

1           BEFORE THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3

4

5

Pathfinder Pipeline Project

6

Docket No. PF 08-22

7

8

9

10

11

12

Public Scoping Meeting

13

Craig, Colorado

14

October 16, 2008

15

16

17

18

19

The Public Scoping Meeting was held at the

20

Holiday Inn Suites, 300 South Colorado Highway

21

13, Craig, Colorado, commencing at 6:10 p.m., and

22

was reported by Craig Knowles, CM, CSR.

23

24

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

2                   MR. MARTIN: It's 10 after 6, I guess we  
3 will go ahead and get started.

4                   Thank you for coming tonight. My name is  
5 Jim Martin, I'm the environmental project manager  
6 from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,  
7 also known as FERC.

8                   Seated to my right is Tamara Gertsch, from  
9 the Bureau of Land Management. And to my left is  
10 my project manager, Jennie Slade, from ENTRIX.  
11 We also have Jan Ward and Lavinia DiSanto, also  
12 from ENTRIX.

13                   The reason I'm here tonight is to explain  
14 the federal process as it pertains to the  
15 Pathfinder and Bison pipeline projects. Tamara  
16 will also assist me with that by explaining the  
17 Bureau of Land Management process.

18                   But the second and probably most important  
19 reason we are here for tonight is to hear from  
20 the public and to understand their concerns as  
21 they relate to this project.

22                   Before we get into the federal processes,  
23 though, we would like Joanne Unger from  
24 TransCanada to give us a short overview of the  
25 project.

1           MS. UNGER: Thanks, Jim. I am Joanne  
2 Unger, and I work for TransCanada Corporation,  
3 and I'm the project manager for the proposed  
4 pipeline projects. I would like to tell you a  
5 little bit about TransCanada and then get into  
6 discussing the projects.

7           TransCanada is a leading North American  
8 energy infrastructure company with pipeline and  
9 energy assets. Our pipeline business involves  
10 building, owning and operating pipelines for  
11 shippers and producers that want to move products  
12 to a desired market.

13           Currently, right now the company is  
14 achieving a significant milestone in our  
15 business, and that is the 50th anniversary of the  
16 first line that was put into service transporting  
17 natural gas out of Alberta and into eastern  
18 Canada and northeastern United States. That line  
19 is currently in operation today as well.

20           We own 36,000 miles of pipeline that moves  
21 up to 15 billion cubic feet per day of natural  
22 gas volume.

23           And our business, we are currently  
24 constructing 2000 miles of a 30-inch pipeline,  
25 called the Keystone Pipeline Project, which is

1 moving Alberta crude oil to Illinois markets and  
2 is intended to be in service by 2010.

3 We have another proposed project,  
4 expansion of that oil line which is a 3,000 mile  
5 Pipeline Project, a 36-inch diameter project  
6 that, again, will move Alberta oil to Houston  
7 markets. And that project is intended to start  
8 construction in 2010.

9 The company itself stands for a number of  
10 different things, but we really pride ourselves  
11 on our safety, our reliability and pipeline  
12 integrity, as well as our environmental  
13 responsibility.

14 As far as safety goes, we expect all of  
15 the contractors that we employ to meet or exceed  
16 our safety standards. We have been leading  
17 developers in new technology with regards to  
18 pipeline maintenance and integrity, as well as  
19 reliability that's used around the world by other  
20 companies now.

21 And we take environmental responsibility  
22 very seriously. We've engaged ourselves with  
23 lots of agencies in terms of the federal  
24 regulatory process, as well as other agencies  
25 where we are impacting the environmental

1 resources around us and continue to work towards  
2 minimizing that impact.

3 The project itself, I'll talk briefly  
4 about the Bison project. The FERC scoping notice  
5 that came up mentioned the Bison and Pathfinder  
6 Project. The Bison Pipeline Project was proposed  
7 by Northern Border Pipeline, and its project was  
8 to take the supply gas out of the Powder River  
9 Basin and move it to markets in the midwest, like  
10 Chicago, via the Northern Border pipeline system  
11 in North Dakota. And this project has been  
12 around for approximately ten years now.

13 Just recently, TransCanada acquired the  
14 Bison Pipeline Project from Northern Border and  
15 has become part of enabling the Pathfinder  
16 Project, the longer project that is targeting  
17 development gas out of the Rockies basin, and  
18 moving it towards the Chicago markets.

19 The purchase of the Bison Pipeline Project  
20 has allowed a single pipeline to be built between  
21 the Powder River Basin section and the Northern  
22 Border pipeline system.

23 So I am going to talk a little about  
24 Pathfinder now. Pathfinder as I mentioned is  
25 targeting the growth forecast we are anticipating

1 to see out of these basins in Colorado and  
2 southern Wyoming. Currently now there is plenty  
3 of infrastructure to handle the capacity coming  
4 out of the basin.

5 However, with the growth forecasts of what  
6 they are anticipating by the end of 2010 and  
7 2011, it's anticipated that that transportation  
8 capacity will be full, and the gas will be shut  
9 in, or it needs additional capacity in order to  
10 move it to markets.

11 The Pathfinder Project has come out of the  
12 need to find the markets most suitable for that  
13 gas. And TransCanada proposed the Pathfinder  
14 Project, which the pipeline originates near  
15 Meeker, Colorado, moves northeasterly up to the  
16 Northern Border pipeline system where it takes it  
17 into Chicago.

18 The project is approximately 670 miles and  
19 it's scoped to be a 36-inch diameter pipeline  
20 operating at an operating pressure of 1440 psi.  
21 The current intended in-service date of the  
22 project is to coincide with when the  
23 transportation capacity is going to be full in  
24 the basin, and our target in-service date for the  
25 project is the end of 2010.

1           We have been working on a lot of different  
2 activities over the last six to eight months, and  
3 some of those activities include initiating our  
4 FERC pre-filing process in June of this year. We  
5 have attended most of the areas along the line to  
6 conduct open houses which were held in June and  
7 July.

8           And we have been engaging agencies and  
9 private landowners to gain input on concerns or  
10 considerations with regards to our pipeline  
11 routing in order for us to help complete our  
12 detailed routing, which would need to go in as  
13 part of our application in Q1 of 2009.

14           The feedback we have gotten has been  
15 instrumental, as we don't want to file a route  
16 that has a lot of objections to it or that hasn't  
17 been fully vetted through an alternatives  
18 analysis.

19           In addition to this we currently have a  
20 number of different crews doing environmental  
21 studies and conducting engineering studies along  
22 the line which will assist in developing our  
23 detailed routing that will go in as part of our  
24 application.

25           We are currently anticipating that, with

1 the filing in the first part of 2009, we would  
2 anticipate to have an approved certificate early  
3 part of 2010. And the construction along the  
4 Pipeline Project would be completed in 2010, for  
5 an in-service date at the end of 2010.

6 We have a number of different people here  
7 from the company, from construction, engineering,  
8 land and environment. We have set up some  
9 information at the back, and we encourage all of  
10 you that are attendant today after the formal  
11 part of the scoping session is completed to  
12 please feel free to come back and talk to myself  
13 or others that are standing back there for the  
14 company, and we can answer any questions or  
15 concern that you may have.

16 Again, we really thank you for coming  
17 today to participate in the scoping meetings.  
18 Thanks.

19 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Joanne.

20 Tonight's meeting is a joint meeting  
21 hosted by both FERC and Bureau of Land  
22 Management. We have slightly different review  
23 processes that this meeting will support, but  
24 fundamentally the purpose of tonight's meeting is  
25 to get the public's input on the environmental,

1 safety and security concerns that they have.

2 Before we begin with going over the FERC  
3 process, I've asked Tamara to go over the Bureau  
4 of Land Management review process.

5 MS. GERTSCH: Good evening. As a  
6 cooperating agency I too would like to thank you  
7 for participating in tonight's sessions.

8 As Jim mentioned, I'm Tamara Gertsch. I'm  
9 the Washington office project manager assigned to  
10 this project, and I have just a few comments I  
11 would like to share with you about BLM's role in  
12 this process.

13 When BLM works on projects that cross  
14 multiple BLM states and field offices they  
15 ordinarily assign a national project manager, and  
16 that national project manager is myself in this  
17 instance, as well as a lead state and lead field  
18 office. Wyoming has been designated the lead  
19 state office and the Rawlins field office has  
20 been designated as the lead field office.

21 Our Rawlins office will be the office  
22 responsible for processing any subsequent  
23 right-of-way grant that crosses federal lands.

24 On September 9th BLM agreed to be a  
25 cooperating agency in the preparation of an EIS

1 that would address both agencies' concerns and  
2 needs for this project. These joint scoping  
3 sessions afford an opportunity for stakeholders  
4 such as yourselves to provide one set of agencies  
5 to the agencies to meet both of our  
6 responsibilities for proposed actions. We really  
7 encourage and need your input and comments on the  
8 project.

9 The information and comments you provide  
10 will enable FERC and BLM to guide the development  
11 of alternatives and assessment of those  
12 alternatives, as well as to develop appropriate  
13 mitigation measures in the EIS.

14 BLM as you know is the public landowner  
15 that will be ultimately affected by the  
16 right-of-way project. And the project crosses  
17 four BLM states, being Colorado, Wyoming, Montana  
18 and North Dakota, and eight BLM field offices.  
19 There is the Little Snake and White River field  
20 offices here in Colorado; Lander, Buffalo, Casper  
21 and Rawlins in Wyoming; Miles City in Montana;  
22 and the Dickinson field office in North Dakota.

23 The joint EIS will be used by BLM to meet  
24 our NEPA responsibilities in preparing a  
25 right-of-way grant. A joint environmental review

1 will eliminate the need for BLM to prepare  
2 additional environmental analysis in order to  
3 issue the grant.

4 The resource reports which are developed  
5 for the FERC certificate of filing will be used  
6 as the basis of the plan of development. The  
7 plan of development will be completed prior to  
8 any grant being issued, and it becomes part of  
9 the grant and contains the compliance,  
10 reclamation, mitigation and monitoring plans that  
11 will be used for the entire project.

12 At the end of the environmental analysis  
13 our agencies issue their own decisions, with FERC  
14 considering the issuance of a certificate of  
15 public convenience and necessity, and BLM issuing  
16 a record of decision for a right of way grant.

17 BLM would not, however, issue a record of  
18 decision on this project until 30 days after the  
19 publication of an environmental agency's notice  
20 of filing of the final EIS. That would be a  
21 publication in the Federal Register.

22 MR. MARTIN: Thanks, Tamara.

23 The FERC staff's environmental analysis  
24 will result in the generation of an environmental  
25 impact statement. FERC is the lead federal

1 agency, as Tamara mentioned, and BLM is a federal  
2 cooperating agency.

3 I would like to take a few moments now to  
4 further explain the purpose of tonight's public  
5 meeting. First, I would like to clarify that the  
6 proposed project was not conceived by and is not  
7 promoted by either FERC or BLM.

8 FERC reviews applications for the  
9 authority to build and operate interstate natural  
10 gas pipelines. TransCanada is in the process of  
11 preparing an application to submit to FERC. Once  
12 the application is submitted, our obligation is  
13 to review the application and prepare an analysis  
14 of the environmental impacts. We are here to  
15 listen to your concerns so that we can consider  
16 them in our analysis.

17 Pipeline proposals sometimes encounter  
18 objections. Some of the objections are general  
19 in nature and some are very specific to the  
20 environmental impacts.

21 Both of those types of impacts are  
22 important to the commission, but they are  
23 considered in different ways. Environmental  
24 considerations and safety considerations are part  
25 of our environmental impact statement. General

1 objections are considered by our commissioners in  
2 their consideration of the convenience and  
3 necessity of the project.

4 In our notice of intent, issued on  
5 September 30th, we requested your comments and  
6 assigned a deadline of November 3rd. We will  
7 take comments, however, throughout our review of  
8 the project.

9 But for us to adequately address your  
10 concerns, we would like to receive those concerns  
11 of the impacts as soon as possible so that we  
12 have time to analyze them. So we are asking you  
13 to provide those as soon as possible.

14 In addition to verbal comments provided  
15 tonight, we will also accept your written  
16 comments. If you have comments but do not wish  
17 to speak tonight, you may provide written  
18 comments on the comment form at the back table.  
19 You may drop those off with us, and we will take  
20 them back to Washington with us. Or you may mail  
21 them at a later date.

22 Be sure to include the project docket  
23 number, which is PF 08-22 for Pathfinder. If you  
24 have comments on Bison, the docket number is PF  
25 08-23.

1           The Pathfinder and Bison projects are  
2           currently in our prefiling process review. An  
3           application has not yet been filed with FERC. We  
4           consider the prefiling process to be an extension  
5           of our scoping process which is a learning  
6           process. So we are here tonight to learn from  
7           you about the project.

8           There are four fundamental ways that we  
9           gather information during scoping. The first is  
10          information provided by the applicant, and that  
11          is primarily in the form of environmental surveys  
12          that they are currently conducting.

13          We also gather information from other  
14          federal, state and local agencies.

15          Third, we do our own field work and  
16          research on the different issues.

17          And also, the fourth, and probably most  
18          important source, is information provided by the  
19          public.

20          Once we gather the information during the  
21          scoping process we will analyze it and we will  
22          prepare a draft environmental impact statement  
23          that will be distributed for comments. If you  
24          would like to receive a copy of the draft  
25          environmental impact statement, there are two

1 ways.

2 First of all, the notice of intent we sent  
3 out has an attachment on the back. If you fill  
4 that in and send it back in, you will be retained  
5 on the mailing list and you will receive a copy.

6 Secondly, you can fill in the mailing list  
7 form on the table when you came in. Please print  
8 your name and address, and we will add you to the  
9 mailing list.

10 If you don't do either of those things,  
11 then we will take your name off of the mailing  
12 list.

13 After the draft EIS is issued there is a  
14 45-day comment period. During that period we  
15 normally will hold another set of public meetings  
16 similar in format to this one. In those meetings  
17 we will ask you to comment on the draft  
18 environmental impact statement. At the end of  
19 the 45-day comment period we will begin  
20 synthesizing all the information gathered to date  
21 and preparing a final.

22 Once we've issued the final it is  
23 forwarded to our commissioners. Our  
24 commissioners at the Federal Energy Regulatory  
25 Commission will use that document, as well as

1 other information, to make a determination of  
2 whether or not to grant an authorization for this  
3 project.

4 At this time we will begin taking  
5 comments. We have a sign-up sheet at the side  
6 table.

7 Do we have any speakers yet? Well, if we  
8 did, what we would do is read them off and ask  
9 you to come up to the podium.

10 Since no one has signed up yet, I will go  
11 ahead and take comments from the floor. But  
12 first let me go over what we do with the  
13 transcript from tonight.

14 There is a court reporter that is  
15 preparing a transcript, and it's added to our  
16 docket for the project.

17 FERC has dockets that contain all the  
18 information submitted by the applicant and  
19 everything we issue on it and all comments we  
20 receive, and they are all contained within the  
21 docket on our web page, which is available at  
22 [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov).

23 Information on accessing the information  
24 that is provided there is in the notice. If you  
25 have a copy of the notice there are some very

1 detailed instructions on how to access that. If  
2 not, I think we still have some copies of the  
3 notice you can pick up that will give you  
4 information on how to do that.

5 From our web page is a link called E  
6 Library, and E Library is where all that  
7 information is available to download.

8 All that you need really once you get into  
9 our web page and to the E Library link is the  
10 docket number, which, again, is PF 08-22 for  
11 Pathfinder and PF 08-23 for Bison.

12 So with that, I guess I will ask for any  
13 commenters that would like to provide verbal  
14 comments into the record.

15 SPEAKER ANDERSON: I guess -- my name is  
16 Paul Anderson.

17 MR. MARTIN: Could we ask that you come up  
18 and state your name.

19 SPEAKER ANDERSON: Sure.

20 MR. MARTIN: I'll hand the microphone  
21 over.

22 SPEAKER ANDERSON: My name is Paul  
23 Anderson. And we have some property on that  
24 Little Snake River right on the state line. I  
25 assume the pipeline will probably cross it,

1 correct?

2           You know, my concerns from past experience  
3 with both FERC pipelines and the El Paso on the  
4 current 14-inch pipeline going through that is  
5 not a FERC project is the post construction.

6           What I've seen is the reclamation as far  
7 as weed control and revegetation really hasn't  
8 been very sufficient.

9           And I don't know. Does -- these FERC  
10 projects, I assume they fall under the Clean  
11 Water Act and storm water drainage, storm water  
12 drainage rules under the Clean Water Act; is that  
13 correct?

14           MR. MARTIN: Yes. We have our own sets of  
15 procedures regarding water body crossings and  
16 wetland crossings, things of that nature.

17           However, there are other permits that are  
18 issued. The Clean Water Act permit is by the  
19 Corps of Engineers, and it is a federal project.  
20 It will need permits from EPA, from the Corps,  
21 Clean Water Act, and Bureau of Land Management  
22 for their part of the project, as well.

23           SPEAKER ANDERSON: The way I understand  
24 the storm water management under the federal  
25 Clean Water Act is, on reclamation, is the

1        company is responsible for that revegetation up  
2        to 70 percent of the original ground cover.

3                I've been kind of disappointed in past  
4        projects, because I haven't seen consistency,  
5        especially in a wet year like we have had this  
6        last year, in reseeding and weed control.

7                Now, this current pipeline going through,  
8        it's a 14 inch butane-methane pipeline, it's not  
9        a FERC project. You know, what they were  
10       basically putting in their contracts is they  
11       would reseed once and pay the landowner to  
12       reseed.

13               I'm not sure how legal that is under the  
14       Clean Water Act and storm water management,  
15       because I thought they were responsible for that  
16       until it was 70 percent.

17               But under this TransCanada thing, I'd like  
18       to see a little bit better results and a little  
19       bit more effort in reclamation, weed control and  
20       revegetating.

21               Does this project, is it, is this company  
22       responsible for that until it's 70 percent ground  
23       cover, 70 percent to what was there before? They  
24       are responsible until it's that percentage of  
25       recovery, I guess? And even if it takes five or

1 six years or eight years, are they still  
2 responsible?

3 MR. MARTIN: I can't speak for what the  
4 Corps' requirement is. We have a requirement for  
5 successful revegetation. It doesn't have  
6 a percent on it. We do have a percent that is  
7 80 percent for wetlands.

8 So I'm not sure, you know, what the other  
9 agencies have as a revegetation requirement. But  
10 that is something we can look into it and  
11 certainly that is something we can include in our  
12 review.

13 MS. GERTSCH: BLM does require, it's  
14 either 70 to 75 percent. We basically in our  
15 plans of development are talking about probably,  
16 you know, it's usually at least three years, but  
17 up to a five-year plan for that amount of time  
18 for that seeding to come in and make that kind of  
19 a stand.

20 SPEAKER ANDERSON: And, I don't know, and  
21 this is just a question of curiosity, if it's not  
22 a federal FERC regulated project, are the  
23 guidelines still the same with BLM as far as  
24 something like that, reclamation?

25 MS. GERTSCH: We cannot dictate what

1 happens on private land. On federal land, on the  
2 BLM land we certainly can, you know, and we  
3 strongly encourage that same standard on the  
4 private land.

5 But we absolutely, if the landowner  
6 doesn't want that, or elects to do something  
7 else, then BLM's hands are sort of tied in that  
8 situation.

9 MR. MARTIN: Yes. And while we don't have  
10 a, sort of a long-standing percent that we shoot  
11 for, I don't think that is unreasonable to strive  
12 for that target, as well, for the rest of the  
13 project areas.

14 SPEAKER ANDERSON: I take it on private  
15 land, and I may be misunderstanding this, the  
16 state of Colorado, and I assume the state of  
17 Wyoming, is responsible for enforcing the federal  
18 Clean Water Act, which storm water drainage is a  
19 big part of it.

20 I know the state of Colorado takes that  
21 pretty seriously. I haven't been involved, it's  
22 just what I've read about.

23 But I guess I would like to see, and I  
24 don't know how much the BLM has enforced that  
25 with these past two FERC projects that's gone

1 through, but it doesn't appear to me it's been  
2 very efficiently enforced.

3 In our area up there along that Little  
4 Snake River, I've seen the weeds. And the lack,  
5 the lack of reseeding at proper times, especially  
6 on the steep hillsides where it really needs it.  
7 That is my concern.

8 And I guess one other question I had.  
9 This would be the fifth pipeline going across our  
10 place. And it's quite a pipeline corridor going  
11 through there, at the river crossing, they are  
12 all fairly close together.

13 How about, you know, I don't know what  
14 kind of -- and this is just hypothetical, you  
15 know. What kind of terrorist threat has been  
16 evaluated in a crossing like that, close  
17 proximity? Is there a threat? What is the  
18 danger of so many pipelines that close together?  
19 Is there a terrorist threat, because one ignites  
20 and it affects others? Is that a possibility, or  
21 do you have any idea? That is just out of  
22 curiosity that I'm asking that question.

23 MR. MARTIN: You know, that's a good  
24 consideration and one that we will address in our  
25 environmental impact statement.

1           The primary responsibility for pipeline  
2 safety, once they are in operation, falls under  
3 DoT and they have a special unit that deals with  
4 those types of issues.

5           We were hoping to have, I don't think we  
6 do, but we were hoping to have someone from the  
7 Department of Transportation here tonight. I  
8 don't know if we do or not. I guess we didn't.

9           We will take those comments to those  
10 representatives, and we will work in concert with  
11 them to try to provide some better answers for  
12 you.

13           SPEAKER ANDERSON: Is there other areas in  
14 the country that are just pipeline corridors like  
15 that where there is that number of pipelines?

16           MS. GERTSCH: Wyoming is the pipeline  
17 capital of the world, I think. It seems like it  
18 is, anyway. We have so many pipes going through  
19 Wyoming.

20           Right after 9/11 BLM was tasked with  
21 providing lists of all our major infrastructure  
22 like that to Washington, and I know they gave it  
23 great thought and concern.

24           But right at the moment we are also in the  
25 final stages of developing the National West Wide

1 Energy Corridor study. Those corridors basically  
2 have been, you know, with connectivity between  
3 the states, to basically get out energy, the  
4 transmission of energy out, not only electrical,  
5 but pipeline.

6 So they are, you know, it doesn't say that  
7 all pipelines and all transmission lines have to  
8 go within those corridors. However, that is the  
9 preferred area, and that would be areas the field  
10 offices would like to see that infrastructure go  
11 into.

12 So even though they ask for the lists of  
13 the infrastructure, yet we are still doing,  
14 identifying corridor areas for a lot of that type  
15 of stuff.

16 SPEAKER ANDERSON: I'll try to finish up  
17 here. I'm just asking questions out of  
18 curiosity.

19 As far as pipelines in the corridor, I  
20 mean, is there -- there's a limit eventually on  
21 how many pipelines go through. But is it based  
22 on, you know, the need, or will another corridor  
23 be developed in the future, say for  
24 transportation of gas out the Piceance Basin,  
25 north?

1           Would there ever be another corridor  
2 developed? Say we have three more pipelines that  
3 would go through. Would they follow the same  
4 corridor?

5           I mean, is that what, as landowners, is  
6 that what we can expect, is three, four, five  
7 more pipelines going in that same corridor, or is  
8 there a limit and would another corridor be  
9 developed?

10           MR. MARTIN: You know, there isn't a  
11 number that is a limit. I have seen other  
12 corridors that have five or six. I can't say  
13 I've ever seen one that had more than that.

14           FERC has encouraged the use of a single  
15 corridor for, mostly for environmental reasons,  
16 to limit the number of corridors that are out  
17 there.

18           I know this project has, I guess is using,  
19 for instance, a corridor called the Lost Creek  
20 Corridor. There is another corridor that has  
21 five or six pipes in it. The thought was that  
22 there are places where five or six pipelines is  
23 enough.

24           So I can't tell you what the future will  
25 hold in terms of deciding on where the best

1 corridors are. I can tell you that I personally  
2 haven't seen more than five or six in a  
3 particular area. But I have seen up to that  
4 many.

5 MS. GERTSCH: Again, that National West  
6 Wide Energy Corridor study, the limit or width  
7 they were looking at for those corridors was  
8 initially a standard of around 3500 feet. And  
9 they were based on resource reasons and based on  
10 topography and pinch points and what is already  
11 in there. Some of those widths were adjusted up  
12 and down.

13 Some were, basically said, we are full of  
14 pipes in this instance, so this particular  
15 corridor could only be for transmission, let's  
16 say. So they did come back and identify some of  
17 those types of uses like that specifying we are  
18 full of pipes here, particularly as we were  
19 coming down out of the Green River area out of  
20 Wyoming down south, that they basically said,  
21 that is full of pipe, we are not doing anymore  
22 pipe in there.

23 Anyway, I don't know what the answer is.  
24 I think based on, we have to look at each  
25 application separately about what the point is,

1       what the market is, what they are trying to get  
2       out of the state or into the lines and where  
3       their market is.

4               And certainly, we can't force everybody to  
5       go into the corridors. However, those are the  
6       ideal places as far as resources. And they have  
7       already been damaged environmentally, for  
8       instance, so they don't want to see, you know, I  
9       mean, somebody come and jump another half a mile  
10      across your place and decide that is a good place  
11      and then another half a mile. I think it seems  
12      like most people would rather have them  
13      concentrated in one area, rather than have to  
14      deal with a whole string of them across their  
15      place.

16             SPEAKER ANDERSON: I would prefer to keep  
17      them tight. It's far better for us. I have to  
18      say, the pipelines that have gone through have  
19      been very good companies. They have been good to  
20      work with. I really don't have any complaints.  
21      If there have been issues they have been  
22      resolved. And I would assume TransCanada will be  
23      good also.

24             But to sum it up, I would like to see a  
25      little more emphasis on post construction. I

1 really haven't been satisfied in our area. I  
2 haven't been along the whole route. I know the  
3 areas I've passed through, in this area it's hard  
4 to get regrowth, and we have had some dry years.  
5 But this was a good year to get on it, and I  
6 didn't think they got on it like they should.  
7 But the weed control has been disappointing to  
8 me.

9 I want to thank you for allowing me to  
10 comment tonight. That is all I have.

11 MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much for those  
12 comments. We do appreciate that. That is why we  
13 are here, to hear those kinds of concerns. Now  
14 we can take those back and put more emphasis on  
15 those. So we do appreciate that.

16 Now we can take those back and put more  
17 emphasis on those, so we do appreciate that.

18 Is there anyone else that would like to  
19 add anything tonight? All right. Well, we will  
20 stay here, and if anyone wants to talk off line,  
21 we are available, TransCanada is available as  
22 well. You might want to talk to them about some  
23 of those issues, too.

24 So thank you all for coming tonight.

25 (Whereupon, the formal meeting was

1       adjourned at 6:45 p.m., followed by informal  
2       discussions between FERC and BLM staff,  
3       representatives of TransCanada and ENTRIX, and  
4       the public attendees.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

This is to certify that the attached proceeding before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the Matter of:

PATHFINDER PIPELINE PROJECT:

Docket No: PF 08-22

Place: Craig, Colorado

Date: Thursday, October 16, 2008,

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription of the proceedings.

\_\_\_\_\_

Official Reporter