have a second parallel
7 36-inch diameter line.

8 Each section of this second 36-inch line
9 connects at its end points to our continuous 30-inch line,
10 and though these sections of existing 36-inch line are not
11 continuous, they do function together with the 30-inch line
12 and operate as a single system, offering flexibility and
13 redundancy at every point where they run parallel.

14 As this map illustrates, we're proposing to
15 create the additional capacity for this project by
16 constructing approximately 140 miles of new 36-inch diameter
17 pipe in ten sections. These sections would essentially fill
18 the gaps between our existing sections of 36-inch pipeline
19 loop, and would result in nearly continuous 36-inch pipe
20 that connects to and runs parallel with our continuous
21 30-inch pipeline.

22 The new 36-inch pipe would be placed
23 predominantly in our existing right-of-way. In other words,
24 for nearly all properties we cross, we expect we will not
25 have to expand our existing permanent right-of-way.

26

1 This project would also add compression at
2 our existing compressor stations at Sumas, Mount Vernon,
3 Snohomish, Sumner and Chehalis. Installing the new 36-inch
4 parallel pipeline system in Washington offers valuable
5 benefits of system redundancy and flexibility to our
6 existing utility customers, which include Puget Sound
7 Energy, Cascade and many industrial and commercial customers
8 throughout Western Washington.

9 Having a continuous parallel pipeline allows
10 us to perform maintenance or repairs at any point without
11 interrupting gas transportation service. The eight counties
12 along the proposed route would benefit from the increase of
13 more than \$10 million annually in property tax revenue from
14 this project. This is in addition to the \$7 million in
15 property tax Williams currently pays to Washington each
16 year.

17 Other economic benefits would include the
18 creation of approximately 1,400 jobs during the project's
19 peak construction period, and will result in additional
20 state and local revenues and induced jobs. It's estimated
21 that approximately 800 million in direct construction
22 expenditures will be made in the region during the duration
23 of the project.

24 Land owners will also receive compensation
25 based on existing land values, and additional impacts

26

1 related to the construction of the 36-inch pipeline. If the
2 project is approved, the Washington Expansion Project would
3 begin construction starting in 2016, with the natural gas
4 transportation service beginning in 2018.

5 A complete and thorough environmental
6 analysis will be conducted as part of our FERC application
7 process, and as part of that process we've sought input from
8 the community and local agencies to identify and address
9 issues and concerns.

10 In August, we hosted open houses across the
11 proposed project route, and we invite you to contact us and
12 meet with us ongoing, to discuss any questions you may have
13 about the project or its potential impact on you or your
14 property. Our land agents are available to talk with you at
15 your inconvenience. We have a toll-free number, email
16 address, the location of land offices and other important
17 information on our website at www.washingtonexpansion.com.

18 Pipeline safety is the single most important
19 component of our operations. We are regulated by the
20 Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous
21 Materials Safety Administration. The steel pipe we use in
22 our construction is manufactured to strict safety
23 specifications, and a protective coating is factory-applied
24 to repel moisture and other corrosive elements.

25 In addition to other safety measures, and
26

1 prior to placing the pipeline in service, we will examine
2 the pipeline inside and out using highly sensitive
3 inspection tools. We will also test it by filling the
4 pipeline with water and raising the pressure of the water
5 well above our maximum operating pressure, holding that
6 pressure test for several hours to ensure there are no
7 leaks, then releasing the water at permitted locations.

8 Thank you for this opportunity to provide a
9 brief overview of the project. As a project team, we are
10 committed to continuing to meet and work together with you
11 and other members of the community, to understand your
12 concerns and address them in the most reasonable,
13 appropriate way. Thank you.

14 MR. KOPKA: Thank you, George. After our
15 meeting here is adjourned, representatives from Northwest
16 will be available with project maps, and will be on hand in
17 the lobby area to answer questions about the project as
18 well.

19 We will now begin the important part of our
20 meeting, where we hear your comments. We will first take
21 comments from those that signed up on the speakers list,
22 which is on the table as you came in. If you would prefer,
23 you may hand us written comments tonight, or send them into
24 the Commission by following the procedures outlined in the
25 NOI.

26

1 There is also a form on the sign-in table
2 that you can use to write comments on, and get them to me or
3 one of my consultants tonight. There are also instructions
4 on the form detailing how to mail them in later. Whether
5 you provide your comments verbally or mail them in, they
6 will be considered by FERC equally.

7 I'm sure you have noted that this meeting is
8 being recorded by a transcription service. This is being
9 done so that all your comments and questions will be
10 transcribed and put into the public record. To help the
11 court reported produce an accurate record of this meeting, I
12 ask that you please follow some ground rules.

13 When your name is called, please step up to
14 the microphone at the podium and state your name and spell
15 it for the record. Identify any agency or group that you
16 might be representing, and define any acronyms you may use.

17 I also ask that everybody else in the
18 audience respect the speaker, and refrain from any audible
19 show of agreement or disagreement. Do we have the sign-in
20 sheet? Our first speaker tonight is Brian McGuinness.

21 MR. MCGUINNESS: I'm Brian McGuinness,
22 B-R-I-A-N, M small C, capital G-U-I-N-E-S-S, and I've
23 already given you a copy of my statement. But I want to
24 read this into the record also. I'm a property owner and an
25 interested party. My property, a five-acre tract, contains
26

1 within it about 600 lineal feet of pipeline easement.

2 Over the length of two buried pipes, the
3 elevation significantly rises from about 590 feet above sea
4 level to 890 or a 300-foot vertical rise. I believe this
5 easily qualifies in geologic and environmental terms as a
6 steep slope.

7 The ridge over the hillside is normally
8 called Clear Lake Hill. The Williams Company, on their own
9 maps, identifies this section as "Heartbreak Hill." There's
10 a reason for that, which I will get into later, identifying
11 geologic, landslide and erosion issues.

12 I also own a separate but contiguous two-acre
13 parcel of land along the pipeline, that includes my home of
14 34 years, a driveway and an out building. In my following
15 comments, I will note the Northwest Pipeline GP, as operated
16 by Tulsa, Oklahoma-based Williams as "the company."

17 I want it noted for the record that I do not
18 now, nor have I ever had a confrontation with any member of
19 the company over the past 23 years of my pipeline property
20 ownership. Yet I consider this hearing tonight to be
21 premature for two significant reasons.

22 First, the company has been less than
23 forthcoming in explaining its explicit construction plans to
24 implement the expansion. In July, the company sent out
25 requests to property owners, to sign their release to survey
26

1 100 feet beyond its active 30-inch pipeline, both east and
2 west, under the premise of some vague requirement.

3 Then at the August open house meeting in
4 Sedro-Woolley, the true intent of that survey release was
5 made known in a short quip from the project engineer about a
6 95-foot working zone. This totally new information, a
7 500-pound silent canary, if you will, was not further
8 explained, nor was there any written material on the subject
9 available at the open house.

10 On the face of it, 95 feet is 20 feet beyond
11 the company's 75-foot legal right-of-way. But later, in
12 asking specific questions of a company representative, I was
13 told the working zone plan would be measured from five feet
14 west of the active 30-inch pipe going eastbound, thus
15 causing extensive new impacts on undisturbed land
16 approximately 50 feet beyond the existing right-of-way.

17 I have to assume very few, if any, property
18 owners in the northern region are aware of this explicit
19 intent, and thus how could those same property owners make
20 comments to you on potential environmental issues, where
21 they are not aware of the 95 foot working zone.

22 Further complementing this specific issue is
23 your own recent FERC publication, that threatens eminent
24 domain for those property owners who fail to have easement
25 negotiations with the company. What easement? Where in
26

1 existing publications sent to property owners is explicit
2 information about easement intentions?

3 Backing up my own verbal communications with
4 a company representative, I asked on August 16th for an
5 information sheet about the 95 foot working zone. A company
6 rep answered that "a typical drawing" of the zone would be
7 made available to me after being fully vested. That was 47
8 days ago, and as of this afternoon, I have not received any
9 information.

10 The second issue that makes tonight's input
11 premature is the delayed progress of the company's
12 environmental surveyors. I was informed 19 days ago that
13 the survey had begin. I never did see the GPS surveyors,
14 and doubt that they ever stepped foot on my property.

15 I did meet the archaeological surveyors, who
16 indicated the environmental group would be weeks behind. I
17 think they were bogged down in the wetlands, pun intended.
18 Based on the fact that all the northern region's property
19 owners have not been given the opportunity to meet these
20 surveyors before tonight, how meaningful could their
21 comments be in this scoping process, for the future
22 Environmental Impact Statement?

23 Here are some specific comments for the EIS
24 in regard to my property. I have to give you a little
25 background first. The company did extensive repair work on
26

1 its 20-inch pipeline, the western of the two lines on my
2 property, in late 2002 or early 2003. On the night of
3 November 23rd, 2004, about a year later, there was a
4 significant landslide involving about 200 plus cubic yards,
5 my estimate, of soil that traveled from near the top of my
6 property to my neighbor's property about 150 yards
7 downslope, topping one and possibly two berms.

8 The slide was two to three feet deep in
9 spots, and about 40 feet of pipe was exposed with no soil
10 underneath. Having viewed the bottom third of the slide
11 from my living room window that morning, the next morning, I
12 was the first person to call the company.

13 Repairs could not be made immediately due to
14 the rainy winter conditions, to work to clean up the
15 landslide and replace the soil had to be put off for months.
16 Here's my specific input. I will not give approval to a
17 95-foot working zone on my pipeline property that encroaches
18 eastbound beyond the company's existing right-of-way, into
19 undisturbed forest belly.

20 My home, driveway and out building, on a
21 separate but parallel parcel, are directly below this
22 proposed working zone. Being that the soil on this hillside
23 is historically unstable, removing those 40 to 50 year old
24 trees and lower vegetation, and disturbing rooted soil,
25 would pose geological, erosion and landslide hazards.

26

1 If the 2004 landslide had been further to the
2 east, as the eastern portion of the proposed 95-foot working
3 zone, my driveway, out building and house could have been
4 destructively impacted. The evidence is there historically.

5 Regardless of my comments, I'm not against
6 the general proposal to expand the capacity of the line.
7 Though the primary purpose is to profit from sales overseas
8 in the Pacific Rim, I do concede some communities along the
9 pipeline might be able to benefit somewhat from its
10 expansion.

11 If the project is approved, my view is that
12 it should be constructed within its existing right-of-way,
13 as in the past, no additional easements, neither temporary
14 nor permanent.

15 Another alternative for a responsible company
16 would be the more expensive removal of its old western side
17 26-inch pipe, and replacement with the new 36-inch pipe,
18 again staying within its existing right-of-way. There's my
19 comments. Thank you.

20 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. Our next commenter is
21 David Gaines.

22 MR. GAINES: Hi. I'm David Gaines,
23 D-A-V-I-D, G-A-I-N-E-S. I'd like to comment on the
24 socioeconomics of this project. Construction, operation and
25 maintenance of this project will provide improvement of the
26

1 infrastructure, which will allow for future opportunities
2 for economic growth by industrial, manufacturing, commercial
3 and residential growth for both the local, state and
4 national economy or levels.

5 This project will provide family wage jobs
6 during the construction period, but continuing into the
7 future, for both operations and maintenance. As an employee
8 of the locally-based Nelson Companies, Incorporated, which
9 for many years has provided both construction and
10 maintenance services to Williams Companies, I anticipate
11 that this project will create additional economic
12 opportunities for our company.

13 This opportunity for additional services
14 would help Nelson Companies to continue donations supporting
15 local social enhancements, such as Helping Hands Food Bank,
16 Skagit Council on Aging, YMCA Teen Oasis Shelter,
17 Sedro-Woolley Farmers Market, Rotary Club, Sedro-Woolley
18 High School, Sedro-Woolley Little League, Burlington Edison
19 High School, Skagit County Humane Society, retired
20 seniors volunteer program, Skagit Valley Hospital
21 Foundation, Sedro-Woolley Museum, plus many others.

22 Additional services by Nelson Companies would
23 also create economic opportunities for various vendors
24 providing goods and services. Nelson Companies has over 30
25 vendors in Sedro-Woolley, over 35 vendors in Burlington, and
26

1 over 40 vendors in Mount Vernon, and over 61 vendors in the
2 Bellingham area.

3 A few examples of local vendors are North
4 Cascade Ford, Sedro-Woolley Auto Parts, E&E Lumber, Skagit
5 Farmers Supply, Woods Logging Company, Alpine Fire and
6 Safety, Skagit Janitorial, Skagit River Steel, Dan's
7 Equipment, Concrete Northwest, Ferguson Enterprises Hardware
8 Sales and Stellar Industrial Supply. That's all I have.

9 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. Our next speaker is
10 Laurence Brown.

11 MR. BROWN: Good evening. Laurence Brown,
12 L-A-U-R-E-N-C-E, middle initial W, last name Brown,
13 B-R-O-W-N. During your EIS, I would urge the FERC to
14 consider in the socioeconomic impact, the potential for an
15 impact on domestic natural gas prices of the export of
16 significant amounts of natural gas.

17 In addition to that, it would be a potential
18 for a flow-through increase of the price of coal for fuel
19 used by electric utilities, as well as of the resulting
20 electricity itself, adversely impacting the economic
21 situation basically throughout the country, certainly
22 throughout the western United States. Thank you.

23 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. Just you know, the
24 Department of Energy is doing just such an EIS at the
25 moment. It should be released either towards the end of the
26

1 year or early next year. So you'll probably find more all
2 about it online.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Excellent
4 information, good to know. Could you please expand a bit on
5 that? What is the docket number, so that we can get access,
6 and perhaps participate in that process as well?

7 MR. KOPKA: Unfortunately, it's the
8 Department of Energy. I don't know the docket number, but
9 I'm sure you could find it if you do a search online. There
10 have been, you know, several news articles that probably
11 could lead you where you need to go. Okay, go ahead ma'am.

12 MS. DITTRICH: Alana Dittrich. Do you need
13 the spelling? Yeah. A-L-A-N-A, last name Dittrich,
14 D-I-T-T-R-I-C-H, and I am here to speak as a Northwest born
15 and bred environmentalist. I come by my environmentalism
16 naturally, as I'm the daughter of William J. Dittrich,
17 previously a physicist at Western, the first advisor to the
18 Northwest Air Pollution Control Authority, and one of the
19 founders of Whatcom County Parks.

20 I want to say that I oppose this project in
21 its entirety, and that I urge that the EIS consider the
22 environmental impacts on a wide range. We've heard some
23 things about what it will do to our own area. But we need
24 to take into account what it will also do to the areas from
25 which this oil will be gathered.

26

1 Some of this oil will be gathered through the
2 horrendous process of fracking, which absolutely destroys
3 communities in which that process is used. It destroys the
4 aquifers, it occludes wells, it destabilizes the land.
5 Also, in a time when both the Far Right and the Far Left and
6 everyone in between, in other words everyone seems to agree
7 that it's important for the United States to develop energy
8 independence, it is absolutely insane, insane that we would
9 perpetrate environmental damage from the areas from which
10 this oil will come, all the way through to the areas of what
11 we've transported to Asia.

12 What kind of sense is that? We've heard some
13 of the beneficial economic impacts that may come from the
14 taxes, etcetera. These same impacts for the good of our
15 environment, from our economic environment, can be created
16 by pursuing green energy and green jobs.

17 That way, it will be renewable. We won't be
18 shipping our resources to other people when we need them
19 ourselves, and we can develop a sound environment and a
20 sound economy. Finally, I want to say that the EIS most
21 assuredly should take into account the impact of this oil
22 being sent to Asia on both acid rain, which will come back
23 to us, and global climate disruption.

24 It is astounding to me how few people know
25 that exactly what climate science has been predicting for
26

1 decades is already occurring in the United States. How many
2 of you here today know that by the end of the summer, over
3 60 percent of the counties in the United States were
4 federally declared disaster zones, from drought, crop
5 failure and fire, exactly what science predicted.

6 This is not from some wackadoodle website;
7 this was reported on CNN, ABC, CBS, and all you have to do
8 is go to USDA, United States Department of Agriculture
9 website, and you can see the map of the droughts which as of
10 October -- go home and Google it. Go to USDA, look at the
11 map as of October.

12 Almost the entirety of the United States now
13 was bright red. We were one of the -- or that wasn't. But
14 global climate disruption is already beginning to wreak
15 havoc on our own country, and so this is an insane time to
16 be sending not only fossil fuels to other areas, but not
17 developing green energy and weaning ourselves and other
18 countries off fossil fuels.

19 It's an insane project. It should be opposed
20 in its entirety. It should not occur.

21 MR. KOPKA: Okay, thank you. The next
22 speaker is Laura Brakke.

23 MS. BRAKKE: My name is Laura Leigh Brakke,
24 L-A-U-R-A, L-E-I-G-H, B-R-A-K-K-E, and I will try to go
25 topic by topic, and water resources. I will echo what the
26

1 previous speaker just said. I would like the EIS to address
2 the impacts of fracking, the hazards that are created, the
3 site where the fracking occurs, the chemicals that are
4 injected into the subterranean lands to extract the natural
5 gas, and the residual chemicals that might be left that
6 effects on water resources for the people that live there.

7 We didn't talk a lot, but I'm guessing that
8 once we get to the terminus, they're going to reload it.
9 This project will be loaded on ships, okay. Big ships?
10 Yeah, capesized ships, yes. Capesized ships are so big they
11 can't fit through the Panama Canal. They carry a huge
12 amount of very dirty bumper fuel to fuel their engines, to
13 get them from China and back.

14 They generally, so we need to study the
15 effects of using single hold ships to transport large
16 amounts of natural gas, as well as their bumper fuel, what
17 could happen in the event of a grounding on a reef, bad
18 weather, capsize, loss of power anywhere along.

19 Now the shipping route, I'm guessing, is also
20 the same shipping route as the coast ships, being from BC
21 and all the West Coast shipping terminals going to China go
22 up through Unimak Pass, up around maybe not all. But
23 through the Aleutian Chain. Very narrow passageways.

24 It's getting very congested. It's also one
25 of the most dangerous weather-wise shipping areas. It's
26

1 also home to the healthiest food on the planet, wild Alaska
2 sockeye. So we need to study what happens when a Chinese
3 skipper or Portugese chipper or whoever is dragging these
4 huge boats, gets into that weather in the winter.

5 Something happens, the boat breaks apart.
6 The bumper fuel will be held in suspension, is what I
7 understand, somewhere along the top of the bottom, top of
8 the bottom, killing everything in its wake. So the risks
9 and the benefits to me are too great. You can't eat oil,
10 you can't eat natural gas.

11 So you need to look at shipping routes.
12 Also, these ships are going to be at some point in the
13 Columbia River. I'm all about bringing salmon back you can
14 see, whether it Alaska or wild Washington salmon.

15 So we need to study and have a no-action
16 alternative, if we feel that the salmon of the Columbia
17 River going to Snake River would be impacted by the
18 increased amount of giant ship traffic, a crop wash cutting
19 up juvenile salmon. You need to look at that.

20 You need to look at the ballast water. These
21 huge ships have to come into our water space width. You
22 have to look at invasive species that will be offloaded.
23 You have to look at okay, if you treat the water so invasive
24 species are killed and the dirt, what are those chemicals
25 going to do when they're introduced into our local
26

1 resources.

2 So threatened and endangered species would be
3 the sea lions, the salmon, those kind of animals that live
4 at the mouth of the river, and all the way through the
5 Bering Sea, transporting across.

6 Socioeconomics. I'm going to echo that same
7 sentiment, that when you're exporting this natural gas
8 because the Pacific Rim nations will pay more per gallon,
9 what does that do to the families in America who are hurting
10 for gas, money to pay for gas.

11 It seems, and I don't know, socioeconomics.
12 Does war come under that one? When we go to war, so that we
13 can procure energy from overseas, and we talk about wanting
14 to be energy independent, but then we are going to export it
15 because somebody can make more profit, I don't -- we need to
16 study how that affects Americans trying to pay for heating
17 oil. If we have enough, then we should become energy
18 independent.

19 Reliability and safety. I live in
20 Bellingham. I can still remember turning around at the
21 steps of the museum and seeing the mushroom cloud from the
22 pipeline explosion in July of however many years ago. So
23 how, what's going to happen when a pipeline bursts, gets
24 broken, gets dug up and the impacts to the community, life
25 and safety, that sort of thing? That's it for now. Thank
26

1 you.

2 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. That was the end of
3 our speaker list, unless we had any more? Is there anybody
4 else who would like to speak tonight? Sir.

5 MR. BROWN: Laurence Brown. A small addendum
6 to that socioeconomic comment. With regard to the shipping
7 traffic in particular, the impact of large shipping on
8 existing traffic in those waterways, primarily ferries and
9 fishing craft, commercial fishing craft, and on top of that,
10 however, throwing in a little bit of the cumulative impact,
11 what is the likelihood of adverse impact should one or more
12 of the proposed call terminals that have been proposed for
13 this entire area, also be put into place?

14 That is an enormous addition to the shipping
15 traffic that this single project proposes. So there is a
16 need to study the interplay.

17 MR. KOPKA: Yeah, we will be looking at that.

18 MR. BROWN: Okay.

19 MR. KOPKA: Is there anyone else? Just be
20 careful of the wires in front of you.

21 MS. LYNN: I will. My name is Bethany Lynn,
22 B-E-T-H-A-N-Y, L-Y-N-N, and I just want to say out loud to
23 anybody who cares that I am opposed to fracking in general.
24 So I think that anything that supports that business is
25 something I don't want to support myself.

26

1 I'm opposed to exporting our natural
2 resources, just on ethical, moral grounds, you know. So I
3 don't really care so much about the pipeline itself, the
4 pipe; I do care about the hazards of like the explosion in
5 Bellingham and those things. But I think the most important
6 thing is we need to think globally.

7 I think we need to not thinking about the
8 profit that's immediate, and think about the total picture
9 of global impact on Mother Earth, who's being fracked to
10 death.

11 MR. KOPKA: Thank you. Is there anyone else?

12 (No response.)

13 MR. KOPKA: Without any more speakers, the
14 formal part of this meeting will conclude. I will be
15 available if you have any questions. On behalf of the
16 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I would like to thank
17 you for coming tonight. Let the record show that the
18 Washington Expansion Project Scoping Meeting in
19 Sedro-Woolley concluded at 7:02 p.m.

20 (Whereupon, at 7:02 p.m., the meeting was
21 adjourned.)

22

23

24

25