

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

BRADWOOD LANDING LNG PROJECT  
FERC DOCKET NUMBERS CP06-365 and 366

PUBLIC MEETING  
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

\* \* \*

Thursday, November 8, 2007

6:30 p.m.

Hilda Lahti Elementary School

42535 Old Highway 30

Astoria, Oregon

\* \* \*

BEFORE: Mr. Paul D. Friedman  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Office of Energy Projects

\* \* \*

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

1  
2  
3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Good evening, ladies and  
4 gentlemen. My name is Paul Friedman. I am the  
5 18:37:27 project manager for the environmental review of  
6 the Bradwood Landing liquified natural gas,  
7 LNG, project for the Federal Energy Regulatory  
8 Commission. I've come here from Washington,  
9 D.C., to hold a public meeting to take comments  
10 18:37:43 from the public on our draft Environmental  
11 Impact Statement, or DEIS, which was issued  
12 recently for this project.

13 I'd like to thank you all for being here  
14 tonight. Let the record show that the meeting  
15 18:37:59 was called to order at approximately 6:36 p.m.  
16 on Thursday, November 8th. This meeting is  
17 taking place at Hilda Lahti Elementary School,  
18 42535 Old Highway 30, Astoria, Oregon 97103.

19 You may have noticed that a court reporter  
20 18:38:27 is transcribing this meeting. This is so we  
21 can have an accurate record of tonight's  
22 comments. Within a few weeks, a copy of this  
23 transcript will be placed in the public record  
24 for this proceeding and will be available  
25 18:38:38 through the Internet via the FERC's Web site.

1 18:38:42 Now, this is the sixth public meeting  
2 we've held this week, and this is the same  
3 speech I've given every night. So those of you  
4 who have been to other meetings, I apologize  
5 18:38:55 for the fact that I'm so redundant and that I  
6 say the same thing every time and that I read  
7 from a script rather than being extemporaneous.  
8 The reason for that is I want all the meetings  
9 to be held in a similar manner, and I want the  
10 18:39:10 information I provide to the public to be  
11 similar, and I want the transcript from the  
12 court reporter to be similar.

13 We want to go over a few rules of decorum  
14 before we start. We'd like everyone to show  
15 18:39:24 each other some respect. Do not interrupt or  
16 yell out from the audience, and please wait  
17 patiently for your turn to speak. I will call  
18 up speakers in the order in which they sign in,  
19 and I will limit their speeches to three  
20 18:39:41 minutes. I ask that you be civil, and although  
21 you may be enthusiastic and emotional, want to  
22 applaud or yell or boo, I ask you not to. I  
23 ask you to be neutral and give everyone the  
24 same respect.

25 18:40:00 I represent an agency known as the Federal

1 18:40:02 Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, or  
2 Commission, as it's often called, or F-E-R-C.  
3 We are an independent regulatory agency within  
4 the U.S. Department of Energy. We regulate the  
5 18:40:15 interstate transportation of electricity,  
6 hydropower, and natural gas. The Commission is  
7 directed by five Commissioners who are  
8 appointed by the President of the United States  
9 and approved by the United States Congress.  
10 18:40:28 They're the people who make decisions. I am  
11 FERC staff. All FERC staff are civil servants.  
12 On June 5th, 2006, Bradwood Landing LLC  
13 filed an application with the Federal Energy  
14 Regulatory Commission requesting permission to  
15 18:40:50 construct and operate an LNG import terminal  
16 under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, or NGA,  
17 in docket number CP06-365, and NorthernStar  
18 Energy LLC filed an application for an  
19 associated natural gas sendout pipeline under  
20 18:41:10 Section 7 of the NGA in docket number CP06-366.  
21 Hereafter, I will refer to Bradwood  
22 Landing LLC and NorthernStar Energy LLC  
23 collectively as just NorthernStar since, in  
24 reality, they are two subsidiaries of the same  
25 18:41:28 company.

1           18: 41: 32           The FERC is the lead federal agency for  
2                            this project, and we took the lead in producing  
3                            the EIS in order to comply with the National  
4                            Environmental Policy Act of 1969, often  
5           18: 41: 45           abbreviated as NEPA. Our EIS also summarizes  
6                            activities in compliance with other federal  
7                            laws, such as the Endangered Species Act, the  
8                            Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and  
9                            Management Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act,  
10          18: 42: 01       National Historic Preservation Act, Clean Water  
11                            Act, Clean Air Act, and Coastal Zone Management  
12                            Act.

13                           As part of its decision-making process,  
14                            the FERC will consider the environmental  
15          18: 42: 12       impacts on the project as disclosed in the EIS.  
16                            The production of the DEIS was a collaborative  
17                            effort involving FERC staff and our third-party  
18                            environmental contractor, which is a company  
19                            called Natural Resources Group, or NRG, and  
20          18: 42: 29       cooperating federal agencies.

21                           Let me introduce some of the people who  
22                            are here tonight who work for NRG and have  
23                            played a major role in the production of the  
24                            DEIS. Up here next to me doing the slide show  
25          18: 42: 39       is Patricia Terhaar. Patricia is the projects

1 18:42:43 manager for this project for NRG. And in the  
2 back, taking the sign-up sheets, is Janelle  
3 Rieland. Janelle is the project biologist. We  
4 consider our contractor to be an extension of  
5 18:42:56 the FERC staff.

6 The federal agencies that cooperated in  
7 production of the DEIS include the U.S. Army  
8 Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard, and  
9 the U.S. Department of Transportation. A  
10 18:43:08 cooperating agency has jurisdiction by law or  
11 special expertise related to project-specific  
12 environmental impacts, and those agencies may  
13 adopt our EIS to meet their own obligations for  
14 compliance with the NEPA.

15 18:43:23 We issued a notice of availability for the  
16 DEIS on August 17th, 2007, which gave a closing  
17 date for comments as December 24th, 2007. The  
18 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency noticed  
19 the issuance of our DEIS in the Federal  
20 18:43:39 Register on August 24th, 2007.

21 We mailed almost 1300 copies of the DEIS  
22 to various elected officials, federal, state,  
23 and local government agencies, landowners, and  
24 interested members of the public. In addition,  
25 18:43:58 copies were sent to local newspapers and local

1 18:44:01 libraries. Copies are available from the FERC  
2 through our public reference room in  
3 Washington, D.C. It may be viewed  
4 electronically on our FERC Internet Web site  
5 18:44:12 through the eLibrary link.

6 In addition, NRG has some copies. In  
7 fact, they brought some tonight. And if you  
8 want a hard copy and don't have one, you can  
9 give Janelle your name and address, and NRG  
10 18:44:26 will mail you a copy.

11 The DEIS described a proposed action that  
12 is put forward by NorthernStar. The purpose of  
13 the project is to provide a new source of  
14 natural gas to the Pacific Northwest by  
15 18:44:43 importing LNG. LNG is natural gas that has  
16 been cooled to about 260 degrees below zero  
17 Fahrenheit for shipment and storage as a  
18 liquid. It can be transported in specially  
19 designed ships across oceans from its point of  
20 18:45:01 origin.

21 This is a picture of a liquefaction plant.  
22 That's where they take the methane or natural  
23 gas and they cool it to minus 260 Fahrenheit so  
24 it becomes a liquid, and then they export it on  
25 18:45:18 a ship. So it's a liquefaction export

1 18:45:21 facility, and this one's in Alaska. So the  
2 United States is both an exporting and  
3 importing LNG nation.

4 Next slide.

5 18:45:29 This is a picture of what an LNG ship  
6 looks like.

7 Next slide.

8 In summary, the Bradwood Landing LNG  
9 project would consist of the following key  
10 18:45:40 elements: An LNG import, storage,  
11 vaporization, and sendout facility located at  
12 Bradwood Landing in Clatsop County, Oregon,  
13 about 38 miles up the Columbia River from its  
14 mouth. The terminal would include a dredged

15 18:45:53 58-acre maneuvering area adjacent to the  
16 existing Columbia River navigation channel, and  
17 a single berth capable of handling LNG ships up  
18 to 200,000 cubic meters in capacity.

19 The waterway for LNG marine traffic would  
20 18:46:10 extend from 12 nautical miles off the Oregon  
21 coast, up the Columbia River to Bradwood  
22 Landing. The upland portion of the terminal  
23 would include two full-containment LNG storage  
24 tanks with a capacity of 160,000 cubic meters

25 18:46:27 each.

1 18:46:28 A nonjurisdictional 1.5-mile-long,  
2 115-kilovolt power line to be built, owned, and  
3 maintained by PacifiCorp would extend from the  
4 existing Bonneville Power Administration system  
5 18:46:40 to the Bradwood Landing LNG terminal. The LNG  
6 terminal would have a maximum sendout capacity  
7 of 1.3 billion cubic feet of natural gas per  
8 day.

9 A 36.3-mile-long natural gas sendout  
10 18:46:54 pipeline would extend from the Bradwood Landing  
11 LNG terminal to an interconnection with the  
12 existing Williams Northwest Pipeline  
13 Corporation interstate natural gas system near  
14 Kelso, Washington. This would include 18.9  
15 18:47:08 miles of 36-inch diameter pipeline across  
16 portions of Clatsop and Columbia counties,  
17 Oregon, and 17.4 miles of 30-inch diameter  
18 pipeline in Cowlitz County, Washington.

19 Associated with the pipeline would be a  
20 18:47:24 sendout meter station located within the LNG  
21 terminal tract, four delivery meter stations  
22 and interconnections with the Georgia-Pacific  
23 Wauna mill at pipeline at milepost, or MP, 3.7,  
24 Northwest Natural's existing pipeline system at  
25 18:47:40 milepost 11.4, PGE's Beaver power plant at

1 18:47:45 milepost 18.9, and Williams Northwest at  
2 milepost 36.3.

3 There would be six main line block valves  
4 along the pipeline, pig launchers at the  
5 18:47:59 terminal meter station and at Beaver, and pig  
6 receivers at Beaver and Williams Northwest.  
7 There would be some short nonjurisdictional  
8 pipeline laterals, built, operated, and  
9 maintained by the gas customers to interconnect  
10 18:48:12 with NorthernStar's pipeline at Wauna mill,  
11 Northwest Natural, and Beaver power plant.

12 I want to clarify that the FERC is not a  
13 sponsor of this project. This project was  
14 proposed by NorthernStar. The FERC is a  
15 18:48:26 licensing and regulatory agency, and we take no  
16 position on this project until after we have  
17 completed the full review of NorthernStar's  
18 applications.

19 Before the FERC can make a decision about  
20 18:48:42 the project, there are several steps that must  
21 be completed, including public input by holding  
22 meetings like this. First we will consider  
23 comments from the public on the DEIS. Because  
24 the Commission has the responsibility to treat  
25 18:49:00 all parties to a proceeding equally, we must

1 18:49:03 make certain that our process is open and  
2 public.

3 For this reason, we are constrained by our  
4 own internal ex parte rules. This means there  
5 18:49:14 can be no off-the-record discussions or  
6 correspondence between the FERC staff and  
7 interested parties interested in the merits of  
8 this case. Therefore, I urge you to either  
9 speak tonight on the record or to send us your  
10 18:49:26 comments in writing.

11 You can use the Internet through the FERC  
12 Web page at [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov) to have access to  
13 public records in this proceeding and to post  
14 your comments. You may follow the filings in  
15 18:49:44 this proceeding through the FERC's  
16 eSubscription service. You may view all filed  
17 documents in the public record through our  
18 eLibrary link, and you may send in comments  
19 electronically via the eFiling link, or you can  
20 18:50:01 send in written comments the old-fashioned way  
21 by the U.S. mail. Written comments should be  
22 addressed to:

23 Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary.  
24 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.  
25 18:50:11 888 First Street, Northeast, room 1A.

1           18: 50: 15           Washington, D. C. 20426.

2                           Please reference docket number CP06-365

3                           and CP06-366 on your letters. Make sure you

4                           send one original and two copies of any written

5           18: 50: 30           comments submitted, label one copy for the

6                           attention of the FERC Office of Energy

7                           Projects, Division of Gas-Environment

8                           Engineering, gas branch 3, PJ-11.3. That's the

9                           mail stop for my office.

10          18: 50: 44           The FERC will address comments on the DEIS

11                           in a final EIS, or FEIS. Copies of the FEIS

12                           will be sent to all parties on our mailing

13                           list. After we have issued the FEIS, the FERC

14                           staff will analyze both the environmental

15          18: 51: 00           impacts of the proposed project and

16                           nonenvironmental issues, such as rates and

17                           markets. The FERC staff will then make

18                           recommendations about the project to the five

19                           Commissioners, who are our decision-makers. It

20          18: 51: 15           is those Commissioners who will make the final

21                           decision about whether or not to authorize this

22                           project.

23                           If the FERC decides to approve the

24                           project, the Commissioners will issue an order

25          18: 51: 27           to NorthernStar. If the Commission issues a

1 18:51:30 certificate of public convenience and necessity  
2 for the pipeline, under Section 7h of the  
3 Natural Gas Act, that certificate would convey  
4 NorthernStar the power of eminent domain for  
5 18:51:41 nonfederal and nontribal lands along the  
6 pipeline route.

7 If NorthernStar is unable to negotiate  
8 easement agreement with property owners, it may  
9 acquire its right-of-way easements through the  
10 18:51:53 local courts. We urge NorthernStar to  
11 negotiate in good faith with all landowners.

12 The LNG terminal is under a different  
13 portion of the Natural Gas Act, under Section  
14 3. Section 3 does not convey the power of  
15 18:52:06 eminent domain. Therefore, the tract of land  
16 for the LNG terminal must be acquired through  
17 negotiation only.

18 It is likely that a Commission order  
19 authorizing the project would include our  
20 18:52:18 recommended environmental conditions as  
21 outlined in the DEIS. One of the conditions in  
22 the DEIS was that NorthernStar should develop  
23 and fund a third-party environmental monitoring  
24 program to be implemented during project  
25 18:52:33 construction.

1           18: 52: 33           In addition, the FERC staff will monitor  
2                           the project through construction and  
3                           restoration, performing on-site inspections for  
4                           compliance with the environmental conditions of  
5           18: 52: 43           the FERC's order. And the U.S. Department of  
6                           Transportation would also monitor project  
7                           design and construction.

8                           Other agencies must also issue various  
9                           permits before this project could go forward to  
10          18: 52: 58          construction. The Coast Guard would issue a  
11                           letter of recommendation indicating whether or  
12                           not the waterway is suitable for LNG marine  
13                           traffic. The Corps of Engineers would issue a  
14                           permit under the Rivers and Harbors Act and  
15          18: 53: 12          Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

16                           The Washington Department of Ecology, the  
17                           Oregon Department of State Lands, and the  
18                           Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
19                           would issue federally delegated permits under  
20          18: 53: 26          Section 401. The Clean Water Act. The Oregon  
21                           Department of Environmental Quality would also  
22                           issue a federally delegated permit under the  
23                           Clean Air Act, and the Oregon Department of  
24                           Land Conservation and Development would make a  
25          18: 53: 36          determination whether or not the project is

1 18:53:38 consistent with the Coastal Zone Management  
2 Act.

3 Let me emphasize that this meeting is not  
4 a hearing on the merits of NorthernStar's  
5 18:53:47 proposal. As I said earlier, the purpose of  
6 this meeting tonight is to give you, the  
7 public, an opportunity to comment on the DEIS.  
8 While you may want to declare that you are for  
9 or against this project, those kinds of  
10 18:54:01 subjective statements are not particularly  
11 useful to the FERC staff in focusing our  
12 analyses and writing the final Environmental  
13 Impact Statement.

14 The type of comments that we do find  
15 18:54:13 constructive and useful are those that address  
16 data gaps in the DEIS or point out factual  
17 errors that need to be corrected. That's why  
18 it's called a draft. We intend to fix things  
19 that we got wrong in the final.

20 18:54:27 Like I said before, this is a meeting for  
21 you, the public, to comment on the DEIS. It is  
22 not a question-and-answer forum. Because many  
23 of your concerns are complex, the FERC staff  
24 would need to do some additional research  
25 18:54:40 before addressing those issues in the FEIS.

1 18:54:44 Therefore, I will not be able to give accurate  
2 and complete responses tonight to most of your  
3 questions. If you ask a simple question that I  
4 know the answer to, I will try to answer it,  
5 18:54:53 and I will certainly try to answer all  
6 questions having to do with administrative  
7 process or issues.

8 Before we start hearing from speakers  
9 tonight, I suggest we take a short,  
10 18:55:03 three-minute break to allow anyone who has not  
11 signed up on the speakers' list to do so. So  
12 if you haven't signed up but you wish to speak  
13 tonight, you can go back to Janelle and sign  
14 up, and we'll reconvene in about three minutes.

15 18:55:25 (Recess.)

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. We'd like to  
17 reconvene and take public comments at this  
18 time. I was told during the break that you  
19 couldn't hear me in the back. Can you hear me  
20 19:00:59 in the back? Is the sound system working? If  
21 you can hear me in the back, raise your hands.

22 Not very good. I apologize for that.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Reduce the bass,  
24 increase the treble, it might help.

25 19:01:19 MR. FRIEDMAN: It's too late because I'm

1 19:01:20 done speaking. A record of what I said will go  
2 in the public record. I understand my big rear  
3 end was blocking the slides. So we'll put the  
4 slides in the public record as well, so you can  
5 19:01:32 download it from the Internet.

6 I'm going to call people in the order in  
7 which they signed up. You only have three  
8 minutes to speak. I am a runner and I have a  
9 stopwatch on my wrist at all times. So I will  
10 19:01:44 hold you to the three minutes so we're  
11 consistent between meetings.

12 If you've spoken at previous meetings,  
13 you'll go last. We'll give you an opportunity  
14 to speak, but everyone who has not spoken will  
15 19:01:53 go first. I ask that you come up to the  
16 microphone here at the front. Hopefully, that  
17 will work better than this one. You need to  
18 tell us your name and spell your last name for  
19 the court reporter. Identify any organization  
20 19:02:06 you may represent, if you represent one. If  
21 you just represent yourself, you can say that.

22 If you are a landowner along the pipeline  
23 route, please indicate where your property is  
24 according to the mile marks. If you don't know  
25 19:02:18 where your property is by the mile marks, see

1 19:02:22 if Janelle has a copy of the DEIS -- there are  
2 mile marks in the DEIS -- or ask a  
3 representative of NorthernStar. They may know  
4 where your property is located if you don't.

5 19:02:31 The first speaker don't is John Dunzer.  
6 Also, if I mispronounce your name, please  
7 correct me.

8 MR. JOHN DUNZER: John Dunzer,  
9 D-U-N-Z-E-R.

10 19:02:48 I'm a supporter of this project, which of  
11 course you don't really care about, which is  
12 fine with me. I've been a big supporter of  
13 this project but have become disenchanted with  
14 this particular EIS. This EIS, Section

15 19:03:00 3.1.6.3, alternative vaporization technologies,  
16 I feel is totally deficient and is not accurate  
17 and for the following reasons:

18 The sources of vaporization heat that were  
19 considered in this had to do with ambient air,  
20 19:03:17 river water, electrical power, wood chips,  
21 waste heat from cogeneration, natural gas. The  
22 waste heat from cogeneration was initially  
23 selected. However, there were some problems,  
24 technical problems, so that the NorthernStar

25 19:03:29 just decided not to proceed that way, so they

1 19:03:31 selected natural gas as the method of heating  
2 up this LNG.

3 Takes about one and a half percent of the  
4 product to heat it up. We have a new law in

5 19:03:41 the state of Oregon, passed under emergency  
6 legislation August 6. It's called the Climate

7 Control Act, which requires a reduction in  
8 greenhouse gas emissions in Oregon. This, of

9 course, doesn't tell the federal government

10 19:03:55 what to do, but it should tell people like  
11 Clatsop County what to do. But telling Clatsop  
12 County what to do is very difficult for anyone.

13 But anyway, this will increase the  
14 greenhouse gas emissions by 1.5 percent -- from

15 19:04:10 natural gas by 1.5 percent, but actually since  
16 it's a regional facility will increase natural  
17 gas emissions in the state of Oregon by 5

18 percent. It's a little difficult to lower your  
19 greenhouse gas emissions when you're approving

20 19:04:26 projects that increase them by 5 percent. This  
21 is a huge generator of greenhouse gases.

22 Now, the states of California, Oregon,  
23 Washington, here in the west all care about  
24 this. There's a lot of people that care about

25 19:04:42 this. We've got people over in Stockholm that

1 19:04:44 even care about this. And there's nobody  
2 paying any attention in this EIS about  
3 greenhouse gas emissions. There are many, many  
4 alternatives to natural gas to provide this  
5 19:04:58 heat and a much better engineering solution for  
6 this particular gasification plant. This is  
7 30-year-old technology. It's tremendously  
8 inefficient.

9 Now, I know I won't please most of the  
10 19:05:10 people because I think we need this project in  
11 the United States because we need energy  
12 independence, and this is simply a way to try  
13 to save some time in the next 40 years so we  
14 can get there, and I think it's very important  
15 19:05:24 that we do this project. But we don't need to  
16 provide an inefficient, bad design to do it.

17 And so I fully support the project, and I  
18 fully don't support the EIS because the  
19 description is inadequate; it's not correct.

20 19:05:40 The information that's in there on wood chips  
21 is not accurate. NorthernStar knows it's not  
22 accurate. Everyone knows it's not accurate.  
23 All the EIS contractor did was parrot back  
24 exactly what NorthernStar gave them initially.

25 19:05:55 There are already changes in there. Nobody

1           19:05:56   wants to say what it is they're really going to  
2                           do in this project. They just want to keep on  
3                           going and pushing and pushing and pushing.

4                           This EIS is inadequate for the FERC to  
5           19:06:10   make a technical decision on. I've been  
6                           preparing federal EISs for longer than your  
7                           biologist has been alive back there, and I know  
8                           what the heck I'm talking about.

9                           MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Dunzer, wrap up,  
10          19:06:24   please.

11                          MR. JOHN DUNZER: All done.

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

14                          I would appreciate if we don't applaud,  
15          19:06:29   don't boo, just be neutral and treat everyone  
16                          the same. Thanks.

17                          Next is Debbie Twombly. And if I  
18                          mispronounce your name, please correct me.

19                          MS. DEBBIE TWOMBLY: Thank you. I am  
20          19:06:44   Debbie Twombly, T-W-O-M-B-L-Y. I live in  
21                          Brownsmead, Oregon, not far from the Columbia  
22                          River. I am a Clatsop County native. I care  
23                          deeply for this area. I am a mother, a  
24                          daughter. I have grandchildren who live close  
25          19:07:02   by, and I want this place to stay safe for

1 19:07:05 them.

2 What I want to bring to your attention  
3 today -- this may not be exactly what you're  
4 looking for, but I have an edition of National  
5 19:07:14 Geographic from February of this year, 2007,  
6 and it tells about, in an article on energy and  
7 oil edition, how in Nigeria there has been an  
8 LNG plant. And I'm not going to leave this  
9 because I need it for something else, but these  
10 19:07:28 are the exact plants that the storage tanks  
11 that are going to be in place at Bradwood, if  
12 NorthernStar has their way.

13 And the caption: Uprooted to make room  
14 for a liquified natural gas plant. People in  
15 19:07:41 the village of Finima on Bonny Island complain  
16 that the facility has damaged fishing grounds,  
17 with few jobs offered in return. A native  
18 there says, "It's not fair. We can hardly  
19 catch fish anymore. Surviving is very hard."

20 19:07:56 It goes on to state that people were  
21 forced to give up fishing. Young men of the  
22 village had put their hopes in landing a job in  
23 the facility, but offers are scarce. A quote  
24 from another native, "People from the outside  
25 19:08:11 get all the jobs."

1           19:08:12           I fear that that is exactly what we could  
2                            expect here. So not only are we losing natural  
3                            wetland habitat, but we'd also be hurting  
4                            people, hurting our economy, and really  
5           19:08:23           destroying a lot of natural resources. And  
6                            it's really not fair. Now, somebody might look  
7                            at this and they'll say, well, god, that's  
8                            Africa, that's Nigeria. Well, maybe somewhere  
9                            right now in Texas somebody is saying, That's  
10          19:08:37           the West Coast, Oregon. They're just a bunch  
11                            of hicks out there. It's a small town.

12                           And we're not. It's like that's how we're  
13                            being treated. I feel like we're being bought  
14                            off in a lot of ways. NorthernStar comes in  
15          19:08:50           and they give money to local charities, a  
16                            little trickle here and a little trickle there,  
17                            and they're not treating us fair. We're being  
18                            treated like second-class citizens, like peons,  
19                            and we don't appreciate it.

20          19:09:03           We are bright, intelligent people, and  
21                            there are local jobs. People can come back  
22                            here and get jobs that are being created as we  
23                            speak. I've lived here all my life. I feel  
24                            like I have a perfectly good job. I'm a  
25          19:09:17           third-grade teacher at Astor School, and I

1 19:09:20 would hate to think of the danger that there  
2 could be as those horrible tankers are passing  
3 by the playground where so many children are  
4 playing. And that's my statement.

5 19:09:30 Thank you very much.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

7 Next is Ned Heavenrich.

8 MR. NED HEAVENRICH: Good evening. Ned  
9 Heavenrich, and that's as in where you want to  
10 19:09:51 go and what you want to be, heaven and rich  
11 together. Saves a lot of spelling.

12 It's my privilege to work in this building  
13 right here, and I am not in favor of this  
14 project, and one of the reasons -- I have many  
15 19:10:13 reasons. One of the reasons is because of the  
16 dredging. There's a great picture here of the  
17 amount of dredging that will be done in the  
18 turning basin, 700,000 cubic yards of material,  
19 enough to fill dump trucks that would reach  
20 19:10:33 from Longview, Washington, to the  
21 Oregon-California border. That's a lot of  
22 material.

23 And when I first came to this area in  
24 1973, it was on the deck of a fishing boat.

25 19:10:47 And I'm very concerned -- I've seen the

1 19:10:51 degradation of the river over the years, the  
2 decline in the salmon. We have a lot of  
3 endangered, threatened species, and to allow  
4 another project like this is just going to  
5 19:11:02 continue on the road to further degradation of  
6 the resource that is so precious: The icon of  
7 the Pacific Northwest, the salmon. And just in  
8 30 years I've seen it go from, you know, an  
9 abundant amount of fish to a trickle.

10 19:11:23 And so I'm sure that you've looked at this  
11 on the Environmental Impact Statement, and I  
12 just want to say that to allow this to happen  
13 would be another tragedy and not healthy for  
14 the environment here in Clatsop County.

15 19:11:43 Thank you.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

17 Next is Ted Messing.

18 MR. TED MESSING: I'm Ted Messing.  
19 M-E-S-S-I-N-G. I'm 35-year resident of Clatsop  
20 19:12:10 County and a former commercial fisherman.

21 After following these proposed LNG  
22 projects for three years, during which we have  
23 attended nearly every federal, state, and  
24 county meeting, I have my doubts that anything  
25 19:12:22 I could say here today will make much

1           19: 12: 25     difference. I am sure the main purpose of this  
2                             meeting is so you can check the box that says  
3                             you held a public meeting.

4                             However, the consensus outside the bubble  
5           19: 12: 34     is that this project is a bad idea. The  
6                             Bradwood site and the head of Clifton Channel  
7                             is an incredibly sensitive area for all  
8                             Columbia River salmonids. It is the gateway to  
9                             their estuary.

10          19: 12: 49             The dredging involved will completely  
11                             destroy the natural shallow-water entrance to  
12                             the entire downstream estuary ecosystem.

13                             Changing river currents will wash away fragile  
14                             islands, all of which are part of a wildlife

15          19: 13: 04     refuge. This disruption of a natural path to  
16                             the estuary of the 13 endangered salmonid  
17                             species will be a daily occurrence. Dredging,  
18                             tugs turning massive tankers, millions of  
19                             gallons of river water sucked up for ballast

20          19: 13: 21     does not seem healthy for salmonids.

21                             The LNG industry says they can mitigate  
22                             for this destruction, but how do you mitigate  
23                             for a river that has been turned into an  
24                             industrial ditch? Mitigation is a pathetic

25          19: 13: 34     attempt to restore what we already have after



1 19:14:46 included the Web site at which the report can  
2 be read, and I also understand that it's  
3 already been submitted.

4 So I'm just asking, surprise us. Don't  
5 19:14:54 let this cancer get started in our estuary.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
8 comments.

9 I think it's Georgia Macencourt? Not  
10 19:15:23 close? Please fix it.

11 MS. GEORGIA MARINCOVICH: Not even close.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry.

13 MS. GEORGIA MARINCOVICH: It's Georgia  
14 Marincovich. M-A-R-I-N-C-O-V-I-C-H.

15 19:15:30 MR. FRIEDMAN: I apologize.

16 MS. GEORGIA MARINCOVICH: I am a landowner  
17 in Clifton. (Pause.) My husband said I'd be  
18 too emotional, but I'm going to do it anyway.

19 We're right next to Bradwood, and it's a  
20 19:15:49 fishing village, and we've fished there for a  
21 hundred years. And my fear is that they're  
22 going to build this horrible project here and  
23 they'll destroy the wetlands.

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Georgia, do you want to  
25 19:16:10 wait and come later?

1 19:16:12 MS. GEORGIA MARINCOVICH: No, I want to  
2 finish. Thank you.

3 And that these wetlands, they say they can  
4 replace them by mitigation. There is no way  
5 19:16:20 that these wetlands can be replaced. And my  
6 question is this: You have -- we have all  
7 these environmental regulating agencies, and we  
8 don't hear from any of them. You ask them  
9 about the project, and they say we cannot  
10 19:16:40 comment. Who's protecting the environment?  
11 They can't comment on something as big as this?  
12 I want to just read the agencies off.

13 Are the laws? 404 of the Clean Water Act,  
14 the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and  
15 19:17:01 Management Act, the Fish and Wildlife  
16 Conservation Act, the National Environmental  
17 Policy Act, the Rivers and Harbors  
18 Appropriation Act of 1899, the Endangered  
19 Species Act, the NOAA Fisheries Services  
20 19:17:26 Activities Related to Wetlands Policy and  
21 Guidance, the National Marine Fisheries  
22 Service, the Pacific Fisheries Management  
23 Council, the Oregon Fish and Wildlife, the  
24 Washington Department of Fish and Game.

25 19:17:46 Where are all these agencies that are

1 19:17:48 supposed to protect the fish? And also your  
2 department. You're also supposed to be  
3 protecting the environment.

4 (Applause.)

5 19:18:01 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
6 comments.

7 I do understand that this is an emotional  
8 issue. It affects people deeply, and they have  
9 very strong opinions, but I am going to ask you  
10 19:18:14 again to not applaud, not boo, just be neutral.  
11 Thanks.

12 I hope to do better pronouncing your  
13 husband's name. Jack Marincovich.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Friedman, it's  
15 19:18:31 hard to hear in the back. Is it possible to  
16 turn it up?

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't know how. If I put  
18 it closer to my face, is it better?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

20 19:18:39 MR. JACK MARINCOVICH: Mr. Chairman, my  
21 name is Jack Marincovich. I'm a commercial  
22 fisherman on the river and also representing  
23 the Columbia River Fishermen of Astoria.

24 Our organization is well over a hundred  
25 19:18:52 years old. We represent the interests of

1 19:18:55 commercial fishermen on the Columbia River.

2 There's roughly 500 commercial fishermen that  
3 participate on the Columbia River. We come  
4 from three and four generations of fishermen.

5 19:19:08 They spend most of their time on the Columbia  
6 River, so they like to believe they know what's  
7 good and what's bad for the Columbia.

8 I've been following this for the best part  
9 of three years. I went to the first open house

10 19:19:20 in Bradwood, and we talked with people there,  
11 and we've been going to meetings ever since. I  
12 testified at the mark (inaudible) deal. I

13 testified at the meeting at the Astoria High  
14 School in the first part of July, I think it

15 19:19:34 was, along with 200 other people, and I think  
16 two-thirds spoke against the project. We had  
17 good testimony, professional people.

18 But for some reason all that testimony was  
19 pushed under the table and it was -- it was --

20 19:19:51 it was discarded, wasn't even used, and that  
21 really, really turned me off on the process of  
22 public input, you know. So I've come to the  
23 conclusion that I think the project is a

24 bigger -- is a bigger task, it's a bigger deal

25 19:20:11 than our county people handle and make

1 19:20:15 decisions.

2 I just -- sorry -- elected officials,  
3 Clatsop County Commissioners, we elected them,  
4 we voted them in, but right now I think it's  
5 19:20:25 too big of a task for them to judge. I

6 think -- we've got all these federal agencies  
7 that -- I know our commercial fishing seasons,  
8 most of our seasons and regulations come down  
9 from National Marine Fisheries. They hand down  
10 19:20:40 the regulations to the states.

11 And then we have meetings, and they decide  
12 when we can work on the river and when we can't  
13 work on the river. We have Endangered Fishing  
14 Act -- Fish Species Act. There's certain fish  
15 19:20:56 we can catch, certain fish we can't catch.

16 They stop us, on our line they stop us. I'm  
17 just waiting for these agencies, these federal  
18 agencies -- we have a list of them here: Clean  
19 Water Act, Magnuson Act, Fish and Wildlife  
20 19:21:09 Conservation Act, National Environmental Policy  
21 Act, Rivers and Harbors, Endangered Species.

22 All these federal agencies that have more  
23 to say about what goes on the rivers than  
24 county commissioners or county planning  
25 19:21:25 commission. And I'm waiting for them to step

1 19:21:27 in because they're the ones that curtail our  
2 operations, and go back to Bradwood Landing.  
3 We grew up in Clifton. About a dozen families  
4 still own property.

5 19:21:41 Very few days through the year I don't  
6 drive down the county road. My dad's house is  
7 still there. We spend most of all our time  
8 there. We work there. We play there. We do  
9 fishing. We do hunting in the area. It's more  
10 19:21:54 than -- it's more than just a way of making a  
11 living through the years and our people behind  
12 us; it's a way of life.

13 And the wetlands in Bradwood Landing,  
14 we've been through them, you know, all through  
15 19:22:08 the years and --

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Jack, can you wrap it up.

17 MR. JACK MARINCOVICH: Okay. Hunt Creek  
18 runs down through wetland, and it's too  
19 valuable of a wetland, and it can't be  
20 19:22:19 mitigated downstream anyplace. If those  
21 wetlands are destroyed, they can't be replaced  
22 anyplace else.

23 So thank you for the time, and we'll catch  
24 you at the next meeting.

25 19:22:30 (Laughter.)

1 19:22:32 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
2 comments.

3 Brent Foster.

4 MR. BRENT FOSTER: Good evening. Thanks  
5 19:22:47 for the opportunity. My name is Brent Foster.  
6 I'm speaking on behalf of Columbia Riverkeeper.  
7 I'm executive director of Columbia Riverkeeper.

8 And in many ways I think that the EIS  
9 reads more like a promotional document than a  
10 19:22:59 candid assessment of what this project might  
11 actually do. I understand that the political  
12 push that has resulted in what I'd call the  
13 rush to develop LNG terminals, put strong  
14 pressure on FERC to, let's say, look more  
15 19:23:13 favorably on high-impact facilities like  
16 NorthernStar's Bradwood project, but  
17 fortunately enough, NEPA and other federal laws  
18 still apply, and this EIS simply does not meet  
19 them.

20 19:23:26 I'm going address -- we're preparing  
21 detailed comments which we'll be submitting  
22 before the deadline, but I'll just touch on two  
23 issues today, both the EIS's failures in terms  
24 of evaluating the project's effect on salmon  
25 19:23:39 and, secondarily, on people, two things that I

1 19:23:41 think are extremely important to this  
2 communi ty.

3 As a starting point, on salmon, the EIS is  
4 completely unrealistic. It essentially is  
5 19:23:51 painting a very rosy picture of what putting a  
6 major industrial port in the middle of the  
7 United States lower 48's best terrain salmon  
8 runs. It not only downplays the very speci fic  
9 effects of the LNG terminal but, frankly, is  
10 19:24:09 not comprehensive of the fact that there is an  
11 actual salmon crisis going on. Virtually  
12 ignores the biologi cal opi ni on process which  
13 has now been rejected mul ti ple times by a  
14 federal judge in which the federal government  
15 19:24:21 is an intimate player.

16 The Columbi a River estuary, in those  
17 discussions, which have resul ted from  
18 litigation over the operation of the Columbi a  
19 River main stem, is speci fi cally focused from  
20 19:24:32 the federal government, of which you're a part,  
21 on banki ng basi cally the future of Columbi a  
22 River salmon largel y on the success of the  
23 Columbi a Ri ver estuary.

24 This EIS completel y ignores, I thi nk, the  
25 19:24:46 importance, how this is going in a very

1           19:24:49    direction than another arm of the federal  
2                            agency, which I get to hear in court on a  
3                            regular basis, talking about how the estuary  
4                            and improvements here are going to be the  
5           19:24:57    solutions to the Columbia's hydropower system.

6                            Specifically, the EIS grossly downplays  
7                            the effects of several billion, not million,  
8                            gallons of ballast water withdrawal thanks to  
9                            the unproven, never tested, never even built,  
10          19:25:13    let alone prototyped or proven methods of  
11                            putting ballast water in ships using fish  
12                            screens. The EIS is optimistic, but blindly  
13                            so.

14                            It unreasonably assumes that mitigation  
15          19:25:27    measures are going to work. It ignores the  
16                            fact that central components of NorthernStar's  
17                            mitigation, like the Svensen Island purchase,  
18                            are essentially little more than a sham.

19                            Svensen Island was about to be purchased by  
20          19:25:41    Columbia Land Trust, although this is ignored  
21                            by the EIS, and prior to the finalization of  
22                            the purchase, NorthernStar came in, offered a  
23                            higher price; next thing you know, it's  
24                            mitigation.

25          19:25:52            It was going to be already bought and

1 19:25:54 purchased. It's completely inappropriate to  
2 consider as mitigation since essentially this  
3 is the project, and NorthernStar is the company  
4 which stored it as conservation benefit.

5 19:26:04 Impacts on salmon stranding are also just cast  
6 aside.

7 I want to address quickly three points on  
8 people. We are going to echo Dr. Havens'  
9 testimony in regard to FERC's use of the  
10 19:26:19 incorrect model. In evaluating, it's very  
11 important you portray a clear picture of what a  
12 tanker breach of a tanker passing Astoria in  
13 Puget Island would actually mean in terms of  
14 lost lives, in terms of damaged structures and  
15 19:26:33 economic damage to infrastructure.

16 Relying on Sandia's estimate no longer  
17 makes sense because the GAO clearly says Sandia  
18 likely underestimates the actual effect of a  
19 cascading failure due to one rupture in one  
20 19:26:49 tank, you're likely to lose -- or at least  
21 there's good reason to believe you'd lose the  
22 whole tanker. With that I'll wrap up my  
23 comments and look forward to submitting them in  
24 the final.

25 19:26:59 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

1 19:26:59 Next speaker is Jerry Havens.

2 DR. JERRY HAVENS: Thank you for  
3 permitting me to comment at this meeting. I'm  
4 appearing as a scientist and as a concerned  
5 19:27:18 citizen to inform you of potential problems in  
6 FERC's approval of vapor cloud exclusion zones  
7 prepared for the Bradwood Landing DEIS.

8 Recent events indicate to me that FERC's  
9 compliance with the Congressional mandate to  
10 19:27:35 consider remote siting of LNG terminals in  
11 order to protect public safety is being based  
12 largely on exclusion, or safety, zones required  
13 by the U.S. Department of Transportation  
14 regulation 49 CFR 193. As a result, the  
15 19:27:51 establishment of such exclusion zones, which  
16 are mandated for land-based facilities only,  
17 has become the key method by which the  
18 sufficiently remote siting is insured. I  
19 believe that such methods as are presently  
20 19:28:05 applied do not and cannot insure the public  
21 safety as intended.

22 In the limited time available, I'll  
23 comment only on the vapor cloud exclusion zone  
24 determination.

25 19:28:17 Presently, only two modeling methods are

1 19:28:19 approved for determining vapor cloud exclusion  
2 zones. The DEGADIS model, of which I am a  
3 co-author, was developed with the support of  
4 the U.S. Coast Guard and the Gas Research  
5 19:28:30 Institute. Approved for use in the federal  
6 regulation in the early '90s, DEGADIS does not  
7 account for any holdup of LNG vapor by dikes or  
8 other obstructions.

9 Because of the need for models which can  
10 19:28:45 account for such complicated effects, the FEM3A  
11 model was developed as a result of a  
12 ten-year-long research effort supported by the  
13 Gas Research Institute and a consortium of  
14 international LNG interests, for which I was  
15 19:28:58 the principal investigator. FEM3A, approved in  
16 the year 2000, is clearly specified in 49 CFR  
17 193 as the model that must be used if vapor  
18 cloud holdup by impoundment is to be taken into  
19 account.

20 19:29:17 Here, the Bradwood Landing applicant  
21 attempts to take the vapor holdup effect of the  
22 impoundment into account without using the only  
23 permissible method, FEM3A, for doing so.  
24 Instead it uses DEGADIS coupled with an absurd  
25 19:29:38 assumption that the LNG vapor evolved from a

1 19:29:40 spill would accumulate in the impoundment  
2 without mixing with air. In effect, the  
3 applicant assumes that zero LNG vapor would be  
4 released from the impoundment during the first  
5 19:29:51 several critical minutes after a spill, when  
6 the rate of vapor generation is the greatest.

7 This assumption has the effect of  
8 substantially reducing the calculation of the  
9 size of the vapor exclusion zone. Most  
10 19:30:03 importantly, the assumption has been proven to  
11 be wrong. Experiments have conclusively shown  
12 that the LNG vapor does not simply remain  
13 unmixed and unwarmed until it fills up and  
14 overflows the impoundment.

15 19:30:18 However, that absurd and demonstrably  
16 wrong assumption is the basis for the  
17 calculation of the vapor exclusion zone in this  
18 case. To be reasonable, this must be redone  
19 either using negatives without attempting to  
20 19:30:31 take the effect of the vapor holdup, or by  
21 using FEM3A.

22 I believe that the vapor cloud exclusion  
23 zones determined in the DEIS fail to provide  
24 for public safety as intended by 49 CFR 193 in  
25 19:30:46 two other ways, briefly:

1           19: 30: 48           The design spill used by the applicant  
2                            here has been arbitrarily specified as the  
3                            breakage of a six-inch line on the cargo  
4                            unloading line for the facility, with a  
5           19: 31: 00           ten-minute duration spill of 140,000 gallons,  
6                            while the impoundment volume into which the  
7                            spill would occur has been sized to account for  
8                            530,000-gallon spill.

9                            My review of 11 other environmental impact  
10          19: 31: 16       statements shows DEIS approval for design spill  
11                            from the ship unloading line ranging from  
12                            29,000 gallons to 810,000 gallons. I do not  
13                            understand how FERC can approve such a large  
14                            variation in the design spill which determines  
15          19: 31: 36       the extent of the exclusion zone. After all,  
16                            the ship unloading lines, as well as the  
17                            arrangement of the smaller lines serving the  
18                            unloading line, are all based on similar  
19                            technology.

20          19: 31: 48       Since the vapor cloud's own determinations  
21                            are directly related to the size of the spill,  
22                            it could have the appearance of simply  
23                            determining the size of the spill that the  
24                            property distance allows.

25          19: 32: 01           MR. FRIEDMAN: Dr. Havens, please wrap it

1 19:32:04 up, and we need to see it in writing because  
2 it's a complex issue.

3 DR. JERRY HAVENS: The determination of  
4 the vapor cloud exclusion zone has been made  
5 19:32:10 assuming a wind speed of two meters per second.  
6 This assumption is not conservative, although  
7 it's allowed by 49 CFR 193. Models and  
8 experiments indicate that the worst case is at  
9 a higher wind speed. In this regard, I point  
10 19:32:25 out in closing the fire radiation exclusion  
11 zone is required to be determined by FERC, and  
12 Bradwood Landing appears to have done so for  
13 the wind speed that maximizes the exclusion  
14 zone. The same reasoning is applicable to the  
15 19:32:41 termination of the vapor cloud exclusion zone.

16 Thank you.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
18 comments.

19 (Applause.)

20 19:32:47 MR. FRIEDMAN: I expect if you have more  
21 detailed comments, that you'll send us another  
22 letter, much more detailed.

23 DR. JERRY HAVENS: I'm sorry?

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: If you have more detailed  
25 19:32:55 comments, you can send those in as well.

1 19: 32: 58 DR. JERRY HAVENS: I'm done.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Carolyn Eady.

3 MS. CAROLYN EADY: My name is Carolyn  
4 Eady, E-A-D-Y.

5 19: 33: 14 I'm opposed to the Bradwood Landing, and  
6 my comments regarding the DEIS are as follows:  
7 First, omissions. You have a table there,  
8 that's actually a map, figure 4.7.1-1, page  
9 4-276: Sensitive resources along the waterway.

10 19: 33: 33 It omits Station Camp and Dismal Nitch and part  
11 of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Park;  
12 the Astoria bridge connecting Oregon and  
13 Washington; Clatsop County parks on or near the  
14 Columbia River, including the John Day boat

15 19: 33: 50 ramp, a very popular one, the Westport boat  
16 ramp, and the Big Creek Park; the Oregon  
17 Department of Forestry campground and trail at  
18 Gnat Creek; the City of Warrenton trails along  
19 the Columbia River; the City of Astoria river

20 19: 34: 04 wal k.

21 In addition, it omits the frequency of  
22 floods in northwest Oregon. There have been  
23 five over the past 150 years. They usually  
24 close the Columbia River and have freighters

25 19: 34: 16 lined up all along the waterfront. It should

1 19:34:20 also be noted that ODF reported the flood of  
2 '96 -- 1996 caused thousands of shallow,  
3 rapidly moving landscapes.

4 You omit the frequency in which the Coast

5 19:34:32 Guard closes the bar at the mouth of the  
6 Columbia River due to extreme weather. You  
7 omit the fact that the URS geological hazard  
8 report -- they mention, in fact, in the DEIS,  
9 we should feel okay about the pipeline because  
10 19:34:51 California has not had a major failure in the  
11 last 60 years.

12 The URS report mentions specifically that  
13 the only failure was in Alaska during their 9.2  
14 earthquake. I think that's a significant  
15 19:35:08 omission in the DEIS. A level-nine earthquake  
16 is 30 times stronger than a level seven, and  
17 they had not experienced a level nine in  
18 California during those years.

19 There's a statement -- this is more in the  
20 19:35:27 case of an error: An earthquake associated  
21 with a portion of the Cascadian subduction zone  
22 in northwest Oregon and southwestern Washington  
23 has not occurred in historic time, page 4-11.

24 I'm baffled by that statement. We can  
25 19:35:44 give you the exact dates going back thousands

1 19:35:47 of years, including the last one, January 26,  
2 1700. We are 307 years into a 300- to 500-year  
3 range of having major earthquakes. A local  
4 geologist estimates our risk of such an  
5 19:36:08 earthquake at 15 to 20 percent. I cannot  
6 understand -- and I'll give you these  
7 comments -- how they came up with the figures  
8 they did.

9 This is not an academic exercise for  
10 19:36:22 people who live here. This research that's  
11 developed over the last 20 years has changed  
12 everything, including building codes,  
13 education, signage, escape routes, you name it.  
14 The final comment --

15 19:36:37 MR. FRIEDMAN: Please wrap it up.

16 MS. CAROLYN EADY: I'll wrap it up. The  
17 hazards associated with the pipeline, they  
18 identify them, but they never looked at the  
19 compounding effect that a major earthquake  
20 19:36:48 would have on an area that is already hazardous  
21 and subject to landslides and faults.

22 Thank you.

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

25 19:37:01 Next is Joseph -- and correct me if I

1 19:37:05 mispronounce it -- Boehm.

2 MR. ROBERT BOEHM: I think you're talking  
3 Bob Boehm. That's all right.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Please correct  
5 19:37:19 me.

6 MR. ROBERT BOEHM: My name is Bob Boehm,  
7 spelled B-O-E-H-M. I live approximately a mile  
8 and a half from Clifton, and I'd like to  
9 address the security problems at the site  
10 19:37:32 itself.

11 I may not be a terrorist, but I am a  
12 hunter, and unless they plan on defoliating a  
13 thousand yards around the whole perimeter of  
14 that area, any terrorist could sit up in the  
15 19:37:46 woods and lob bombs in that area all day long.  
16 It is one of the worst places to have an LNG  
17 terminal, just because the location. There are  
18 hills surrounding the east side and the west  
19 side, and it's -- and it's very heavily wooded,  
20 19:38:05 and anyone could sit up there and just raise  
21 havoc with it.

22 And the second problem I have with the  
23 project is that I've lived in Clifton probably  
24 approximately 40 years, and I have seen the  
25 19:38:21 amount of rain that we have in the area, and

1           19: 38: 27    you could say that coming down Clifton Road in  
2                            the middle of wintertime is at times horri fic.  
3                            And all the little tributaries that run into  
4                            Hunt Creek, a lot of times we have so much  
5           19: 38: 39    rain, it overfills the culverts and it spills  
6                            right across the road.

7                            And if there was ever a spill -- and when  
8                            I read, there's going to be approximately at  
9                            times a thousand trips a day up and down that  
10          19: 38: 52    Clifton Road for this LNG terminal. And if  
11                            there is a spill, and odds are there probably  
12                            will be, and if it happens in the winter, there  
13                            is no way that there will be any type of  
14                            emergency vehicles to get to that spill,  
15          19: 39: 08    because it will run right into Hunt Creek and  
16                            right into the estuary, and then you'll have a  
17                            problem, a real big problem.

18                            And I don't think any of this has been  
19                            addressed. It's really nice to see it in the  
20          19: 39: 22    summertime when there's no rain, but in the  
21                            wintertime, when we have snow and everything  
22                            else, and they'll be working, what, 24/7, and  
23                            there will be problems. And then what?

24                            And really the only reason, in my opinion,  
25          19: 39: 37    that it is put in that area is because they

1 19:39:41 figure it was out of sight, out of mind, and  
2 what would happen would happen. And the people  
3 that live on Puget Island and in Brownsmead and  
4 Clifton, we're kind of disposable, and that's  
5 19:39:53 the way I feel about it.

6 And also one other thing. I feel really,  
7 to be quite candid with you people, this is  
8 nothing but a big facade, and it's been kind of  
9 shoved down our throat. They throw a little  
10 19:40:06 money around, and you people -- I don't know  
11 you, but this is the way I see it. People go  
12 like that with their hands (indicating) and  
13 it's a done deal. And I -- and I don't know if  
14 it's a done deal, but a lot of people tell me  
15 19:40:19 it's a done deal.

16 That's all I have to say.

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
18 comments.

19 Next is Cheryl Johnson.

20 19:40:39 MS. CHERYL JOHNSON: Cheryl Johnson,  
21 Astoria, Oregon.

22 What changes are necessary to allow a  
23 private company access to the Columbia River  
24 for the purpose of making a profit for its  
25 19:40:48 shareholders? In examining the DEIS, a number

1       19: 40: 50   of disturbing questions emerged. The WSR  
2                    recommends facilities and infrastructure to  
3                    make the waterway suitable for LNG marine  
4                    traffic. These are listed on page 4-432.  
5       19: 41: 03   Among them, quote: Augmentation of shoreside  
6                    firefighting capabilities to provide protection  
7                    services to the facility as well as the  
8                    communities along the transit route and, quote,  
9                    shoreline patrols.  
10      19: 41: 18            Continuing on page 4-433, the DEIS refers  
11                    to additional measures that may include, quote:  
12                    Security boardings, surveillance and  
13                    monitoring, patrols, vessel escort and  
14                    additional security measures. The DEIS makes  
15      19: 41: 31   repeated reference to such facilities and  
16                    infrastructure. Here comes the problem.  
17                    Quote: Because any unauthorized disclosure of  
18                    the details of these measures could be employed  
19                    to circumvent proposed security measures, it is  
20      19: 41: 46   not releasable to the public, page 4-433.  
21                    Problem number one: We, the communities  
22                    that will be directly affected, cannot know  
23                    what safety and security measures will be  
24                    required. The plan is secret.  
25      19: 41: 59            On page 5-17 the EIS references another

1 19:42:03 problem, costs of these requirements. Quote:  
2 An issue that has developed for several LNG  
3 terminal projects, including Bradwood Landing  
4 project, is a concern that local communities  
5 19:42:14 would have to bear some of the costs of  
6 insuring the security emergency management of  
7 the LNG facility and the LNG vessel while in  
8 transit and unloading at the dock.

9 Here comes the problem. Quote: The  
10 19:42:28 specific security emergency management costs  
11 for the proposed project are not yet available.  
12 Page 5-17. Problem number two: Nobody knows  
13 what these safety and security measures are  
14 going to cost.

15 19:42:42 And now we come to the heart of this  
16 issue, who will pay. On page 4-436, quote:  
17 The ERP shall include a cost-sharing plan that  
18 contains the description of any direct cost  
19 reimbursements NorthernStar agrees to provide  
20 19:43:01 to any state and local agencies with  
21 responsibility for security and safety.

22 Problem number three: What if  
23 NorthernStar agrees to pay 10 or 20 percent of  
24 the safety and security costs required in our  
25 19:43:16 communities so that their ships can travel the

1 19:43:19 Columbi a Ri ver three times a week? Who pays  
2 the remaini ng 80 or 90 percent?

3 In conclusion, in the al ternative secti on,  
4 5.1.02, the only al ternatives considered by  
5 19:43:33 FERC were those along the coast of Washi ngton  
6 and Oregon. Since the maj ori ty of the gas is  
7 clearly headed for Cali forni a, all Cali forni a  
8 sites must be considered.

9 Currently NorthernStar has a proposal for  
10 19:43:46 an offshore site in Northern Cali forni a.  
11 Wouldn' t it make more sense to keep 80 percent  
12 of the gas in Cali forni a and send 20 percent to  
13 the Paci fic Northwest than the current plan to  
14 trash the Columbi a Ri ver, endanger the ci ti zens  
15 19:44:02 of Washi ngton and Oregon, whi le usi ng hundreds  
16 of mi les of pi peli ne to send 80 percent to  
17 Cali forni a?

18 FERC shoul d i nclude consi derati on of all  
19 proposed termi nals i n Cali forni a before aski ng  
20 19:44:15 our communi ties to assume these i ncredi ble  
21 burdens for the profi t of an i ndi vi dual company  
22 servi ng the energy needs of Cali forni a.

23 Thank you.

24 (Appl ause.)

25 19:44:26 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your

1 19: 44: 27 comments.

2 Next is James Kodama.

3 MR. JAMES KODAMA: James Kodama, 1015

4 Ellen Street, Kelso, Washington.

5 19: 44: 46 MR. FRIEDMAN: Spell your last name for  
6 the court reporter, please.

7 MR. JAMES KODAMA: Kodama, K-O-D-A-M-A.

8 I read in the paper today that we'd hear  
9 from Jerry Havens on the subject of LNG, so I

10 19: 44: 55 spent a few moments on the Internet, and here's  
11 what I found: To believe Mr. Havens' claim

12 that he is not an LNG proponent or opponent is

13 to ignore the obvious. He is simply a hired

14 gun brought in by the project proponents to

15 19: 45: 13 scare the bejeebies out of people who aren't

16 familiar with the details of the project, the

17 safety record of the industry, or the science

18 behind LNG.

19 Mr. Havens would have us believing our

20 19: 45: 26 lives in fear, that there is a terrorist hiding  
21 behind every tree and bush in the Pacific

22 Northwest, just waiting for a chance to get us.

23 The U. S. Coast Guard is aware of the risk  
24 of the proposed LNG carriers from terrorists as

25 19: 45: 44 well as the construction of LNG carriers. The

1 19:45:47 measures identified by the Coast Guard are  
2 designed to harden the target and make it  
3 difficult for a terrorist to damage an LNG  
4 carrier.

5 19:45:58 In '04, Sandia National Laboratories  
6 published guidance on risk analysis and safety  
7 implications of a large liquefied natural gas,  
8 LNG, spillover water. The 167-page report has  
9 been widely accepted as accurately representing  
10 19:46:17 the risk of the LNG spillover water. The  
11 report discusses the issues relating to massive  
12 spills into the water, and it also discusses  
13 the probability of such an event, rather than  
14 use the Sandia Lab's guidance to analyze their  
15 19:46:35 project.

16 The probability of an actual release of  
17 LNG is extremely unlikely. In fact, it's close  
18 to zero. On the Columbia River, LNGs carry --  
19 carriers will be attached to -- tugboats which  
20 19:46:50 travel at 12 knots or less. The bottom of the  
21 river is mostly sand. Given these factors and  
22 the excellent safety records of the pilots, it  
23 is extremely unlikely that an LNG carrier would  
24 suffer an accident which could reach the cargo  
25 19:47:06 tanks. In fact, to date, there has never been

1 19:47:10 a significant spill of LNG from any LNG  
2 carrier.

3 It turns out that Mr. Havens has testified  
4 against the LNG projects across the country.

5 19:47:21 He has -- was recruited by the mayor of Fall  
6 River, Massachusetts, to oppose the Weavers  
7 Cove LNG. He has filed testimony against Sound  
8 Energy Solutions in Long Beach, California.

9 And for some people here today, Mr. Havens  
10 19:47:40 should be a familiar face. In '05 an  
11 environmental group opposed Bradwood Landing  
12 brought Mr. Havens to Astoria to deliver his  
13 fear-mongering stump speech. So I have to  
14 wonder, Mr. Havens, who is paying for you to be  
15 19:47:56 here tonight? I challenge you to tell us.

16 Despite his testimony, since Mr. Havens  
17 made his concerns known to the Secretary of  
18 Homeland Security in February of '04, FERC has  
19 issued 14 separate final Environmental Impact  
20 19:48:14 Statements related to the LNG facilities. I've  
21 included this list in my written testimony.

22 Finally, most telling, was a rebuttal I  
23 came across on the Weavers Cove project, and I  
24 quote: Finally and perhaps most importantly,  
25 19:48:32 Dr. Havens is not an expert on the safety and

1 19:48:37 security of LNG vessels or the security of LNG  
2 terminal facilities. He has no identifiable  
3 experience whatsoever in analyzing terrorism  
4 events, their effects, their probabilities, or  
5 19:48:56 the potential to mitigate such threats.

6 MR. FRIEDMAN: James, can you --

7 MR. JAMES KODAMA: In summary, based on  
8 these flaws, Dr. Havens' modeling and criticism  
9 based on modeling are erroneous, unreliable,  
10 19:49:11 and add nothing though this record. His  
11 opinions, which voiced to the Commissioner or  
12 Congress are just that, opinions, but opinions  
13 nevertheless, unsupported by the scientific or  
14 technology -- technical analysis.

15 19:49:31 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
16 comments.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I make a point  
18 of order, sir?

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: No. You'll have to wait  
20 19:49:35 for your turn to speak, sir.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I met this  
22 gentleman at their office. Can you just  
23 clarify whether you're on their payroll or not.  
24 I met him their office.

25 19:49:46 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ex parte, huh?

1 19:49:49 MR. FRIEDMAN: Next is Lori Durheim.

2 Let's be quiet, let the next speakers  
3 speak, please.

4 MS. LORI DURHEIM: I'm Lori Durheim,  
5 19:50:00 D-U-R-H-E-I-M, from Astoria. And I've been  
6 fighting this for three years since Cal Pine  
7 slithered into town. You know what happened to  
8 Cal Pine.

9 I will address three areas of many  
10 19:50:18 concerns. First, in the DEIS, FERC recommends  
11 that NorthernStar develop an emergency response  
12 plan with a cost-savings plan -- cost-sharing  
13 plan to reimburse the local providers of these  
14 services. Since the local fire, law  
15 19:50:38 enforcement, and rescue departments are  
16 understaffed with inadequate equipment and  
17 funds, I question this. The money is scarce,  
18 and how are they going to do the cost-sharing?

19 Second, in the DEIS, page ES-5, FERC in  
20 19:50:59 part says: We have recommended that  
21 NorthernStar defer construction until surveys  
22 are completed. This sounds like it's already  
23 been a fast track to approval. NorthernStar is  
24 in like flint.

25 19:51:19 Third, the noise during construction, as

1 19:51:22 stated on page ES-5, could occur up to 24 hours  
2 per day, seven days a week, for approximately  
3 two months. What was not mentioned was the  
4 light pollution during construction and also  
5 19:51:37 when the plant is up and running. Why should  
6 the families on Puget Island and on the Oregon  
7 side be subjected to this? This project is not  
8 wanted and not needed.

9 Thank you.

10 19:51:51 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
11 comments.

12 Next is Erie Johnson.

13 MR. ERIE JOHNSON: My name's Erie Johnson.  
14 Last name is Johnson, S-O-N. Thank you for the  
15 19:52:21 opportunity to make a statement. My wife and I  
16 reside in Astoria, and we moved to this  
17 location from the state of Alaska. And one of  
18 the things that we enjoy about this area is  
19 that there are some -- a number of  
20 19:52:39 environmental similarities: Water, green,  
21 ocean, all those kinds of things that most of  
22 the people that speak here at these events  
23 appreciate.

24 I was pleased to see that you had a  
25 19:52:56 picture of the LNG export plant from Alaska. I

1       19:53:00    can tell you that I support this project at  
2                    Bradwood, and I also supported that project.  
3                    So I'm confident that we have elected  
4                    officials, government agencies that will see  
5       19:53:14    that this project's done correctly and will  
6                    hold the company to the -- to what the rules of  
7                    environmental impact statement and other kinds  
8                    of licensing requirements require for a  
9                    successful project.

10       19:53:32            I've been, as I said, in Alaska. I've  
11                    worked in several western states with other  
12                    kinds of industrial developments, mining and  
13                    other things like that, and it's been my  
14                    experience, while I'm not a scientist and don't  
15       19:53:45    propose to be one, that -- that these agencies  
16                    do hold these companies accountable and, thus,  
17                    the projects are -- are not completely without  
18                    fault, but for the most part they have been  
19                    positive influences on the communities where  
20       19:54:03    they've located.

21                    Some things that I like about the  
22                    environment is the water and the wetlands and  
23                    those kinds of things, and I was pleased to  
24                    hear and see that the company, in its plans,  
25       19:54:16    does have mitigation activities that will

1 19:54:19 provide for additional wetland and habitat that  
2 might be disturbed with the project.

3 You asked if people owned property along  
4 the route. I would say that there are a number  
5 19:54:38 of people that live here that would like to own  
6 property, but because of the types of  
7 employment opportunities we have, there's not a  
8 lot of young people that are going to be able  
9 to have that opportunity. Projects such as  
10 19:54:54 this one and others that I've seen provide jobs  
11 that will allow people to make family wages and  
12 thus be able to become landowners.

13 Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
15 19:55:05 comments.

16 Becky -- Becky Read.

17 MS. BECKY READ: Becky Read, R-E-A-D,  
18 (inaudible), Oregon.

19 Three quick comments. Number one, the  
20 19:55:29 relationships are being built with public  
21 safety agencies in the region. I serve the  
22 tricounty area, region one, as a work force  
23 development officer, and of course that is my  
24 emphasis. I am pro business, and I know  
25 19:55:51 that -- I mirror some of the comments that the

1 19:55:55 previous speaker, Eric Johnson says, that we  
2 really do need this. This is a component of  
3 job growth and economic viability.

4 Number two, we have need for natural gas  
5 19:56:13 as our region grows. And the last -- and  
6 lastly, this is going to have a positive  
7 economic impact on our region that, as we are  
8 becoming business-friendly, more  
9 business-friendly, people are looking at  
10 19:56:31 Astoria; that we have an opportunity to make  
11 something of ourselves with this economic  
12 opportunity.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
15 19:56:40 comments.

16 Richard Parker.

17 MR. RICHARD PARKER: My name's Richard  
18 Parker. P-A-R-K-E-R. And I'm here  
19 representing myself and my wife. We are  
20 19:56:58 residents of Astoria, have been for the last  
21 five years.

22 I want to comment just on a couple of  
23 items concerning restoration and mitigation  
24 being done to accomplish that. NorthernStar  
25 19:57:17 has proposed a very robust mitigation plan,

1 19:57:21 including restoration programs at Hunt Creek,  
2 Svensen Island, and Kalama Creek. They're  
3 doing this in order to create or to enhance  
4 wetland habitats as compensation for wetlands  
5 19:57:35 and habitats impacted by its project.

6 Now, NorthernStar would also implement  
7 various mitigation plans to compensate for  
8 impacts on water bodies, wetlands, vegetation,  
9 and habitats. NorthernStar natural gas will go  
10 19:57:51 well beyond, I'm confident of this, what is  
11 required for mitigation, and that is why I  
12 support Bradwood Landing and this project.

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

15 19:58:15 Jean Dominey.

16 MS. JEAN DOMINEY: My name is Jean  
17 Dominey. D-O-M-I-N-E-Y. I live in Astoria. I  
18 have a small letter and an attachment to  
19 submit.

20 19:58:42 You wanted things directed specifically to  
21 this draft Environmental Impact Statement. I  
22 find in reading it that many of the problems  
23 that are identified, the solutions, however,  
24 are followed very frequently, such as, "there  
25 19:59:00 will be mitigation in part."

1           19:59:07           This project is a direct threat to the  
2                           restoration of salmon along the entire Columbia  
3                           River basin, into British Columbia, Canada.  
4                           Our government has spent billions of dollars on  
5           19:59:20           salmon restoration. I was going to specify the  
6                           number in here, but I think all of you know it.  
7                           The gouging out of the 47 acres we have  
8                           heard of -- in here I believe it says 52 of  
9                           sediment -- in Clifton Channel will destroy  
10          19:59:43          habitat and organisms in the salmon food chain  
11                           as well as the small salmon themselves.  
12                           I looked for the section on entrainment  
13                           and impingement. These will destroy not only  
14                           what I mentioned, but in some cases even the  
15          19:59:59          larger fish which can suffocate. I was in  
16                           contact today with the National Marine  
17                           Fisheries. They tell me that NorthernStar has  
18                           yet to specify what type of screening will be  
19                           employed. No matter how small this might get  
20          20:00:19          to be, there still be organisms of the food  
21                           chain that will pass through, will be contained  
22                           in the ships, will be carried out, and then  
23                           when the water is exchanged in the ocean, as is  
24                           very common, the freshwater organisms will die.  
25          20:00:39          Therefore, the NorthernStar project is a great

1       20:00:44   collection point for organisms to eradicate  
2                   from our environment.

3                   Maintaining the turning basin will result  
4                   in continued silt disturbance, which in here

5       20:01:00   they call silt turbidity, and I must say that  
6                   the salmon don't limit themselves to 20 feet of  
7                   water. We will also have, from maintaining the  
8                   turning basin, increased velocity of channel  
9                   flow, which in turn results in more shoreline  
10       20:01:21   erosion and more destruction of wetlands than  
11                   has previously been admitted by the applicant.  
12                   It is not limited just to the section shown  
13                   here.

14                   I mention that the screen has not been  
15       20:01:38   addressed, nor has the problem of the waves,  
16                   stranding of displaced fish. There has been  
17                   absolutely no study of the amount of displaced  
18                   fish with wave standing -- stranding by these  
19                   megalith ships.

20       20:02:04       I would state unequivocally --

21                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Wrap up, please.

22                   MS. JEAN DOMINEY: -- that this project is  
23                   in direct violation of goal 16 of the state of  
24                   Oregon. I am attaching a letter to this letter

25       20:02:17   I'm submitting to you that enumerates some of

1           20:02:19    the salmon species listed on the ferry landing  
2                           that's two miles upriver from the Bradwood  
3                           project site. I do not take this threat to the  
4                           salmon or the thousands of jobs, all the way up  
5           20:02:39    to British Columbia that are threatened by this  
6                           project. Thank you.

7                           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
8                           comments. Put them right here. Thank you.

9                           MS. JEAN DOMINEY: Thank you very much.

10          20:02:53       MR. FRIEDMAN: Please correct me if I  
11                           mispronounce your name. Elizabeth Mannarino.

12                           MS. ELIZABETH MANNARINO: Elizabeth  
13                           Mannarino.

14                           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for correcting  
15          20:03:04    me.

16                           SPEAKER: Elizabeth Mannarino. I'm an  
17                           Astoria resident.

18                           MR. FRIEDMAN: Spell your last name.

19                           SPEAKER:

20          20:03:14       MS. ELIZABETH MANNARINO: Oh.  
21                           M-A-N-N-A-R-I-N-O. I'm an Astoria resident,  
22                           and I have a number of concerns about this  
23                           Bradwood Landing project and other LNG projects  
24                           along the Columbia River that I don't feel have  
25          20:03:36       been adequately addressed.

1           20:03:40           One of the issues which has been addressed  
2                           on the side of problems are dredging and  
3                           habitat degradation for salmon. I don't think  
4                           the solutions have been adequately addressed.

5           20:03:57           I feel that this project is not compatible with  
6                           the livelihoods of many people in this area.  
7                           While there will be some jobs by the project,  
8                           there are many jobs now in fishing and in  
9                           tourism and recreational boating which would be  
10          20:04:18          impacted by the passage of these tankers.

11                          The public information on what has to be  
12                          done for exclusion zones has been quite vague,  
13                          and for those who know the Columbia River bar,  
14                          for smaller boats, fishing boats, recreational  
15          20:04:43          boats, it's very important to pass at the  
16                          proper time and tide. If you don't, it's  
17                          extremely dangerous.

18                          Now, if a tanker holds up recreational  
19                          fishing -- and the recreational fishing season  
20          20:04:59          at times are often quite short and the  
21                          commercial are also quite short -- this could  
22                          negatively impact the tourism and would also  
23                          impact the safety and livelihood of the  
24                          fishermen and women.

25          20:05:15          My other concerns are livelihood of people

1       20:05:20    here who depend upon tourism, who depend upon  
2                    people coming to this area because it is  
3                    beautiful and attractive and a lovely place to  
4                    live. The sheer size of the tanks and the  
5       20:05:38    project do not at all fit with small and medium  
6                    sized industrial development. They don't fit  
7                    with the marine- and aquatic-related industries  
8                    which are supposed to be fostered.

9                    The safety is a real concern for me.

10       20:06:04   There are -- there may not have been a large  
11                    LNG accident; that doesn't mean there won't be  
12                    one. Chernobyl is something -- we were told  
13                    nuclear power was safe. Well, sometimes it  
14                    isn't. Three Mile Island; sometimes it isn't.

15       20:06:24   So it's likely that at some time an accident  
16                    will happen. We are not prepared for that sort  
17                    of thing.

18                    MR. FRIEDMAN: Elizabeth, wrap it up,  
19                    please.

20       20:06:32        MS. ELIZABETH MANNARINO: Wrap it up.  
21                    Okay. The other thing is that the path of  
22                    ships goes right along the shore in many  
23                    places, along the Columbia River, between the  
24                    mouth and Bradwood Landing. There's no way to  
25       20:06:42    alter that. I -- I am not entirely familiar

1           20:06:47     with the capacities of shoulder-fired missiles,  
2                             but I understand that on the black terrorist  
3                             market they are rather easy to obtain.

4                             Now, in order to keep somebody a few  
5           20:07:02     hundred feet away from a tanker might be very  
6                             difficult. Our shoreline is wooded. There are  
7                             houses along there. What do you have to do?  
8                             Do you have to move all the people away, or  
9                             simply not protect them adequately?

10          20:07:19             MR. FRIEDMAN: Elizabeth, let's wrap up.

11                             MS. ELIZABETH MANNARINO: Thank you very  
12                             much.

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

15          20:07:27             Correct me if I mispronounce your name.  
16                             We're going to guess it's Cal Dominey.

17                             MR. CARL DOMINEY: It's Carl.

18                             MR. FRIEDMAN: We apologize. We had  
19                             trouble reading your writing.

20          20:08:09             MR. CARL DOMINEY: I understand. It's  
21                             probably my printing.

22                             Anyway, I have a couple things I want to  
23                             enter into the record. The Oregonian --  
24                             Oregonian newspaper, interestingly enough, has  
25          20:08:17     a section called Northwest Earthquakes and --



1       20:09:24    the river, it must be escorted with two  
2                    vessels, also the same priority designation as  
3                    search and rescue, which means the Coast Guard  
4                    vessels cannot leave to go save someone's life.

5       20:09:36    If the Warren facility is built another 150  
6                    tankers are proposed, which means four Coast  
7                    Guard vessels would not be available to save  
8                    lives a majority of the year.

9                    Does the Coast Guard have the resources,  
10      20:09:49    funding, and manpower to do this? We don't  
11                    know. The report is classified. And the  
12                    definition of "classified" is, and I quote,  
13                    withheld from general circulation for reasons  
14                    of national security.

15      20:10:01         The public has a right to know what kind  
16                    of pickle they will be in. The Coast Guard  
17                    report must be a large part of these  
18                    deliberations. Without full knowledge of the  
19                    serious curious consequences of this proposal,

20      20:10:14    common sense would dictate that this  
21                    application be denied.

22                    Now, I'd like to enter this into the  
23                    record from the water suitability report by the  
24                    Coast Guard, safety and security zone. Moving

25      20:10:26    safety and security zone will be established

1       20:10:28    around the LNG vessel , extending 500 yards  
2                    around the vessel , but ending at the shoreline.  
3                    No vessel may enter the safety and security  
4                    zone without first obtaining permission of the  
5       20:10:39    Coast Guard in their report.

6                    Now, comments on the pictures that I'm  
7                    about to give to you on these boards. These  
8                    pictures --

9                    MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

10       20:10:51       MR. CARL DOMINEY: These pictures were  
11                    taken on Monday and Tuesday of this week in the  
12                    middle of Astoria over in the East Warren  
13                    Basin. They're mounted so that you'll be able  
14                    to follow them along in logical order.

15       20:11:03       Two comments: Number one, there's a  
16                    cruise ship in one these, and that cruise ship  
17                    is covered under DEIS report 4.1.8.8: Cruise  
18                    ships and LNG tankers are not to be near each  
19                    other. I'm paraphrasing that a little bit.

20       20:11:19       Two, Columbia River Channel Organization  
21                    estimates 40,000 jobs are in some way connected  
22                    to shipping on the Columbia River. You think  
23                    about that. Directly or indirectly. LNG  
24                    tankers will have a dramatic adverse effect on  
25       20:11:32       the shipping, i.e., jobs. In these pictures

1           20:11:38    you will see on Monday that there are nine  
2                            tankers. Most of them are moored in the river.  
3                            One or two are moving up and down the river.  
4                            In the set of pictures taken on Tuesday, you  
5           20:11:51    will see that there are ten tankers and one  
6                            cruise ship.  
7                            MR. FRIEDMAN: Carl, wrap up, please.  
8                            MR. CARL DOMINEY: Ten more seconds.  
9                            Okay. There are ten tankers and one  
10          20:12:01    cruise ship. The channel of the cruise ship is  
11                            just a few hundred feet from the side of cruise  
12                            ship. Now, what is the point of these  
13                            pictures? The congestion obviously. The point  
14                            of the pictures is you cannot have both. The  
15          20:12:17    commerce shipping and the cruise shipping won't  
16                            be able to operate effectively, and that's  
17                            where the adverse effect comes on the jobs.  
18                            Okay. So a choice really needs to be  
19                            made. If you're going to have LNG, you're  
20          20:12:29    going to have to expect a massive adverse  
21                            effect on jobs and shipping and cruises in  
22                            Astoria. If you're going to have those, then  
23                            you can't have LNG. Thank you for allowing me  
24                            to finish.  
25          20:12:40           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your

1 20:12:41 comments.

2 Next is Roger Rocka.

3 MR. ROGER ROCKA: Hi. It's Roger Rocka,

4 R-O-C-K-A. I live in Astoria, Oregon. From

5 20:13:01 '94 to '04, I was the executive director of the

6 Astoria and Warren Chamber of Commerce.

7 Nothing really makes sense without

8 context, and since the promoters who are

9 pushing this project and the people who

10 20:13:15 ultimately will have authority over it are

11 strangers here, I'd like to offer a little bit

12 of local context, if I may.

13 The Columbia River is not a suitable site

14 for an LNG terminal. This is famously the

15 20:13:29 graveyard of the Pacific, the place where more

16 than 2,000 ships and boats have perished. Even

17 today the Columbia is -- the Columbia bar is

18 impassible for days at a time because of fierce

19 winter storms.

20 20:13:43 The shipping channel is narrow, with

21 little room to maneuver, and it hugs the Oregon

22 shore. As it passes Astoria, the shipping

23 channel brings LNG tankers very close, within a

24 stone's throw, of large numbers of people.

25 20:13:58 Whether you're in a metropolitan area of 10

1       20: 14: 02     million or a town of 10,000, I think the point  
2                    is to not bring LNG in close contact with  
3                    thousands of people. And that will happen  
4                    here.

5       20: 14: 11             We are a long way from where the gas will  
6                    be used, meaning long pipelines through  
7                    presently unspoiled lands. This is the one and  
8                    the only great river of the West, the one and  
9                    the only Columbia estuary, where we do all we

10      20: 14: 27     can to preserve precious wildlife habitat  
11                    that's vanishing elsewhere.

12                    This project has no harmony with this  
13                    place. It does not complement what exists  
14                    here. It does not benefit the people or the  
15      20: 14: 39     nature that exists here. The project does not  
16                    conformed to county or state zoning and  
17                    planning policy, unless you somehow suspend  
18                    common sense and define this development that  
19                    is bigger than anything else in this region as  
20      20: 14: 55     small.

21                    Only a few LNG terminals will be built,  
22                    and there may be other places in the country  
23                    that have the infrastructure, that have the  
24                    separation from population, and that want the  
25      20: 15: 07     development. This is not one of those places.

1           20: 15: 12           Also I've heard mention made of jobs this  
2                               evening, and from what I've seen, there are a  
3                               lot of jobs in this project already. There's a  
4                               lot of high-priced talent being employed by the  
5           20: 15: 24           promoters of this project. But those of us who  
6                               live here really aren't willing to sell our  
7                               river for 35 to 50 jobs, and we think that's  
8                               what's happening. Thank you.

9                               MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
10          20: 15: 40        comments.

11                               (Applause.)

12                               MR. FRIEDMAN: Jan Mitchell.

13                               MS. JAN MITCHELL: He's a tough act to  
14                               follow, but I'm his wife. I'm used to it.

15          20: 16: 01           I'm a planner, or a retired planner, and  
16                               my understanding of the EIS is that it is the  
17                               document that follows a project but is the  
18                               thing that gives an unbiased evaluation of what  
19                               the impacts that we can understand will be.

20          20: 16: 22           And so it's a very important document, and it's  
21                               very important that it not be subjective, that  
22                               it not be influenced by who is running the  
23                               project and/or pressured. And there are just a  
24                               few things in this study that I think are very

25          20: 16: 46           crucial. Roger's mentioned some -- most of

1           20: 16: 49    them.

2                    This -- this -- this LNG project would  
3                    cause an amount of six ships a day to go past  
4                    Astoria. It would go past sensitive uses, go  
5           20: 17: 03   past an elementary school, a hospital, lots of  
6                    senior housing and, as mentioned before, it  
7                    passes our newest national park and lots of  
8                    historic sites of national significance.

9                    We've also talked about salmon here, and  
10           20: 17: 27   unless somebody mistakes salmon for animals  
11                    that have been joked about in the past major  
12                    EISs, like butterflies and prairie dogs and so  
13                    on, the salmon is an indicator for how well  
14                    we're doing here. The salmon and the people  
15           20: 17: 44   are inextricably linked, and the salmon is sort  
16                    of our canary in the coal mine, and it's not  
17                    doing well.

18                    And we've built lots of people -- because  
19                    we are a small community, we have lots of  
20           20: 17: 58   wonderful people sitting out in this audience  
21                    who you might find cleaning up a river channel,  
22                    dragging trees to shade a stream, people who  
23                    give up their weekends to go and try to make  
24                    conditions better for the salmon.

25           20: 18: 17           The immensity of this project argues

1       20:18:21    against all of those efforts that are under  
2                    way. I was a planner in California, so I know  
3                    about seismic safety. I can't even imagine  
4                    what a level-nine earthquake is. I've seen 7.3  
5       20:18:39    or something. I can't even imagine, but it's  
6                    going to change our world. You know, my house  
7                    may be down on the next block below me if I'm  
8                    lucky, but I -- and that we know is going to  
9                    happen. It happens every three to five hundred  
10      20:18:56    years.

11                    We have evidence on the ground, you can go  
12                    to the coastline here, you can go to the Ecola  
13                    State Park and see the evidence of those  
14                    earthquakes. You can see the swales and the  
15      20:19:10    dunes in Clatsop Plank, and that shows you  
16                    where those earthquakes have occurred.

17                    Now, if you have that kind of  
18                    destruction -- and we're going to be shut off,  
19                    say, for a week or two, because Portland's  
20      20:19:25    going to be in trouble. They're not coming to  
21                    us. And then you have a huge facility like  
22                    this of a flammable material -- I mean, just --  
23                    it just -- it makes me unable to describe what  
24                    that -- what that may be happening.

25      20:19:44            MR. FRIEDMAN: Can you wrap up?

1 20:19:45 MS. JAN MITCHELL: Yes, I will.

2 Anyway, I would like you to go back, look  
3 at this impact statement, and look at the  
4 impacts of weather on the coast, the difficulty  
5 20:19:54 of crossing the Columbia bar, and the  
6 likelihood of a catastrophic earthquake, and  
7 see if that doesn't figure more into how you  
8 approach this.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
10 20:20:07 comments.

11 Next on the list is Dale Treusdell.

12 MR. DALE TREUSDELL: Dale Treusdell.  
13 T-R-E-U-S-D-E-L-L. I'm a frequent visitor to  
14 the area and have family living in this area.  
15 20:20:43 I've become interested to some degree what's  
16 going on. One of the things that came up in  
17 discussion was the amount of traffic that was  
18 going to be on the -- created because of this  
19 project, if it goes forward. And I got to  
20 20:21:00 thinking about that, and I have a little  
21 information, that this would be approximately  
22 125 ships a year. I think some were saying six  
23 a day, something of that kind. And it's true  
24 that it's an increase, 6 to 8 percent possibly.

25 20:21:22 But there's a price that everybody pays

1       20: 21: 24     for progress, and I think one of the things  
2                    that we have been running into this evening is  
3                    that many people are not interested in paying  
4                    the price, but if you're going to have  
5       20: 21: 40     progress, you're going to move ahead, you're  
6                    going to do something in the area -- there's a  
7                    lot more than just the few jobs that are  
8                    concerned with the plant itself when they talk  
9                    about how many jobs are involved, because we're  
10      20: 21: 57    talking about running up and down the full  
11                    coast.

12                    If you've been looking at your gasoline  
13                    prices lately, you can understand where energy  
14                    enters into this. We need energy. We need a  
15      20: 22: 10    project of this kind to help -- to help in that  
16                    aspect. In the interest of brevity, I'll let  
17                    it ride at that.

18                    MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much for  
19                    your comments.

20      20: 22: 25    Next is Jeanette -- please correct me when  
21                    I mispronounce your name -- Nachbar.

22                    MS. JEANETTE NACHBAR: That was very good.  
23                    It's very close. It's pronounced knock-bar.  
24                    It's spelled N-A-C-H-B-A-R.

25      20: 22: 48    I want to state that I think Bradwood

1       20: 22: 51     Landing -- I'm a proponent of this project, and  
2                    I think that Bradwood Landing will continue to  
3                    meet and exceed the standards that have been  
4                    set forth by the state and federal and county  
5       20: 23: 00     agencies. I feel it is an important project.  
6                    I feel that we need the tax revenue that this  
7                    is going to bring to Clatsop County. We're an  
8                    extremely poor county, and we need to do  
9                    everything we can to open our doors to  
10      20: 23: 14     industry.  
11                    I think LNG and gas is a good bridge  
12                    energy to be used until we can come up with  
13                    better things in the future and make a more  
14                    massive change throughout the United States.  
15      20: 23: 28     I have heard a lot about fear tonight,  
16                    fear of explosions, that type of thing. I live  
17                    with someone who's in the disaster-planning  
18                    area, works in that area. I actually have to  
19                    do that for Washington County for the section  
20      20: 23: 41     that I work in, and I'm probably very well  
21                    prepared for a disaster at my house.  
22                    I know about tsunamis and destruction  
23                    zone, but I don't worry about the day-to-day  
24                    fears that I'm hearing here today. And I think  
25      20: 23: 58     with liquified natural gas plants, the safety

1 20:24:01 record they've had in the past speaks for  
2 itself. I also find that it's rather arrogant  
3 and ironic to talk about salmon restoration and  
4 hunting and fishing the animals at the same  
5 20:24:15 time, in the same evening. I've gotten a real  
6 kick out of that, but that's just a private  
7 thing.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Frank -- again,  
10 20:24:28 correct me when I pronounce your name --  
11 Aquesto.

12 MR. FRANK AQUESTO: Frank Aquesto.  
13 A-Q-U-E-S-T-O. I've lived in the county here  
14 for 20 years, come from Portland. The first  
15 20:24:48 thing I want to address is the safety feature  
16 of these tanks. They seem to be everybody's  
17 concern. If anybody's familiar with the east  
18 end of the Ross Island Bridge, years ago there  
19 used to be huge storage gas tanks. At that  
20 20:25:01 time, if anybody remembers, they were  
21 manufacturing gas and coal and storing it  
22 there. Anyway, I never heard of one incident  
23 there in all these years. I'm sure in all  
24 these years the technology has improved  
25 20:25:13 immensely.

1           20: 25: 14           As far as the fish and water intake by LNG  
2                               ships at berth would be screened to prevent  
3                               entrenchment and impingement of salmon and  
4                               steel head both. This is supposed to set a high  
5           20: 25: 27           standard on the Columbia. Thank you.

6                               MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

7                               Carol Newman.

8                               Are you being attacked by the microphone?

9                               MS. CAROL NEWMAN: Carol Newman, as in

10          20: 25: 48          Paul. Brownsmead resident of 33 years.

11                              And I just -- I can't help but -- there's  
12                              the switch. Okay. Talk about arrogance,  
13                              arrogance, arrogance of people who care about  
14                              salmon restoration and yet hunt and fish. I  
15          20: 26: 19          was quite interested to hear Jeanette to say  
16                              that because I'm a vegetarian. I'm sure she  
17                              is, too, because she will not hunt and fish.  
18                              Totally blew me away, because the salmon  
19                              restoration and fishing go together.

20          20: 26: 33          But anyway, the person that I really --  
21                              all right. I'm just going to handhold this  
22                              thing. It's too high for me.

23                              The person that really disturbed me is  
24                              gone now, but I just want this on the record.

25          20: 26: 57          I couldn't get his name quite right, James

1           20:27:00   Kodama from Longview, who dared --

2                           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:   Kelso.

3                           SPEAKER:

4                           MS. CAROL NEWMAN:   Kelso.   I'm sorry.   The

5           20:27:07   Longview don't want to hear he's from Longview.

6                           I found his behavior odious, and I also

7                           quote, was that Jerry Havens is a hired gun.

8                           That's what he said.   I hope somebody will

9                           investigate and find out who he is and who

10          20:27:27   wrote that piece that he said.   Dr. Havens is

11                           the scientist who prepared all the material

12                           that is used throughout the world.   Who the

13                           hell is this guy, talking science as if he

14                           knows what he's talking about?

15          20:27:42               Okay.   So, back to what I wanted to say

16                           before these guys talked.   Just a couple of

17                           items.   I live within three miles of Bradwood

18                           Landing.   I do not consider myself someone who

19                           needs to be talking about terrorists or

20          20:28:08   anything else, but I also don't consider myself

21                           a person who should be thought of, or any of

22                           the other people in this room, for or against,

23                           as dispensable.

24                           Whether we are tens, hundreds, or

25          20:28:23   thousands, or millions, Boston or Long Beach,

1           20: 28: 27     California, the fact is if a tanker blows in  
2                             front of Astoria, or a pipeline blows, or  
3                             anything happens to those ships in the Columbia  
4                             River, we will be impacted. And when I say  
5           20: 28: 41     "we," I don't mean the folks from Texas or you  
6                             folks; I mean us, those of us who choose to  
7                             live here because we care for this place. We  
8                             take care of this place.

9                             The major earthquake is expected,  
10          20: 28: 56     according to science, within the next 50 years.  
11                             Maybe it won't happen. But it is expected.  
12                             Mitigation? God, we've lived with that word  
13                             for 30 years, mitigation, and it was Brown &  
14                             Root, the Halliburton folks, who used it here  
15          20: 29: 15     30 years ago.

16                             MR. FRIEDMAN: Carol?

17                             MS. CAROL NEWMAN: Okay. I want to say  
18                             Svensen Island was ours and it still is. It's  
19                             going to be taken care of without NorthernStar,  
20          20: 29: 24     and I hope FERC will take care of that for us,  
21                             make sure to use the DEIS, the EIS to protect  
22                             this area. Thanks.

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

25          20: 29: 35     MS. CAROL NEWMAN: I'll put this back

1           20: 29: 37   carefully so the next person can use it.

2                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Here's my quandary, is that  
3                   when you signed in, some people checked the box  
4                   they had spoken before, but I do not recognize  
5           20: 29: 46   them. So I'd like them to stand up and tell me

6                   whether you've spoken at any of the five  
7                   previous FERC meetings this week. So please  
8                   stand up and let's clarify this.

9                   David Ambrose.

10          20: 29: 57       MR. DAVID AMBROSE: I have not spoken this  
11                   week.

12                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for clarifying.

13                   Jimmy Beckwith.

14                   MR. JIMMY BECKWITH: I have not spoken.

15          20: 30: 04       It was two years ago when I spoke. So I said,  
16                   yeah, I spoke.

17                   MR. FRIEDMAN: I meant this week. I'll  
18                   explain why in a second. Jay Kiddle?

19                   MR. JAY KIDDLE: No, I haven't.

20          20: 30: 14       MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. And John  
21                   Koehler.

22                   MR. JOHN KOEHLER: I spoke last night.

23                   MR. FRIEDMAN: You did speak. So except  
24                   for John, I'm going to call the people's whose  
25          20: 30: 24       names I said first, and then we'll have gone

1       20: 30: 26     through everybody, and I'm going to again --  
2                    the way we run these meetings is I let people  
3                    who have not spoken go first, and then if we  
4                    have time -- because we're going to close this  
5       20: 30: 37     meeting at 10:00 -- if we have time, then  
6                    people who did speak at previous meetings will  
7                    get another opportunity if we have time.

8                    So now I'm going to go through that list  
9                    again. And David Ambrose, you're first.

10       20: 30: 52     MR. DAVID AMBROSE: David Ambrose,  
11                    A-M-B-R-O-S-E. I live in Astoria.

12                    The first thing is invasive species and  
13                    noxious weeds, in another capacity. My agency  
14                    is the point agency for noxious weed control in  
15       20: 31: 10     the county, and I've read very briefly the  
16                    section on what the proponents plan to do to be  
17                    sure that we don't get any new ones and to be  
18                    sure that they don't spread any of the old ones  
19                    that we have.

20       20: 31: 28     I hope that they keep in good contact with  
21                    the Oregon Weed Board and keep up to date on  
22                    what's going on. I wanted to list just four  
23                    new ones, ones that are of concern to us in  
24                    Clatsop County:

25       20: 31: 41     Gorse, of which we have only one colony,

1       20: 31: 43   and we spend approximately \$1500 a year to  
2                   control ;

3                   One called clematis vitalba,  
4                   V-I-T-A-L-B-A, and that -- we have a small  
5       20: 31: 57   colony of that, but in the Portland area it's  
6                   rapidly taking over a lot of our forests. We  
7                   don't want to see that one come here;

8                   Garlic mustard, which has just started its  
9                   invasion in the county -- not in the county,  
10       20: 32: 11   but in the state;

11                  And another big one is Spartina grass,  
12                  which, as you may know, in Willapa Bay is a  
13                  problem that they're dumping millions of  
14                  dollars in to try to eradicate. Their plan  
15       20: 32: 26   looks fairly well, but I hope that you'll hold  
16                  them to a higher standard and make sure that  
17                  they're completely vigilant with all of the  
18                  crews and construction crews that would be  
19                  working on a pipeline.

20       20: 32: 38       The chances that we get invasive new  
21                  species, it's pretty high, and once they're  
22                  here, they're very hard to get rid of. We have  
23                  a couple that we've been trying to work on for  
24                  five years in small patches. They're still  
25       20: 32: 51   there, with the arsenal river sites that we can

1       20: 32: 56    use.

2                   The other thing I wanted to point out on  
3                   the point of order was you've asked us not to  
4                   make personal attacks on people, and at least  
5       20: 33: 05   two of the people that I've heard tonight have  
6                   done that. I hope that you will be a little  
7                   more forceful in keeping people to the line  
8                   because we all get emotional, and those  
9                   emotions can rise to the -- to the meeting.

10       20: 33: 22       One other thing now. The 500-meter  
11                   exclusion zone as it goes past Astoria, the  
12                   assumption may have been that the center line  
13                   of the channel was used to make that 500-meter  
14                   exclusion zone, but I hope that you can  
15       20: 33: 37   research and check a little closer to make sure  
16                   that the vessels that use that channel may not  
17                   be in the center line of the channel a lot of  
18                   the time. Maybe they're to the landward side,  
19                   maybe to the water side. And that 500-meter  
20       20: 33: 53   zone may be a little bit wider than it's  
21                   indicated in the maps.

22                   Thank you.

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

25       20: 34: 06       Jim Beckwith.

1 20: 34: 08 MR. JIMMY BECKWITH: Yes. Hello. My name  
2 is Jimmy Beckwith. I have one question for  
3 you --

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Beckwith, spell your  
5 20: 34: 12 last name for the court reporter.

6 MR. JIMMY BECKWITH: Oh. B-E-C-K-W-I-T-H.  
7 Beckwith.

8 And I do have one question I wanted to ask  
9 you guys, but most of it is for these people  
10 20: 34: 23 back here. Seems like everybody is coming up  
11 and talking about emotional issues and concerns  
12 about the environment and stuff like that, and  
13 we're all concerned about that. I'm a 60-year  
14 resident of this community. I was born in  
15 20: 34: 36 Astoria. I am a construction worker. I have  
16 been around a lot of projects, got turned down  
17 because they were nasty, polluting things.

18 The aluminum plant, it got turned down.  
19 They wanted to put a train once a week through  
20 20: 34: 55 Astoria full of coal and dump it in Warrenton  
21 and said it was really good for us. It wasn't.  
22 It got turned down.

23 Now, LNG, natural liquefied gas, barely  
24 burns. It doesn't explode. It's not  
25 20: 35: 11 dangerous. It floats on the water. It won't

1       20: 35: 13   get into the ground.  When it does turn into a  
2                   vapor, it doesn't go along the ground like  
3                   propane; it rises and goes away.  It catches  
4                   fire, it burns straight up like a candle.  It  
5       20: 35: 25   doesn't go whoosh.  I'm telling you, people,  
6                   don't let fears from people that are just  
7                   afraid of everything, you know, dissuade you on  
8                   this.  It's just amazing.  This is the  
9                   cleanest, safest procurement project there is  
10      20: 35: 43   around.

11                   Our community, I've been -- I've been on  
12                   boards for fire departments.  I work for the  
13                   community.  I am invested in this community.  
14                   It's my whole life.  I'm not going to allow  
15      20: 35: 55   anything to come in here.  I've been working at  
16                   this, being at most of the meetings for -- just  
17                   holler when I'm done -- for the whole time, and  
18                   I'm looking to be sure that it's going to be  
19                   safe in some way.  If it's not safe, I want to  
20      20: 36: 09   know about it.  I'm going to argue about it.

21                   But I'm telling you, this community is  
22                   losing timber revenues.  The fire departments  
23                   are raising taxes and whatnot.  Our  
24                   communities, everyone from Westport to Cannon  
25      20: 36: 22   Beach, is going to benefit from the tax

1 20:36:26 revenues that come in. We must have industry.  
2 We can't survive with just tourists and things  
3 like that.

4 Our schools are getting less and less  
5 20:36:38 things that they can do because they cut  
6 programs and they cut programs and they cut  
7 programs. Man, when I was a kid, I went to  
8 this school when they first built it. Of  
9 course, they've done a lot of remodeling. I

10 20:36:49 wish they could remodel me.

11 But my question for you guys is, and this  
12 is of concern, one of the very first speakers  
13 that came on here said that the technologies  
14 that they're using or proposing for these ships  
15 20:37:01 and the plant are not up to snuff, that they  
16 are outdated. Is this true? You're not going  
17 to answer me, of course.

18 MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. That's a rhetorical  
19 question. We'll answer it in the FEIS.

20 20:37:12 MR. JIMMY BECKWITH: But it's important  
21 that you folks guard against it, if it is that  
22 sort of thing, and somehow or other let people  
23 know that it's not technology that is viable.  
24 I believe the technology is there --

25 20:37:23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Beckwith, you told me

1 20: 37: 25 to cut you off when you were done.

2 MR. JIMMY BECKWITH: Why, thank you. I  
3 believe the technology is safe and is proven.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: The answer is that we  
5 20: 37: 34 employ a suite of engineers who do an extensive  
6 job of looking at the engineering drawings and  
7 the engineering plans, and they would recognize  
8 whether or not this is the most up-to-date LNG  
9 engineering. We look at these kinds of  
10 20: 37: 49 projects all across the nation all the time and  
11 consider our staff of engineers to be LNG  
12 experts.

13 Next on my list is Mr. Faust. Mr. Faust,  
14 please tell us your first name.

15 20: 38: 14 MR. FRED FAUST: This newspaper article --

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Faust, what's your  
17 first name? Your first name?

18 MR. FRED FAUST: Fred.

19 MR. FRIEDMAN: And spell your last name  
20 20: 38: 23 for the court reporter.

21 MR. FRED FAUST: It's one of my names,  
22 Faust, F-A-U-S-T.

23 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

24 MR. FRED FAUST: And the newspaper article  
25 20: 38: 31 had something about an engineer that lived back

1       20: 38: 34    in 1912 in England, and he was noticing an  
2                   advertisement from the folks that put out the  
3                   S.S. Titanic and where they were mentioning  
4                   that their luxury liner was 110 percent safe.

5       20: 38: 49    And as a professional engineer, he commented,  
6                   he said, I can't understand how anything can be  
7                   110 percent safe. He said, I'm going to book  
8                   passage on the maiden voyage because I want to  
9                   get to the bottom of this thing.

10       20: 39: 05                   (Laughter.)

11                   MR. FRED FAUST: That was a little  
12                   something I just jotted down today.

13                   As a World War II veteran, I just wanted  
14                   to say thanks for the air power from the 50  
15       20: 39: 20    carriers launched here in the Columbia. As a  
16                   safeguard for national security and more  
17                   dependable air currents, would it be okay to  
18                   locate the LNG operations within three miles of  
19                   our coast, our coastline? And I want to thank  
20       20: 39: 39    the LNG folks for considering this beautiful  
21                   state. Thank you.

22                   (Laughter.)

23                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.  
24                   Jay Kiddle.

25       20: 39: 53                   MR. JAY KIDDLE: My name is Jay Kiddle.

1       20: 40: 00   K-I-D-D-L-E.  And first off, before I get into  
2                   my comments, I do want to comment on this guy's  
3                   statement about natural gas not being  
4                   explosive.  I lived through a natural gas  
5       20: 40: 14   explosion when I was 21, in the Portland area.  
6                   It devastated a square-block building that I  
7                   was in.  I was the only one in that building  
8                   that walked out unhurt, thank God, and I took  
9                   people out.  There were balls of flames, and I  
10       20: 40: 28   will never be around this facility, facility in  
11                   our community, and a lot of people will be  
12                   moving out too.

13                   But my comment is I'm a boater, pleasure  
14                   boater, and I spend most of my pleasure time  
15       20: 40: 39   out on the Columbia River, and I'm greatly  
16                   concerned about the closure of our river to  
17                   other uses and boaters.

18                   Against international treaties in the  
19                   history, historical use of the seas, while this  
20       20: 40: 54   river is wide, it is not deep.  There is no  
21                   room to get out of the channel for sailboaters  
22                   and other pleasure crafts that travel the  
23                   river.  Most travel at four to six knots.  Most  
24                   have radios, but very rarely do we ever have  
25       20: 41: 11   them on.  Now, I don't know how we're going to

1       20: 41: 13   extrude us out of the river when we're out  
2                   there tooling around.

3                   There is -- I'm especially worried about  
4                   bar closures for boaters. There's limited time  
5       20: 41: 24   for pleasure boaters to cross the bar. If you

6                   ever come down from Washington, come down the  
7                   beautiful Juan de Fuca Straits, and you plan 36  
8                   to 40 hours to get down here to the Columbia  
9                   River. What do you do if you get down here and

10       20: 41: 39   the river's closed, the bar's closed to other  
11                   uses?

12                   You can only cross that bar at the bottom  
13                   of the river tide and the top of the tide for  
14                   pleasure boaters. If you're excluded from

15       20: 41: 51   those times, you have to wait 12 hours or six  
16                   hours before you can cross that river. Who in  
17                   their right mind is going to head for our  
18                   Columbia River if they're going to be excluded  
19                   from getting into here?

20       20: 42: 04       I'm worried about storm closures of the  
21                   bar. When they open these rivers back up, the  
22                   bar back up, who's going to get the  
23                   right-of-way? Well, our fishermen have to sit  
24                   out there and lose their catches while they

25       20: 42: 17   wait for this river (sic) to turn around?

1           20: 42: 21           And everyone's talking about terrorists.  
2                           Well, it doesn't take a terrorist to cause  
3                           harm. In the 20 years I've lived here in  
4                           Astoria, I've long Oregonian here, in the 20  
5           20: 42: 32           years I've been here, we've had dozens of  
6                           freighters, commercial freighters, run aground  
7                           by river and bar pilots in our river. In the  
8                           early '90s we had a freighter ripped off the  
9                           Port of Astoria, pier three, and ended up  
10          20: 42: 48          against the Megler Astoria bridge, which closed  
11                           the bridge for over a day. That ship was  
12                           docked by union longshoremen. We don't need  
13                           terrorists. All it takes is an accident.  
14                           We share this river with all kinds of  
15          20: 43: 03          hazardous materials and ships that carry all  
16                           kinds of materials up and down this river. If  
17                           this LNG isn't -- if this LNG is so safe, why  
18                           are they closing the river to other uses? Our  
19                           Columbia is a national treasure. We do not  
20          20: 43: 21          need this plant on it. It will be detrimental  
21                           to our wildlife and Lewis and Clark National  
22                           Wildlife Reserve.  
23                           I thank you and ask you to deny Bradwood  
24                           Landing's application.  
25          20: 43: 36          MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your

1 20: 43: 37 comments.

2 I believe that I've called everyone on the  
3 list who had not previously spoken. So now I'm  
4 going to ask the audience, is there anyone who  
5 20: 43: 46 would like to speak who did not speak at the  
6 previous FERC meeting this week? If so, raise  
7 your hand.

8 Yes. Okay. Please come up here, then,  
9 state your name for the record, spell your name  
10 20: 43: 59 for the court reporter.

11 MR. ROBERT HALSAN: My name is Robert  
12 Halsan. I can --

13 (Reporter requests clarification.)

14 MR. ROBERT HALSAN: It's spelled  
15 20: 44: 10 H-A-L-S-A-N.

16 I can outdo most of these people. I've  
17 been here for 75 years, and if that's any  
18 attribute, then I think I'm in a position to  
19 assess some of the things and make comments on  
20 20: 44: 26 some of the things that have surfaced this  
21 evening.

22 Safetywise, I personally am married to a  
23 lady whose father fished on the river for some  
24 48 years, and that's one thing that is  
25 20: 44: 43 certainly a concern. Likewise, let's address

1       20: 44: 46    the safety features.  More especially, if you  
2                    have reason to be on the river or frequent the  
3                    shoreline, you'll note that there's a lot of  
4                    river traffic, namely, container ships.

5       20: 45: 01        I personally harbor more concern of the  
6                    safety features of these container ships that  
7                    are frequenting this river.  Namely, there are  
8                    five concerns, especially based, I suspect, in  
9                    Japan, that frequent the scene, frequent the

10      20: 45: 21   port for the most part.  And on board those  
11                    same ships, who knows what in the world's in  
12                    the holds or in the containers.  It's not  
13                    even -- Homeland Security doesn't have reason  
14                    to even have any inkling of what, in fact,

15      20: 45: 38   might be on board.

16                    Good Lord.  Lord knows all it takes some  
17                    dirty bomb that would be dropped off the ship  
18                    in transit to Port of Portland and what, pray  
19                    tell, would happen to our whole river system?

20      20: 45: 52        This is -- this is a safety concern I'm  
21                    really concerned about.  I think I'm totally  
22                    justified in saying that.  I have more than  
23                    just a direct bearing on it.  I observe these  
24                    same ships.  There are, like I said, five

25      20: 46: 09   different concerns, of Japanese-based concerns.

1       20: 46: 12    The river pilots I understand service three and  
2                    a half of those same ships a week, and they  
3                    spend, what is it, about -- I believe it's  
4                    about two and a half hours to take that ship

5       20: 46: 32    upriver to a point where it would be at its  
6                    resting place at the Bradwood Landing site.

7                    One other concern that I heard mentioned  
8                    is landslides. Well, granted, there was a  
9                    landslide to the immediate east of that locale

10      20: 46: 47    that came down, and I don't know -- it did take  
11                    the life of a person off of Puget Island. But  
12                    as far as landslides up there in that Bradwood  
13                    area, I would certainly stand corrected, but I  
14                    know of no instances where there have been any

15      20: 47: 05    landslides per se. I don't feel that's a real  
16                    critical issue.

17                    The other item that I note that is really  
18                    a concern to a lot of people and people who are  
19                    more than casual acquaintances of mine --

20      20: 47: 23       MR. FRIEDMAN:  Sir, wrap it up.

21                    MR. ROBERT HALSAN:  Am I out of time?

22                    MR. FRIEDMAN:  Yes.

23                    MR. ROBERT HALSAN:  Al ready?

24                    MR. FRIEDMAN:  Yes.

25      20: 47: 31       MR. ROBERT HALSAN:  Al ready.  Goodness

1 20: 47: 32 gracious.

2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
3 comments.

4 Is there anyone else who has not  
5 20: 47: 36 previously spoken who wishes to? Please come  
6 up here, state your name, spell your name for  
7 the record.

8 MR. MURRAY STANLEY: My name is Murray  
9 Stanley, S-T-A-N-L-E-Y. And I would like to  
10 20: 47: 51 talk a little bit -- I listened to corporate  
11 America speak. (Indicating.) How about that?  
12 Is that better?

13 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, especially when you  
14 lean forward.

15 20: 48: 08 MR. MURRAY STANLEY: I pay attention to  
16 corporate America and the stewardship of our  
17 environment, and I don't know if you noticed  
18 the paper, but Exxon Mobil is in our Supreme  
19 Court right now, and the reason they're there  
20 20: 48: 24 is because they do not want to pay the  
21 \$2.5 billion that they were fined as -- for the  
22 VALDEZ when it ran aground up in Williams Bay.

23 Now, they fined them \$2.5 billion.  
24 They're in our Supreme Court refusing to pay it  
25 20: 48: 51 and hoping that the Supreme Court will nullify

1       20: 48: 55     that decision that they had to pay. That was  
2                    18 years ago, and they're still fighting it.

3                    And by the way, Exxon Mobil made \$39 billion  
4                    last year. The most money by any corporation  
5       20: 49: 17     in the United States to date, but they're not  
6                    paying.

7                    Now, PG&E, they are 20 years behind on  
8                    their upgrades for emissions. They refuse to  
9                    do them. DEQ tries to chase them around, do  
10       20: 49: 36    something. They're a toothless tiger. They  
11                    can do nothing with these people. When and if  
12                    a tanker runs aground, do you think that  
13                    they're going to fix things up for us? I don't  
14                    think so. So I just wanted to bring that point  
15       20: 49: 53    to you people. If you think that NorthStar's  
16                    going to do us any favors, you're crazy. Thank  
17                    you.

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

20       20: 50: 08                    (Appause.)

21                    MR. FRIEDMAN: Is there anyone else in the  
22                    audience who has not previously spoken at a  
23                    FERC meeting this week who wishes to speak  
24                    tonight?

25       20: 50: 21                    Okay. In that case I'm going to call the

1 20:50:23 people who previously signed up to speak at  
2 other meetings and give them one last chance.  
3 Laurie Caplan.

4 MS. LAURIE CAPLAN: I'm Laurie Caplan.

5 20:50:49 C-A-P-L-A-N.

6 Evidence proves that there will be  
7 substantial air and water pollution and  
8 environmental damage resulting from the  
9 construction and day-to-day operations at  
10 20:51:03 Bradwood. So what will happen in an emergency?

11 The Knappa Fire District has sole  
12 responsibility for emergency response and  
13 mitigation for incidents at Bradwood.

14 The fire district researched the four  
15 20:51:18 existing LNG terminal facilities in the United  
16 States, incidents at two LNG peak shaving  
17 plants in Oregon, and information from the  
18 Coast Guard and NorthernStar. In its testimony  
19 submitted last month to the Clatsop County

20 20:51:35 Commissioners, the fire district identified  
21 massive gaps in its resources.

22 More employees, vehicles, equipment,  
23 training, and a new fire station facility are  
24 needed to cope with just the, quote, predicted  
25 20:51:49 routine emergencies, unquote, at the terminal.

1       20:51:54    The report says this will not be enough to deal  
2                   with, quote, catastrophic incidents, unquote.  
3                   The report does not include resources needed  
4                   for emergencies on LNG tankers or along the  
5       20:52:07    shipping channel or the proposed pipeline. The  
6                   report does not include resources needed by  
7                   other emergency responders such as police,  
8                   highway patrol, security, haz mat, and  
9                   ambulances.

10       20:52:22            The Knappa, Astoria, Warrenton, and  
11                   Clatskanie fire districts will need a total of  
12                   15 more full-time employees and six interns to  
13                   provide what the Knappa district calls a,  
14                   quote, conservative, effective response to  
15       20:52:40    incidents at Bradwood Landing. The district  
16                   will need numerous annual trainings for  
17                   responders. It will need four specialized  
18                   fire, rescue, and communications vehicles, a  
19                   water craft, combustible, and/or multi-gas  
20       20:52:56    detectors for all emergency vehicles and  
21                   personnel, satellite communications equipment,  
22                   and much more. The fire districts can't afford  
23                   these essential resources, and NorthernStar,  
24                   the Coast Guard, the State of Oregon, Clatsop  
25       20:53:13    County, and the federal government have not

1 20:53:15 offered to pay for them.

2 Environmental damage from even a routine  
3 industrial accident at Bradwood could be  
4 widespread, long term, and devastating. It's

5 20:53:26 hard to imagine what the impact of a actual  
6 catastrophe would be, especially without  
7 massive spending for equipment, personnel, and  
8 other resources. FERC must reject LNG at  
9 Bradwood and protect the public and the  
10 20:53:43 Columbi a Ri ver from thi s fool hardy project.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
13 comments. Marge Castle.

14 MS. MARJIE CASTLE: Good evening. Marjie  
15 20:54:00 Castle. M-A-R-J-I-E, C-A-S-T-L-E. This is my  
16 fourth time to speak this week. Each time that  
17 I have spoken, I have chosen a topic that I  
18 have found deficient in the DEIS. Tonight I  
19 speak because of information that was given out  
20 20:54:17 last night by NorthernStar.

21 Thank you for this last -- one last  
22 opportunity to publicly express my concerns of  
23 the DEIS, as printed. I hold a degree in  
24 biology, a Master's degree in technology, and  
25 20:54:30 an advanced certification in brain research. I

1       20:54:33     am not an amateur to research, and I understand  
2                   the hours of commitment FERC staff and  
3                   third-party contractors have put into this  
4                   document.

5       20:54:41             As I stated last evening, though, it has  
6                   many, many holes, and I can't help but wonder  
7                   if that was done deliberately. If so, one's  
8                   imagination could run overtime as to why so  
9                   let -- to let imaginations fly. Many times

10      20:54:57     it's not imagination but reality that becomes  
11                   the result.

12                   Mr. Friedman, you stated multiple times  
13                   over the course of this week that landowners  
14                   could go to NorthernStar to get an answer as to  
15      20:55:10     if the pipeline was on their property and at  
16                   what mile marker. All my husband could get for  
17                   an answer was, "The drill site is not on your  
18                   property." We have lived with a drill site on  
19                   our property, that proposal, for two years.

20      20:55:26             The revised Cowlitz County geo hazard  
21                   report supported our claims that we submitted  
22                   to your organization that the hillside near the  
23                   proposed site on our property to have been --  
24                   was unstable and further recommend -- and it

25      20:55:44     was further recommended by the geo hazard

1       20:55:47   report that three alternative placements for  
2                   that drill site should be looked into.

3                   Two of those recommendations would have  
4                   seriously increased costs to NorthernStar as  
5       20:55:55   well as required additional HDDs up the  
6                   Abernathy Creek draw. The third alternative  
7                   was to move the drill site from where it was  
8                   currently sited to a more westerly situation.

9                   That would mean further up on top of the ridge  
10       20:56:12   within the association of homeowners to which  
11                   we belong. That whole ridge has a different  
12                   drainage and goes into a totally different  
13                   creek system. Based on the neighborhood survey  
14                   on feelings towards the proposed NorthernStar  
15       20:56:29   LNG project and location of another pipeline in  
16                   our neighborhood, only one piece of property  
17                   was left.

18                   The major horizontal drill site for  
19                   placement of the 30-inch pipeline has been  
20       20:56:41   moved and not within just a few feet but  
21                   possibly over the width of two parcels, or  
22                   approximately 1,350 feet. That's a major  
23                   change. As of tonight, Mr. Coppedge admitted  
24                   NorthernStar does not even know where the drill  
25       20:56:56   site now will be.

1           20:56:58           This is a major indication. This is the  
2                           site to bring the pipeline under the Columbia  
3                           River into Cowlitz County, Washington. Any new  
4                           location -- any new location on that ridge has  
5           20:57:11           not been communicated to the landowners of that  
6                           area. It will be located within a few feet of  
7                           a year-round creek that feeds into Mill Creek,  
8                           the last native salmon run creek on the  
9                           Columbia River. Along each side of the unnamed  
10          20:57:30          creek wetlands exist. Eagles, owls, raccoons,  
11                           deer, all kinds of animals live there.

12                        Because of all this information and other  
13                        information that is conspicuously missing from  
14                        the DEIS and because location change appears to  
15          20:57:45          have been known by FERC prior to the issuance  
16                        of the DEIS, I therefore formally demand that  
17                        all further discussion and consideration of  
18                        this draft Environmental Impact Statement be  
19                        stopped until all pertinent environmental, air  
20          20:57:58          and water quality, road, safety, socioeconomic,  
21                        effective residential, and any other additional  
22                        necessary information is gathered and report  
23                        submitted for the change of the pipeline HDD  
24                        under the Columbia River drill site, and that  
25          20:58:14          all pertinent agencies be allowed to review and

1       20: 58: 18   comment and a new complete draft Environmental  
2                   Impact Statement released to the public for  
3                   further comment.

4                   Thank you.

5       20: 58: 25       MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
6                   comments.

7                   (Appl ause. )

8                   MR. FRIEDMAN: Duncan MacKenzi e.

9                   MR. DUNCAN MacKENZIE: Good eveni ng. My  
10       20: 58: 47   name i s Duncan MacKenzi e. D-U-N-C-A-N,  
11                   M-A-C-K-E-N-Z-I -E.

12                   In the DEIS on page 2-23 i s a di scussi on  
13                   of support faci liti es associ ated wi th the LNG  
14                   terminal , notably, the ni trogen system and the  
15       20: 58: 59   pipel i ne associ ated above-ground faci liti es i n  
16                   2 1. 4. The appl i cant' s resource reports one,  
17                   11, and 13 note that the ni trogen system wi ll  
18                   produce ni trogen gas for purgi ng pi pes,  
19                   processi ng equi pment, and vessel s onl y.

20       20: 59: 14   However, nowhere i n the DEIS nor the publ i cly  
21                   avail able resources or materi als revi ewed i s  
22                   any menti on of the need or method to be used to  
23                   adj ust the hi gher heati ng val ue of the i mported  
24                   gas to meet transmi ssi on speci ficati ons for  
25       20: 59: 27   requi red interstate gas l i ne transmi ssi on.

1           20:59:29           The only statement found as to the  
2                           applicant's position with regard to this issue  
3                           was summed up in a 25 July 2006 application by  
4                           lawyers on page 24 and 25 as follows: Bradwood

5           20:59:39           Landing recognizes the importance of  
6                           interchange ability, but submits that this  
7                           concern does not require resolution prior to  
8                           the approval of authorization it seeks.

9                           With the exception of Trinidad and Tobago,  
10          20:59:50           LNG produced around the world has an HHV value  
11                           much higher than the natural gas as a source.  
12                           The federal supply market facility would not  
13                           seem to provide LNG at sufficiently low HHV to  
14                           accomplish intact blending. Furthermore, there  
15          21:00:04           is a tendency for the HHV values to increase  
16                           during the transport and delivery cycles as  
17                           boil-off of the lighter hydrocarbons occurs.

18                           While liquified natural gas can be  
19                           supplied with an adjusted HHV by the supplier,  
20          21:00:18           it is costly and decreases the flexibility of  
21                           the shipper to supply a wide market.

22                           Currently, the Northwest Pipeline, Williams  
23                           Pipeline transmission specifications do not  
24                           appear to have a maximum HHV value, nor are a  
25          21:00:32           maximum or minimal Wobbe Index values given as

1       21:00:36   conditional supplies from Canada have been  
2                   within acceptable ranges.

3                   This may account for the applicant's  
4                   apparent lack of address to this issue.

5       21:00:42   However, if the Natural Gas Council + Group  
6                   guidelines developed in anticipation of  
7                   increasing West Coast LNG ports are adopted,  
8                   then the HHV will be limited to a maximum of  
9                   1110 BTUs a standard cubic foot and the Wobbe  
10       21:00:58   Index will be required to be 4 percent of  
11                   historical values.

12                   There are two aspects of this issue,  
13                   which, despite the applicant's protestations  
14                   noted above, would appear to require resolution  
15       21:01:08   prior to approval or authorization. First, as  
16                   found on lines 30 through 36 of the submerged  
17                   combustible vaporizer data sheet and the air  
18                   contaminant discharge permit, the composition  
19                   of this fuel and the HHV value of 1068 BTUs per  
20       21:01:27   standard cubic foot is found.

21                   However, in the absence of the design  
22                   information or mention of how the manner of HHV  
23                   adjustment will be accomplished, how is the  
24                   applicant capable of assuring the Oregon  
25       21:01:36   Department of Environmental Quality that the

1 21:01:38 stated fuel composition and HHV are correct and  
2 are being held to the values stated? If these  
3 values cannot be substantiated, the air  
4 modeling quality and the emissions data might  
5 21:01:49 be called into question.

6 Additionally, has the attendant noise and  
7 potential cooling water demand of an air  
8 separation unit for sufficient capacity for  
9 nitrogen injection or compressor capacity for  
10 21:01:59 air injection adequately been accounted for in  
11 the applicant's submissions? As noted in the  
12 operation equipment list associated noise data  
13 found in the applicant's resource report nine  
14 and also in the DEIS, no air separation unit or  
15 21:02:17 compressors are noted.

16 MR. FRIEDMAN: Duncan, wrap it up please.

17 MR. DUNCAN MacKENZIE: Yep.

18 It is requested that FERC recommend that  
19 the applicant address the manner in which HHV  
20 21:02:25 adjustment will be accomplished to equal a  
21 suitable Wobbe Index and to ensure that the  
22 anticipated emissions will conform to the  
23 submitted data contained in the air quality  
24 discharge permit and the FEIS; also, that the  
25 21:02:38 applicant review the application as to noise

1 21:02:40 and water resources for their inclusion in the  
2 DEIS.

3 Thank you for your time.

4 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your

5 21:02:46 comments.

6 Next, Steve Dragich.

7 MR. STEVE DRAGICH: Mr. Dragich, Dragich

8 Trust. D-R-A-G-I-C-H. I have four items to

9 submit tonight, and I'm also submitting my

10 21:03:11 comments on the total DEIS.

11 Item one: In September 7, 2005, an  
12 original list of 512 landowners was submitted

13 to FERC by NorthernStar Energy Limited

14 Liability Corporation, legal representative

15 21:03:27 VanNess & Feldman, Washington, D.C. Copies

16 were sent to FERC and contractor Natural

17 Resources Group. At that time no CEII,

18 standing for critical energy infrastructure

19 information, was proclaimed; no privacy claim

20 21:03:44 invoked. All future requests from that date,

21 September 7, 2005, for landowner lists and

22 pipeline route maps were denied.

23 Item two: December 14, 2006, biological

24 assessment meeting on the Bradwood proposal

25 21:04:03 itself. No notification was given to

1       21:04:05    intervenors, and intervenors who were present  
2                    were denied attendance and no reasons as to why  
3                    they were denied attendance. In reference to  
4                    are ex parte communication, it is noted on the  
5       21:04:16    meeting roster that FERC kept that John  
6                    Buchovecky, NorthernStar legal representative,  
7                    and Gary Coppedge, NorthernStar vice president,  
8                    were in attendance.

9                    Item three: In the FERC manual title,  
10       21:04:32    ideas for better stakeholder involvement, page  
11                    9, industry options, chapter title, Make route  
12                    information easy and understandable,  
13                    NorthernStar either has claimed exemption under  
14                    item four of the Freedom of Information Act or  
15       21:04:49    CEII exemption under FERC rules 630.

16                    One final comment: Since the end of World  
17                    War II, my family has helped provide security  
18                    for the lower Columbia, specifically river mile  
19                    50 to river mile 60. To give you an example of  
20       21:05:07    how bad a plan can go, I refer to December 8th,  
21                    1941, which my family was involved in the  
22                    security after the attack on Pearl Harbor.  
23                    Specifically, my family, or my father and his  
24                    brothers, specifically his brothers, were part  
25       21:05:24    of the United States Army, manned a machine gun

1 21:05:28 post on the peak of the Rainier bridge between  
2 Longview, Washington, and Rainier, Oregon.

3 There was a general blackout in effect,  
4 and their duty at that time was to provide  
5 21:05:40 river security. A freighter approached upriver  
6 in a blackout condition. Recognition signals  
7 were misidentified. At the time they were  
8 manning a 30-caliber machine gun post, which  
9 they opened fire. Luckily, if you want to  
10 21:06:05 extrapolate, just think what you could do with  
11 a 30-caliber machine gun and an LNG tanker.

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

14 John -- it's not working.

15 21:06:30 Okay. John Koehler. John?

16 MR. JOHN KOEHLER: Koehler?

17 MR. FRIEDMAN: Koehler, yes.

18 MR. JOHN KOEHLER: My name's John Koehler.  
19 K-O-E-H-L-E-R. I live in the proximity of  
20 21:06:47 where the rail head is going to be located in  
21 Cowlitz County.

22 Since testifying last night, I talked with  
23 NorthStar and found out that they are moving  
24 the drill head location. They don't know where  
25 21:07:01 it is. So we're guessing somewhat, but I want

1           21:07:07    it to be brought to your attention so that you  
2                            can consider it when you're doing all your  
3                            work, that some of that wetlands that Marjie  
4                            Castle was referring to is my wetlands, and  
5           21:07:17    that on my property is a major spring. It  
6                            provides approximately half the water flow of  
7                            that unnamed creek she was referring to that it  
8                            feeds down into, Coal Creek -- or into Mill  
9                            Creek, which is a major salmon spawning ground.

10          21:07:36            If they are locating their drill head in  
11                            that area, you need to be aware -- you need to  
12                            get someone out there, locate my spring and  
13                            assess, with your expertise, the impact that  
14                            that drilling may have on that spring, and that  
15          21:07:52    if they damage the spring, the impact it would  
16                            have on the salmon.

17                            So, thank you.

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

20          21:07:59            Next is Vance Fraser.

21                            MR. VANCE FRASER: Hello. I'm Vance  
22                            Fraser. That's F-R-A-S-E-R.

23                            As requested, let's look at some more  
24                            errors and deficiencies of the DEIS. Section  
25          21:08:24    1.1, purpose and need. The project is designed

1       21:08:30   to provide up do 1.3 billion cubic feet per day  
2                   to the Pacific Northwest. Apparently, lessons  
3                   learned from the advertising industry are  
4                   necessary to justify this project. Provide gas  
5       21:08:44   up to 1.3 BCFD. So that "up to" can mean  
6                   almost zero, with the rest going elsewhere, and  
7                   the risk and damage to the fishing industry and  
8                   shipping industry remain here.

9                   The DEIS continues on about delivery of  
10       21:08:58   gas to Wauna and the Beaver power plant. There  
11                   is no reason to believe that these plants will  
12                   not have energy without LNG. They are fully  
13                   supplied right now.

14                   Now, it, the DEIS, goes on about  
15       21:09:14   connecting to Northwest Natural and Williams  
16                   pipeline, but no real and actual demand, just  
17                   magical future demand described in the industry  
18                   self-serving Northwest Gas Association  
19                   projections, which fall apart compared to the  
20       21:09:30   less biased Energy Information Agency  
21                   projections.

22                   With electrical generation and industrial  
23                   use of the gas far exceeding other uses in this  
24                   region, and with the trend of industry leaning  
25       21:09:46   to be China and elsewhere, where is this big

1       21:09:49    need and demand coming from? Well, electrical  
2                    generation. And let's see exactly what, where,  
3                    and how much that will be going in the DEIS,  
4                    please.

5       21:10:02            Still, in section 1.1 it states that  
6                    imported LNG will contribute to gas price  
7                    stabilization. We have seen how well that has  
8                    worked for other foreign imported energy, which  
9                    arrives by ship. What is the price of crude

10      21:10:19    oil today? You can strike that one from the  
11                    justification.

12                    The DEIS goes on to state that there has  
13                    been and will continue to be increasing demand  
14                    for natural gas in U.S. and in the Pacific

15      21:10:34    Northwest. This is purely speculative  
16                    conjecture. As soon as a cheaper or a more  
17                    attractive alternative comes along, we will be  
18                    stuck with this big piece of crap and this  
19                    pipeline unless FERC requires a reasonable  
20      21:10:50    abandonment plan.

21                    The DEIS cites the Northwest Gas  
22                    Association -- Association that the Northwest  
23                    will fall short of peak demand under a  
24                    high-growth-demand scenario or under a

25      21:11:05    base-case scenario with extreme cold weather

1           21:11:10    conditions. Now, since many Californians have  
2                           got tired of the rain, where is this  
3                           high-growth demand going to come from? And  
4                           since Al Gore has assured me of global warming,  
5           21:11:22    just exactly what temperature and for how long  
6                           does extreme cold weather mean?

7                           Thank you.

8                           MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
9                           comments.

10          21:11:35        Gayle Kiser.

11                           MS. GAYLE KISER: Nice to see you all  
12                           again. Gayle Kiser. G-A-Y-L-E, K-I-S-E-R.

13                           I'd like to come to the defense of  
14                           Dr. Havens. I have here some statements by  
15          21:11:57    Richard Kuprewicz, who's a member of the  
16                           Washington State Commission on Pipeline Safety  
17                           and also the Pipeline Safety Trust. He talks  
18                           about a serious fatal flaw in FERC's siting  
19                           process, concerning LNG marine facility siting.

20          21:12:13    Some serious deceptions representative of very  
21                           poor, even reckless, risk management that I  
22                           have observed in the siting process, quote, for  
23                           LNG marine receiving as well as gas  
24                           transmission pipelines.

25          21:12:26        For LNG facilities, watch out for

1 21:12:29 misinformation indicating, quote, the  
2 worst-case release will be a pool release, end  
3 quote. Experienced hazard analysis teams call  
4 this phenomena "stacking the deck." By  
5 21:12:42 constraining the review to the very restricted  
6 limited boundary case, real possible events are  
7 not properly analyzed, scrutinized, or properly  
8 engineered, and risks are those seriously  
9 understated. This isn't a new phenomena; talk  
10 21:12:58 to the Three Mile Island designers.

11 And also, reverting back to the DEIS, on  
12 pages 4-443 and 4-444, we're discussing the  
13 causes of pipeline failure. On table 4.11.9-3,  
14 it says that earth movement accounts for 13.3  
15 21:13:23 percent of the failures. Those are nationwide  
16 figures. In Cowlitz County, earth movement  
17 accounts for 100 percent of pipeline failures.

18 This is going to be a 30-inch pipeline in  
19 Cowlitz County, carrying 1280 pounds per square  
20 21:13:39 inch. The blast zone will be 741 feet on  
21 either side. That wipes out a quarter mile.  
22 In 1995, the Williams pipeline blew in Castle  
23 Rock. In 1997 the Williams pipeline blew in  
24 Kalama. On December 13 of 2003 it blew up in  
25 21:13:57 Toledo. Those were all due to land movement.

1       21:14:01     In 2006 a 36-inch pipeline in Wyoming blew up  
2                   and sterilized 600 acres.  Totally blew the  
3                   topsoil away.

4                   The existing KB pipeline which traverses  
5       21:14:15     Cowlitz County is above ground near my house.  
6                   The neighbor there had to move because of the  
7                   land movement.  He had to move his home because  
8                   of land movement.  So I have serious concerns  
9                   about locating this pipeline in Cowlitz County,  
10      21:14:29     and I hope FERC takes the geologic hazard  
11                   report very seriously.

12                   Thank you.

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

15      21:14:39     At this time we've gone through the list  
16                   of everyone who wanted to speak.  Frans, go  
17                   ahead.

18                   MR. FRANS EYKEL:  Mr. Friedman, I have to  
19                   catch the ferry, so I'll be very quick.  My  
20      21:14:48     name is Frans Eykel.  E-Y-K-E-L.  Good evening  
21                   again.

22                   I have two -- three comments here.  I'd  
23                   like to comment on a statement from a gentleman  
24                   here earlier this evening.  He stated that LNG  
25      21:15:07     cannot explode.  LNG can explode, due to rapid

1 21:15:13 expansion. When -- LNG is built in water, it  
2 will explode with an equivalent of a couple of  
3 pounds of TNT. That is well-known in the  
4 industry.

5 21:15:27 Secondly, the personal attack on  
6 Dr. Havens' credibility, I was appalled and he  
7 requires an apology.

8 Third, should FERC not stop all the  
9 activity on this permit application until all

10 21:15:47 the documents are compiled and can put  
11 everything into the draft EIS so we can read  
12 only one book instead of 20 or 30 different  
13 documents that still need to be filed, like  
14 corrections on the biological assessment and

15 21:16:08 thermal mixing, the filter for the water  
16 intake, which is stopped secret because they  
17 don't even know how to do it yet, and so many  
18 other things. If you start -- if you permit  
19 someone to do something, it should be all up

20 21:16:28 front, not through the back door.

21 That's all I got. Have a nice day, Paul.

22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, and have a safe  
23 ferry trip.

24 Is there someone else who wants to speak?

25 21:16:39 Please come up to the front, state your name,

1 21:16:41 and spell your last name for the record.

2 MR. MARVIN KING: (Indicating.)

3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, she doesn't remember.

4 MR. MARVIN KING: My name is Marvin King,  
5 21:16:47 and I'm against this for myself and the rest of  
6 my future generation and everything else.

7 Anybody that's for this project should  
8 have to live on the pipeline or buy property  
9 right next to the pipeline. I didn't hear  
10 21:17:00 anybody in favor that said -- one person that  
11 said they were going to be affected by it.

12 There are so many problems with the  
13 proposed site that one doesn't really know  
14 where to begin. Let's start with the DEIS.

15 21:17:09 Oh, wait, it's incomplete and won't be able to  
16 changed until after all public comments and  
17 reviews have been made. I would like to take  
18 this time to ask FERC for an additional 120-day  
19 comment period until after a complete DEIS has  
20 21:17:24 been submitted.

21 I guess safety should be at the top of  
22 list. NorthernStar has gone to great lengths  
23 to assure all of us that we are out of harm's  
24 way. This could not be further from the truth.

25 21:17:34 The double-tank design was found to be

1       21:17:36    inadequate by our own Pentagon. L. Hunter  
2                    Lovins on energy security concluded, and I  
3                    quote: Proneness to brittle fracture implies  
4                    that relatively small disruptions by sabotage,  
5       21:17:42    earthquake, objects flung at the tank, et  
6                    cetera, could well cause immediate, massive  
7                    failure of an above-grade LNG tank. A General  
8                    Accounting Office study similarly concluded  
9                    that tanks afford limited protection even  
10       21:17:42    against non-military small arms projectiles.

11                    There are hundreds, if not thousands of  
12                    locations that a one-eyed, one-armed, uneducated  
13                    terrorist could destroy a tank from. Maybe we  
14                    should all have to have a background check to  
15       21:18:14    go into the woods or stay at the Cannery Pier  
16                    Hotel at Astoria. These ships will go within  
17                    100 yards of this hotel, where a terrorist  
18                    could rent a room at.

19                    How about the Astoria Megler bridge? How  
20       21:18:27    many times will it be shut down while LNG is  
21                    going underneath? I can just picture the  
22                    terrorists laughing as they pull the pin from  
23                    the grenade as they throw it from the bridge.  
24                    "Oh, FERC, they made it so easy for us."

25       21:18:40    The terrible thing is an LNG tanker

1       21:18:43   carries 700 tons of TNT, or 5500 times the  
2                   atomic bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. That's  
3                   disturbing. An LNG explosion in Cleveland in  
4                   1944, which left 128 dead and over 200 injured,  
5       21:18:58   contained only 5 percent of the volume of  
6                   today's tankers. Why does the government and  
7                   FERC have to wait until catastrophic failure  
8                   and death to realize this?

9                   The FERC relies heavily on independent  
10       21:19:09   studies which are inaccurate and misleading.  
11                   Quest of Oklahoma concluded after the September  
12                   11th attacks that the immediate dangers to  
13                   humans and life from an LNG carrier, only 470  
14                   feet. Dr. James Fay, scientist from MIT,  
15       21:19:22   disputes these findings were never subject of a  
16                   peer review or submitted to a scientific  
17                   journal. Dr. Fay says, and I quote: For all  
18                   credible spills, including terrorist attacks on  
19                   the storage tank and/or LNG tanker, the danger  
20       21:19:36   zone for humans extends nearly two miles, end  
21                   quote. This is significantly different than  
22                   the Quest findings.

23                   After doing minimal research, one can  
24                   learn of the LFL, or low flammability level, of  
25       21:19:50   this particular gas. Because of its LFL,

1           21:19:53    studies have shown the release of 125,000 cubic  
2                            meters could create a vapor cloud of up to 30  
3                            miles before ignition. How can FERC ignore and  
4                            deny all of these studies done by our own  
5           21:20:06    government of the dangers and effects of LNG to  
6                            humans and the environment I will never  
7                            understand.

8                            Oregon and Washington have millions of  
9                            acres of secluded forests and unpopulated  
10          21:20:18    areas. If FERC is going to allow these plants  
11                            to be built, they should not come within 50  
12                            miles of any population whatsoever.

13                            MR. FRIEDMAN: Sir, please wrap it up.

14                            MR. MARVIN KING: I would love to tell you  
15          21:20:28    of every single LNG accident and explosion in  
16                            the world, but FERC has put the quality of all  
17                            of our lives into a three-minute speech. Go  
18                            figure.

19                            MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your  
20          21:20:40    comments.

21                            (Applause.)

22                            MR. FRIEDMAN: Is there anyone else that  
23                            wishes to speak? If not, at this time --

24                            MS. CHERYL JOHNSON: I'm coming.

25          21:20:52    MR. FRIEDMAN: Three minutes, Cheryl.

1 21:20:54 MS. CHERYL JOHNSON: Cheryl Johnson,  
2 Astoria.

3 I would like to take this opportunity to  
4 thank Congressman Wu, who repeatedly and  
5 21:21:00 persistently requested from FERC to extend the  
6 comment period for this draft Environmental  
7 Impact Statement. If it were not for his  
8 persistence, this would all have been finished  
9 a long time ago. His first request was denied,  
10 21:21:12 second request was denied, and he continued to  
11 be persistent. He was finally successful and  
12 it extended from 45 days to 120. We would like  
13 to thank Congressman Wu for speaking up on  
14 behalf of the citizens of Oregon.

15 21:21:27 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

16 This is not working. I'll have to speak  
17 loud.

18 On behalf of the FERC, I want to thank you  
19 all for being here tonight, providing comments  
20 21:21:39 on the DEIS for the Bradwood Landing LNG  
21 project. Let the record show that this meeting  
22 was concluded at approximately 9:25 p.m. Thank  
23 you.

24 (MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:25 P.M.)

25 21:21:51

\* \* \*

|    |            |                                      |      |
|----|------------|--------------------------------------|------|
| 1  | 21: 21: 51 | TESTIMONY INDEX                      |      |
| 2  |            |                                      | Page |
| 3  |            | Testimony by Mr. John Dunzer         | 18   |
| 4  |            | Testimony by Ms. Debbie Twombly      | 21   |
| 5  | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Mr. Ned Heavenrich      | 24   |
| 6  |            | Testimony by Mr. Ted Messing         | 25   |
| 7  |            | Testimony by Ms. Georgia Marincovich | 28   |
| 8  |            | Testimony by Mr. Jack Marincovich    | 30   |
| 9  |            | Testimony by Mr. Brent Foster        | 34   |
| 10 | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Dr. Jerry Havens        | 38   |
| 11 |            | Testimony by Carolyn Eady            | 43   |
| 12 |            | Testimony by Mr. Robert Boehm        | 46   |
| 13 |            | Testimony by Ms. Cheryl Johnson      | 48   |
| 14 |            | Testimony by Mr. James Kodama        | 52   |
| 15 | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Ms. Lori Durheim        | 56   |
| 16 |            | Testimony by Mr. Erie Johnson        | 57   |
| 17 |            | Testimony by Ms. Becky Read          | 59   |
| 18 |            | Testimony by Mr. Richard Parker      | 60   |
| 19 |            | Testimony by Ms. Jean Dominey        | 61   |
| 20 | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Ms. Elizabeth Mannarino | 64   |
| 21 |            | Testimony by MR. CARL DOMINEY        | 67   |
| 22 |            | Testimony by Mr. Roger Rocka         | 72   |
| 23 |            | Testimony by Ms. Jan Mitchell        | 74   |
| 24 |            | Testimony by Mr. Dale Treusdel       | 77   |
| 25 | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Ms. Jeanette Nachbar    | 78   |

|    |            |                                   |      |
|----|------------|-----------------------------------|------|
| 1  | 21: 21: 51 | TESTIMONY INDEX (Continued)       |      |
| 2  |            |                                   | Page |
| 3  |            | Testimony by Mr. Frank Aquesto    | 80   |
| 4  |            | Testimony by Ms. Carol Newman     | 81   |
| 5  | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Mr. David Ambrose    | 85   |
| 6  |            | Testimony by Mr. Jimmy Beckwith   | 88   |
| 7  |            | Testimony by Mr. Jay Kiddle       | 92   |
| 8  |            | Testimony by Mr. Murray Stanley   | 99   |
| 9  |            | Testimony by Ms. Laurie Caplan    | 101  |
| 10 | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Ms. Marj i e Castle  | 103  |
| 11 |            | Testimony by Mr. Duncan MacKenzie | 107  |
| 12 |            | Testimony by Mr. Steve Dragich    | 111  |
| 13 |            | Testimony by Mr. Vance Fraser     | 114  |
| 14 |            | Testimony by Ms. Gayle Kiser      | 117  |
| 15 | 21: 21: 51 | Testimony by Mr. Frans Eykel      | 119  |
| 16 |            | Testimony by Mr. Marvin King      | 121  |
| 17 |            | Testimony by Ms. Cheryl Johnson   | 125  |

\* \* \*

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

21:21:51

## CERTIFICATE

I, Robin L. Nodl and, a Washington  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, an Oregon  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, a Registered

21:21:51

Diplomate Reporter, and a Certified Realtime  
Reporter, do hereby certify that I reported in  
stenotype the proceedings had upon the hearing  
of this matter, previously captioned herein;

21:21:51

that I transcribed my stenotype notes through  
computer-aided transcription; and that the  
foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true  
and accurate record of all proceedings had  
during the hearing of said matter, and of the  
whole thereof.

21:21:51

Witness my hand at Portland, Oregon, this  
30thday of November, 2007.

21:21:51

---

Washington CSR No. 2530

Oregon CSR No. 90-0056