

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

In the Matter of:  
Apex Expansion Project Scoping Meeting

Location:  
Bountiful High School  
695 South Orchard Drive  
Bountiful, Utah

Date: June 9, 2009

Reporter: Brad Young, CSR, RPR

1 June 9, 2009

7:09 p.m.

2

3

P R O C E E D I N G S

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

DAVID HANOBIC: All right, we are going to get started now. Good evening, on behalf of the FERC, I want to welcome all of you here tonight. Let the record show that the Apex expansion project scoping meeting began at 7:09 p.m. on June 9, 2009. My name is David Hanobic, and I am an environmental project manager with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. To my right is Rich McGuire, also with FERC.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When you came in tonight at the table were our environmental consultants with ENTRIX. They will be assisting us in conducting our environmental analysis. Tonight we also have representatives from the Forest Service and the Bureau of Reclamation with us. They are David Green with the Forest Service and Beverly Heffernan with the Bureau of Reclamation. These two agencies, in addition to the Bureau of Land Management, will be cooperating with the FERC in the preparation of our environmental impact statement. I will ask each of the representatives to present a brief overview of their agency's involvement in the project in a few moments.

The purpose of this meeting is to give you the

1 opportunity to provide environmental comments  
2 specifically on Kern River's planned project. Kern  
3 River entered into the FERC pre-filing process on  
4 March 13, 2009, which began our review of the facilities  
5 that we will refer to as the Apex expansion project.  
6 The Apex expansion project would deliver gas into  
7 southern Nevada.

8 The main facilities that Kern River is  
9 considering for the project are approximately 28 miles  
10 of new 36-inch-diameter pipeline in Morgan, Davis and  
11 Salt Lake Counties, Utah; one new compression station in  
12 Beaver County, Utah, replacing an existing compressor in  
13 Millard County, Utah; and adding additional compression  
14 to three existing compressor stations in Wyoming, Utah  
15 and Nevada.

16 In a little while I will also ask Kern River  
17 to take the floor to present a more-detailed project  
18 description. They will also be available in the foyer  
19 after the formal meeting is closed, and they will be  
20 able to answer some more of your questions regarding the  
21 project.

22 Right now I am going to talk a little bit  
23 about the scoping process and public involvement in FERC  
24 projects in general. The main FERC docket of the Apex  
25 expansion project is PF09-7-000. The "PF" means that we

1 are in the prefiling stage of the process. No formal  
2 application has been filed at FERC for the project.  
3 Once Kern River files a formal application a new docket  
4 number will be assigned.

5 The National Environmental Policy Act requires  
6 that the Commission take into consideration the  
7 environmental impacts associated with new natural gas  
8 facilities. Scoping is a general term for soliciting  
9 input from the public before the environmental analysis  
10 is conducted. The idea is to get information from the  
11 public as well as agencies and other groups so that we  
12 can incorporate issues of concern into our review. This  
13 scoping period started last month when we issued our  
14 notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact  
15 statement, or NOI. In that NOI we described the  
16 environmental review process, some already identified  
17 environmental issues, and the steps FERC and cooperating  
18 agencies will be taking to prepare an environmental  
19 impact statement, or EIS.

20 We have extra copies of the NOI at the table  
21 in the foyer when you came in, if you need to get one.  
22 They look like this. If you didn't get one in the mail  
23 or didn't get one tonight, I would encourage you to get  
24 one before you leave.

25 We have set an ending date of June 15, 2009

1 for this scoping period. However, the end of the  
2 scoping period is not the end of public involvement.  
3 There will be another comment period once the draft EIS  
4 is published. An important step in the environmental  
5 review process and the preparation of the EIS is to  
6 determine which environmental resource issues are most  
7 important to you. Your comments and concerns, along  
8 with those of other people and agencies participating in  
9 this process, will be used to focus our environmental  
10 analysis. Your comments tonight, together with any  
11 written comments you have already filed or intend to  
12 file, will be added to the record as comments on the  
13 environmental proceeding.

14 We then take your comments and other  
15 information and work on our independent analysis of the  
16 project's potential impacts. We will publish those  
17 findings in the EIS, which will be mailed out to those  
18 people on our mailing list, and as I mentioned before  
19 will be publicly noticed for comments. Currently, our  
20 mailing list for this project is well over 2500 people,  
21 agencies and organizations. In order to contain costs  
22 and make sure that interested parties receive the EIS,  
23 we are requiring a positive response to indicate you  
24 actually want the document.

25 If you noticed on the notice of intent there

1 was a return mail attached to the back by which you  
2 could indicate you wanted to remain on our mailing list.  
3 If you want to remain on the mailing list from this  
4 point forward you must either return the mailer or have  
5 signed in at the FERC table tonight indicating that you  
6 wanted to be maintained on our mailing list, or send in  
7 comments to FERC with your address on it. Otherwise,  
8 you will not receive anything else from FERC on this  
9 project. Of course, if you are a landowner you will  
10 probably still receive information and contact directly  
11 from Kern River.

12 Also, please note that because of the size of  
13 the mailing list the mail version of the EIS might be on  
14 a CD ROM. This means unless you tell us otherwise the  
15 EIS you will find in your mailbox will be on a CD ROM.  
16 If you prefer to have a hard copy mailed to you, you  
17 must indicate that choice on the return mailer attached  
18 to the NOI, which you can do by checking the box at the  
19 bottom, or have told us tonight when you signed in at  
20 the table that you wanted to receive a hard copy instead  
21 of a CD ROM.

22 Now I want to differentiate between the roles  
23 of the FERC commission and of the FERC environmental  
24 staff. The five-member commission which is appointed by  
25 the president and confirmed by the senate is responsible

1 for making the determination on whether to issue a  
2 Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Kern  
3 River. The EIS prepared by the FERC environmental  
4 staff, which Rich and I are both a part of, does not  
5 make that decision.

6 In general, an EIS describes the project  
7 facilities and associated environmental impact,  
8 alternatives to the project, mitigation to avoid or  
9 reduce impacts, and our conclusion and recommendations  
10 to the Commission. So the EIS is used to advise the  
11 Commission and to disclose to the public the  
12 environmental impact of constructing and operating the  
13 proposed project.

14 The Commission will consider the environmental  
15 information from the EIS, public comments, as well as a  
16 host of nonenvironmental issues such as engineering,  
17 markets, rates, finances, tariffs, and design and cost,  
18 in making an informed decision on whether or not to  
19 approve this project. Only after taking the  
20 environmental and nonenvironmental factors into  
21 consideration will the Commission make its final  
22 decision on whether or not to approve the project.

23 At this point are there any questions about  
24 the FERC scoping process or FERC's role in this  
25 proceeding? Okay, that's my overview of the FERC role.

1 Next on the agenda I would like to introduce David Green  
2 with the Forest Service.

3 DAVID GREEN: Good evening, everyone. I'm  
4 glad to see you here. Your comments are important to  
5 us. This is a good venue for giving us your comments.  
6 Like David said, we are a cooperating agency with FERC  
7 on this project, and our role here is to provide  
8 technical expertise to FERC and to the Kern River  
9 pipeline project on issues related to the Forest Service  
10 lands that this pipeline crosses.

11 We have only two roles in this process. FERC  
12 is the lead agency, and our decision is to decide  
13 whether or not to concur with FERC's decision, and if we  
14 concur will amend the forest plan, if necessary, to  
15 amend it to allow this pipeline through the right-of-  
16 way. And we are here to protect the natural resources,  
17 soils, watershed, wildlife, vegetation, visual  
18 aesthetics, historic sites on your national forest.

19 With that, that's pretty much all I would have  
20 to say.

21 BEVERLY HEFFERNAN: Hi everyone. Thank you  
22 for coming this evening. My name is Beverly Heffernan.  
23 I am the chief of the Bureau of Reclamation's Provo area  
24 office. As Dave has stated Reclamation is also a  
25 cooperative agency on this project because both the

1 preferred alternative and the alternative going down  
2 Bountiful Boulevard as described in the scoping  
3 materials would cross designated landfill facilities,  
4 and, therefore, we would have a decision to make, in  
5 combination with the decisions that FERC has to make and  
6 the Forest Service has to make in dealing, as well, as  
7 to whether to authorize such a crossing.

8 So we will also be working with the other  
9 agencies in analyzing and looking at your comments, as  
10 well as the other analyses that Kern River has to  
11 prepare as part of this process; and then at the end of  
12 the EIS process we, like FERC and the Forest, would use  
13 that EIS and any other relevant information to make a  
14 decision on whether to allow the proposed pipeline to  
15 cross Reclamation lands.

16 DAVID HANOBIC: All right, thank you both.

17 Now I would like to introduce Chris Bias from  
18 Kern River. He will give a quick overview of the  
19 project.

20 CHRIS BIAS: Thank you. My name is Chris  
21 Bias. Good evening. I am the project director of  
22 expansion projects for Kern River in this particular  
23 Apex expansion project. This gentleman here is Doug  
24 Gibbons, the project manager over land environment and  
25 public consultation for this project. We are here to

1 give you a brief overview on the project and what we are  
2 about and listen to your comments. If you have more  
3 specific comments the project team members will be  
4 available after the meeting. We have maps and project  
5 and contact information outside. I have got quite a bit  
6 to cover, and in an effort to do that and stay within my  
7 allotted time I am going to give that a shot. So bear  
8 with me.

9 I am going to work with some slides a little  
10 bit during this process. If you want to direct your  
11 attention up there, that would be good. Here is a brief  
12 project overview. This map shows our existing and  
13 proposed facilities. The existing Kern River pipeline  
14 system which has been in operation since 1992 is a  
15 1680-mile natural gas pipeline system operating in  
16 Wyoming, Utah, Nevada and California. We are to  
17 construct and operate the Apex expansion project, a new  
18 29-mile, 36-inch diameter natural gas pipeline through  
19 the Wasatch mountains, Morgan, Davis and Salt Lake  
20 Counties in northern Utah. The proposed project also  
21 includes the construction of a new compressor station  
22 near Milford, Utah, modifications to the existing  
23 compressor stations in southwest Wyoming, Elberta, Utah,  
24 Fillmore, Utah and northeast of Las Vegas, Nevada.

25 The project would loop the Kern River

1 pipeline. Looping is a process of building a parallel  
2 pipeline along an existing pipeline route in order to  
3 increase pipeline capacity and enhance reliability. In  
4 2003 the majority of the Kern River pipeline system was  
5 looped, with the exception of the area through the  
6 Wasatch mountains and the greater Las Vegas area.

7 Next slide, please. Here is a map showing our  
8 preferred and alternative routes. Since the completion  
9 of the 2003 looping expansion project Kern River has  
10 sought to close the gap in the Wasatch mountains and the  
11 Salt Lake valley and has examined a number of potential  
12 routes. As part of the FERC prefiling process Kern  
13 River took part to evaluate and submit a preferred route  
14 that we believe to be the best option after considering  
15 stakeholder input, environmental and cultural and visual  
16 resources, construction constraints and economic  
17 considerations.

18 The FERC prefiling process is focused on  
19 public consultation, providing information to  
20 stakeholders and gathering their feedback and comments  
21 to help the company identify and define a preferred  
22 route. Kern River will submit the preferred route  
23 during this phase of the project from the FERC when the  
24 company files the formal application for a certificate  
25 of public convenience and necessity.

1                   Our current preferred route generally  
2 parallels the existing Kern River alignment through  
3 Morgan, Davis and Salt Lake Counties with local  
4 variations due to terrain, geotechnical, developmental  
5 constraints and stakeholder input.

6                   Kern River has also identified an alternative  
7 route that follows existing pipelines to the Bountiful  
8 City limits where it turns south and follows Bountiful  
9 Boulevard. It rejoins the existing Kern River  
10 right-of-way near the Eagle Point development in North  
11 Salt Lake. This route was determined to be a viable  
12 option because it has the least impact to the  
13 historical, recreational and environmental resources of  
14 any of the routes considered.

15                   In addition, by locating the route under an  
16 existing road there is less private property  
17 disturbance, visual impact to the mountains, and it is  
18 within a U.S. Forest Service designated utility  
19 corridor. Kern River will continue to work with  
20 interested stakeholders and affected communities to  
21 further evaluate the route during the pre-filing process.

22                   During our public consultation, specifically  
23 during the open houses we held in March, we heard from  
24 landowners and other stakeholders that the deviation  
25 near the North Salt Lake/Salt Lake City border was

1 strongly favored over the existing preferred route. As  
2 a result, this deviation became our preferred route and  
3 some variation of that will be filed in our application  
4 this fall. The deviation is still being reviewed and  
5 refined. We have and will continue to consult with  
6 cities, counties and other stakeholders to find the best  
7 route to this area.

8 Citizens have expressed interest in this  
9 portion of the route and, in fact, there was a tour  
10 there earlier this evening. We appreciate all of the  
11 constructive feedback we have received from the public  
12 and encourage continued engagement in the process to  
13 help refine the route and strengthen the project.

14 If approved pipeline construction will begin  
15 in early 2011, with operation by the end of that same  
16 year. Construction at some of the compressor stations  
17 could start in the latter part of 2010.

18 Why is this project needed? The Apex  
19 expansion project is needed for three primary reasons:  
20 First, demand for natural gas in the region is growing  
21 as a result of increased use by homes, businesses and  
22 electric power plants in the West.

23 Second, the existing Kern River pipeline  
24 system is operating at capacity and needs to be expanded  
25 to accommodate the anticipated increases in demand. The

1 Kern River mainline system has been operating at  
2 capacity since the original pipeline began operation in  
3 1992. The single pipeline through the Wasatch mountains  
4 and the Salt Lake area represents bottlenecks on our  
5 mainline system. We have parallel pipelines coming into  
6 the Wasatch mountains on the east and leaving Salt Lake  
7 City on the west, and have done everything we can with  
8 our existing pipeline facilities to expand the capacity.  
9 We increased compression, looped most of the rest of the  
10 system, and made other enhancements to expand the  
11 capacity. Looping this portion of the system in  
12 northern Utah is essential to any additional expansion  
13 of the Kern River system.

14 Lastly, enhancing system reliability along the  
15 entire route of the Kern River pipeline system. A  
16 looped pipeline enhances reliability and provides  
17 operational flexibility.

18 What are the benefits of this project? This  
19 project will provide significant sustained benefits to  
20 the region and to the Salt Lake area. It will add the  
21 infrastructure needed to enhance surface reliability and  
22 increased access to clean-burning natural gas fuel  
23 supplies for customers throughout the region.

24 Area residents will also benefit because their  
25 local distribution companies, such as Questar, and power

1 generators, like PacifiCorp, will have access to an even  
2 more reliable natural gas supply. The project will  
3 create long-term, sustained tax revenues for the  
4 counties crossed by the pipeline. For example, in 2008  
5 Kern River paid \$1.3 million in property taxes to Salt  
6 Lake, Davis and Morgan counties. With this expansion it  
7 is anticipated those payments will increase by an  
8 additional \$1.1 million during the first year of  
9 operation.

10 What about safety? Our highest priority is  
11 the safe operation of the pipeline system, and a safe  
12 pipeline system means a safe public. Pipelines are the  
13 safest way to transport natural gas, and the nation's  
14 infrastructure of hundreds of thousands of miles of  
15 transmission pipelines, including our region, have a  
16 solid safety record. Kern River has had no incidents on  
17 the system since beginning the operation more than 17  
18 years ago.

19 We will design, construct, operate and  
20 maintain the new pipeline to meet or exceed current  
21 federal safety standards. We have trained personnel to  
22 respond to any emergency in the unlikely event if it  
23 ever were to occur. Furthermore, we will continue to  
24 provide ongoing training and to cooperate -- excuse  
25 me -- coordinate exercises with the local emergency

1 response officials. Safety will always be our highest  
2 priority.

3 Kern River will respect the environment. The  
4 pictures shown, these pictures show pipeline  
5 construction in 1991 when the original Kern River system  
6 was built through the Wasatch mountains, and as it is  
7 today and restored today, in 2003.

8 I'm sorry the picture is a little dark. As  
9 you can see, on the left side is the installation of the  
10 pipeline. That's the green structure you see before it  
11 is placed in the ditch, and there is the gray right-of-  
12 way on both sides of it. This section is 12 years  
13 later, essentially the same type of terrain on our  
14 system.

15 Kern River intends to be a good steward of the  
16 environment now and long after the pipeline is in the  
17 ground. We are committed to protecting the environment  
18 during all phases of the project and subsequent  
19 operational activities. Early on in the preconstruction  
20 process we will conduct surveys to assess and evaluate  
21 environmental impacts. During construction we will  
22 employ various techniques to protect soils, plants, and  
23 wildlife, waterways, and areas of cultural significance.

24 Next slide, please. This picture represents,  
25 depicts a creek crossing area as it was last Saturday.

1 This is on the Kern River pipeline system. It is  
2 difficult to see the right-of-way, which is a good  
3 thing. It is also hard to make this laser pointer work.  
4 In the foreground you can see a yellow marker right  
5 along the creek. That's a standard pipeline marker. If  
6 you look at the ridge on the right it goes over that  
7 somewhat of a shoulder on the mountain area. In between  
8 there is a pipeline, and it is very difficult to see.

9 Our commitment will continue after the  
10 pipeline is constructed. We recognize the concerns  
11 remain about the restoration of the original pipeline.  
12 Revegetating some of the original route was challenging.  
13 We will apply what we learned from our original pipeline  
14 construction and subsequent expansions, and will work  
15 with the community and appropriate federal and state  
16 agencies to identify the best mitigation strategies for  
17 restoring the new route and monitoring the restoration's  
18 success. These slides show 1991 construction activities  
19 and what was restored, it looks like in 2003. Okay, I  
20 think I already covered that.

21 Next slide, please. This last slide contains  
22 important contact information. I would encourage you to  
23 use it.

24 The last topic I want to discuss is about  
25 public involvement. Kern River has and will continue to

1       conduct outreach with all project stakeholders including  
2       landowners, community leaders, environmental and other  
3       advocacy groups. We will listen to what stakeholders  
4       have to say throughout all phases of the project and  
5       will consider their feedback during the development of  
6       the project plan and our certificate application.

7               We have contact information at our table  
8       outside in the vestibule. Our Web site is available at  
9       www.kernrivergas.com. If you click on that you will  
10      find a tab that says "expansions." Go for that, or you  
11      can place a call at (888)222-1897. You can also send us  
12      an email at apexexpansion at kernrivergas.com. Those  
13      options are available to you. I would encourage you to  
14      use them both. Today we are here to support FERC's  
15      project scoping process. Please participate and share  
16      your comments with them.

17              To summarize, Kern River's commitment is to  
18      safely designing, constructing, operating and  
19      maintaining the proposed pipeline. We appreciate your  
20      input during this process.

21              Thank you.

22              DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

23              As Chris said, after our meeting here is  
24      adjourned, representatives from Kern River will be  
25      available with project maps and to answer any additional

1 questions you might have about the project. But at this  
2 time are there any questions that anybody has for Chris  
3 at this time? Could you please come to the microphone?  
4 Chris, you will want to answer at the microphone, too,  
5 so they will all be on the record.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What does it mean by  
7 "looped"? You are talking about a loop thing. I don't  
8 understand the loop part.

9 CHRIS BIAS: A looped pipeline system is  
10 essentially where you have two or more pipelines in the  
11 same general area and serving the same purpose. So it  
12 increases the capacity of the system by increasing the  
13 efficiency of the system in that area. Right now across  
14 the Wasatch mountains we have a single 36-inch pipeline,  
15 and if we were to loop that system as proposed in this  
16 project there will be another pipeline located fairly  
17 close to it, tied in to the system at both ends. It is  
18 like putting another lane on the highway, so to speak,  
19 as far as gas is concerned, if you want to consider a  
20 road analogy. Does that answer your question? Thank  
21 you.

22 DAVID HANOBIC: Any other questions? I would  
23 ask you to just come down front and say it into the  
24 microphone.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A couple of questions I

1 had. Number one -- well, a few -- we are on an  
2 earthquake fault, which concerns me.

3 Number two, my understanding is that the gas  
4 is going for California, the gas is going for the  
5 benefit of California; is that right?

6 CHRIS BIAS: Let me answer your first question  
7 first, and your second one second. We are very aware of  
8 the geological hazards associated with this region, and  
9 those hazards will be identified, evaluated, and the  
10 risk associated with that will be incorporated into the  
11 design. There are things done specifically with  
12 pipelines at fault crossings that make them much safer.

13 We are currently evaluating the fault. We  
14 have an existing pipeline that crosses that fault right  
15 now. It was designed and installed in a way to be very  
16 robust with regard to that type of an activity. That's  
17 being thought of. That's being incorporated into the  
18 design. I won't say that design is complete yet, but we  
19 are working toward that. We are aware of the hazard.  
20 We have some professional geotechnical experts working  
21 on that and engineers to make sure that earthquake event  
22 wouldn't damage the pipeline.

23 I am sorry, what was your second question?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Isn't this dedicated to  
25 go to California, not for Utah?

1                   CHRIS BIAS: This project is actually to serve  
2 customers in southern Nevada, pretty close to the  
3 California border, but it is southern Nevada. That  
4 particular customer has signed up for increased capacity  
5 on this pipeline. The Kern River gas system is an open-  
6 access, interstate, natural gas pipeline. And it is our  
7 job to move gas from where the supply is, which in this  
8 case is in southwest Wyoming, and take it to our  
9 customers along the system.

10                   In addition to creating additional capacity to  
11 move gas for this primary shipper, we also enhance the  
12 reliability of the system by essentially doubling this  
13 pipeline through the Wasatch, and it also allows us to  
14 provide more reliable supply for the other customers we  
15 have in Utah, and there is a substantial amount of Kern  
16 River gas that's delivered into the state of Utah.

17                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why are we even  
18 looking, why are you even looking at running down  
19 Bountiful Boulevard where there is homes, it seems like  
20 it is in heavily populated areas and it doesn't seem a  
21 very good option?

22                   CHRIS BIAS: Our preferred route follows our  
23 existing pipeline for the most part. We have an  
24 alternative which departs from our pipeline, follows a  
25 Questar pipeline, and runs down Bountiful Boulevard.

1 That is our alternative. We need to investigate  
2 alternatives. We want to stress that we are looking for  
3 the right place to put this. There is plusses or  
4 minuses associated with every route that was considered.

5 You talk specifically about the road,  
6 Bountiful Boulevard, it is quite an undertaking to put a  
7 pipeline in a city street, but it is doable, it is  
8 manageable, and while it does cause an inconvenience for  
9 the local traveling public to be sure, there is a lot of  
10 benefits there. There is not another scar on the  
11 mountain. There is not as many landowners impacted, if  
12 you can believe that. There is a lot less on that route  
13 because it is a city-owned street. So landowners are  
14 less, cultural impacts are less because it is a very  
15 developed area already. Wildlife impacts, environmental  
16 impacts are less. We have to balance that with the  
17 points you bring up and the other siting factors that we  
18 consider.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do we have an option to  
20 vote against it? Does any of the owners have an option  
21 to say we don't want it in our neighborhood?

22 CHRIS BIAS: We are trying to develop the best  
23 project we can that addresses all these needs. When it  
24 comes to opposition the best you can do is give us your  
25 input. The thing you are doing tonight, that's great.

1 That helps us a lot. Officially, if you want to try to  
2 stop it, I guess I would say the best recourse is to go  
3 to your federal regulators and look at their Web site or  
4 even ask these folks tonight about how to work that  
5 process so you try to achieve the objectives you have.  
6 We encourage cooperation with us. We love to try to  
7 answer your questions about any issues you have about  
8 our pipeline before you talk with the Government. But  
9 you are welcome to do both things.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You say Bountiful  
11 Boulevard could be torn up if you go that route. In  
12 your material you say there would be some facilities,  
13 some obstructed views or whatever. I don't know what  
14 you mean by that. Where you put your other pipeline you  
15 can still see it from down below, it didn't cover up  
16 very well, you have two scarred pipelines going up the  
17 hill? Do you have facilities, watch stations or  
18 something? It said an upright facility. I don't know  
19 what you are meaning.

20 CHRIS BIAS: Let me answer that last part  
21 first. I will try to get back to the beginning. As  
22 part of this pipeline project as it is currently  
23 designed there would be two what we call mainline  
24 valves. Those are facilities, there is a valve on the  
25 line and there is pipe that comes up on both sides of it

1 and goes around it. There is an example of one of those  
2 in North Salt Lake in that Eagle Point development area.  
3 We have one there. It is surrounded by an architectural  
4 stone wall. You wouldn't hardly recognize it. We would  
5 have two of those aboveground facilities. They would be  
6 placed in an area where we could have access to them to  
7 operate them, and we would seek to make them as  
8 unobtrusive as possible.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But would they be along  
10 Bountiful Boulevard where you would see them all the  
11 time?

12 CHRIS BIAS: If we were to pursue that  
13 alternative route those facilities would have to be  
14 located in a way that makes sense for the land use and  
15 the traveling public and a lot of things would be  
16 considered. Those sites haven't been selected yet for  
17 aboveground facilities on that route.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On your preferred  
19 route, you can't tell on the map, but is it dropping  
20 down where the houses are or further to the east?

21 CHRIS BIAS: The preferred route seeks to  
22 largely avoid residential development that has occurred  
23 and is planned or platted to occur. That's one of our  
24 objectives in siting that was to investigate variations.  
25 There has been enough development around the existing

1 pipeline that you really can't put it right beside the  
2 other one throughout North Salt Lake, for instance.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I see one big  
4 explosion, if we have a little bit of an earth tremor,  
5 that's doubling as much as we would get. But you have  
6 one there now, right?

7 CHRIS BIAS: We have a pipeline now, yes,  
8 across the Wasatch fault.

9 DAVID HANOBIC: We have time for one more  
10 question, if anybody else has a question.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why is it we are not  
12 trying to replace the system with a bigger system in the  
13 same line where we are at?

14 CHRIS BIAS: That's certainly a way to expand  
15 the pipeline is to do that. That thing is done in  
16 certain situations. This pipeline moves about a little  
17 less than 2 billion cubic feet of gas a day. If we were  
18 to replace that pipeline with a larger pipeline we would  
19 have to take that pipeline out of service for a  
20 significant period of time. There is a lot of energy  
21 dependency on this pipeline, and to take that pipeline  
22 out of service for even a day would have a major impact  
23 on energy in the West. To take it out for the weeks  
24 required to replace it with a larger pipeline in the  
25 same ditch, essentially, would have a tremendous impact

1 on energy for quite awhile. We have to keep the  
2 existing pipeline operating until the new pipeline is in  
3 service. The existing pipeline is only 17 years old, it  
4 is in great shape, we have proven that with multiple  
5 inspections. Adding another pipeline, besides giving us  
6 that increased capacity, also enhances system  
7 reliability, and gives us an opportunity to do testing  
8 and maintenance activities on the existing pipeline once  
9 the proposed pipeline is in service.

10 I hope that answered your question.

11 DAVID HANOBIC: All right, again, Kern River  
12 and FERC, and I'm not sure if the Forest Service and  
13 Bureau of Reclamation will be around, but we will try to  
14 be in the back of the room to answer any questions you  
15 might have after the formal part of the meeting is  
16 closed tonight.

17 Now we move on to the part of the meeting  
18 where we will hear the comments from the audience  
19 members. If you would rather not speak you may hand in  
20 written comments tonight or send them to the secretary  
21 of the Commission by following the procedures outlined  
22 in the notice of intent. Whether you verbally provide  
23 your comments or mail them in to FERC they will be  
24 considered by us. There is also a form where you came  
25 in tonight, on the back table in the foyer, where you

1 can write your comments and give them to me or hand them  
2 in back to the table to one of the ENTRIX folks, or you  
3 can mail them in by following the instructions on that  
4 sheet, and they will also become a part of the permanent  
5 record of this project.

6 The meeting is being recorded by a  
7 transcription service, so all of your comments will be  
8 transcribed and put into the public record. To help the  
9 court reporter produce an accurate record of this  
10 meeting I ask that we please follow some ground rules.  
11 If you signed up to speak, when you come in, please come  
12 forward, state your name, and please spell your name  
13 also so that the court reporter can record it  
14 accurately. Also, if you are representing any agency or  
15 group, also please state that and define any acronyms  
16 you may use.

17 For everybody else in the audience I ask that  
18 you please respect the person that is speaking and be  
19 quiet. Out of respect for the person who is speaking I  
20 also ask that you silence any cell phones.

21 We are now ready to call our first speaker,  
22 which will be Paul Rowland.

23 PAUL ROWLAND: Good evening, my name is Paul  
24 Rowland, R-o-w-l-a-n-d, and I am the city engineer and  
25 public works director for the City of Bountiful. The

1       mayor and city council send their regrets for not being  
2       able to be here this evening. Unfortunately, they are  
3       currently holding a public hearing to discuss the budget  
4       for the upcoming year, and they are required to be in  
5       that public hearing this evening.

6                They wanted to pass along that the City of  
7       Bountiful is strongly opposed to the proposed  
8       alternative route along Bountiful Boulevard. I would  
9       like to take a minute to outline a couple of points on  
10      which we are opposed to that route.

11              First off being that the public living along  
12      that route and the public traveling along that route and  
13      immediately adjacent to that route would be placed in  
14      unnecessary danger, or in an unnecessary risk.  
15      Bountiful is a city of approximately 43,000 people.  
16      Bountiful Boulevard is our main north-south collector  
17      road and transportation corridor along the east side of  
18      the city. In addition to being that transportation  
19      corridor it is also a residential road home to 185 or so  
20      single-family homes, 50 condominium units, several  
21      churches, parks, a large golf course, a cemetery, a  
22      couple of recreation sites, and our easterly most fire  
23      station.

24              The construction of a 36-inch-diameter  
25      pipeline in a road that is essentially a residential

1 road would during the time of construction pose  
2 necessary risks that such construction would create in a  
3 residential area. Bountiful Boulevard is the primary  
4 and in fact the only access to all of the -- much of the  
5 area east of Bountiful Boulevard, and in some areas it  
6 is the only access point to those residential areas east  
7 of Bountiful Boulevard.

8 The disturbance, the disruption during  
9 construction would create an access hazard for those  
10 people not only by safety personnel trying to access  
11 their homes, but in case of a fire east of Bountiful  
12 Boulevard those people not being able to evacuate those  
13 areas were they impacted during that summer of  
14 construction.

15 In addition to the risks that are taken during  
16 the construction time, the presence of a 36-inch-  
17 diameter, high-pressure gas line in a residential road  
18 creates long-term risks. Reference has already been  
19 made this evening to the fact that this area is a  
20 seismically active area with a fault zone generally  
21 parallelling Bountiful Boulevard. In addition to the  
22 fault zone there is a landslide area along Bountiful  
23 Boulevard immediately north of Mueller Park Road, which  
24 in the past has created problems with the existing  
25 utilities in the road and to the road itself. Should

1 for any reason, whether it be earth movement caused by a  
2 seismic activity or landslide or even as simply as an  
3 operator in a backhoe cause damage to that pipeline, the  
4 placement of valves along that line are so far apart  
5 that a significant amount of gas would be vented from  
6 the pipe directly into a residential area.

7 Another point is that Bountiful Boulevard, in  
8 addition to being a transportation corridor, is the main  
9 utility corridor for those areas immediately around  
10 there and the areas east of Bountiful Boulevard. A  
11 36-inch-diameter gas pipeline creates a substantial  
12 blockage in the middle of a road. The cross section,  
13 both horizontal and vertical, that it takes up, that it  
14 imposes upon, creates a significant impact on all of the  
15 utilities. That road has multiple water lines, sewer  
16 lines, storm drain lines, phone, gas, electric, all of  
17 the communication lines that serve not only the people  
18 that live immediately along the road but all of those  
19 residents who live east of that road and immediately  
20 adjacent west of the road.

21 That placement of that 36-inch-diameter gas  
22 line in a road that there was no corridor left in that  
23 road to accommodate that road will require relocation of  
24 virtually all of the utilities in that road. Laterals  
25 that cross the road that serve the individual

1 properties, main lines that cross the road that serve  
2 places east and west will all be impacted. In  
3 particular the gravity fed lines, the sewer lines, the  
4 storm drain lines will have the greatest impact because  
5 they have to follow gravity. And if this pipeline is  
6 placed in a position that is in conflict with their  
7 current grade, the resolution of that problem may extend  
8 well beyond the extent of the right-of-way, and in fact  
9 may never really be able to come to a complete and  
10 positive resolution.

11 That's the problems that would be encountered  
12 during the actual construction, not to mention the fact  
13 that virtually from then on all maintenance on those  
14 existing utilities would be impacted and costs increased  
15 by the fact that there is a 36-inch-diameter, high-  
16 pressure gas line in the way, and all utility work,  
17 either relocating or repairing existing lines, needs to  
18 take into account the danger of working around that  
19 high-pressure line.

20 Another point that I wanted to bring up was  
21 that during the construction, aside from the safety  
22 issues, there is just the general disturbance to the  
23 neighborhood, to the general population, and possibly  
24 disturbance to the golf course which uses Bountiful  
25 Boulevard as its sole access point.

1                   Now, we all know that all construction creates  
2                   some kind of disturbance, dust, noise, whatever is  
3                   associated with that, but most construction sites only  
4                   impact the several or few surrounding properties. In  
5                   this case the disturbance caused by this pipeline along  
6                   four and a half miles of Bountiful Boulevard through  
7                   Bountiful City would directly impact all those 185 or  
8                   235 abutting residences, in addition to the churches,  
9                   the golf course, the parks and all of the other people  
10                  using that road, 3500 to 4000 people who use that road  
11                  as a transportation corridor.

12                  It is our firm belief that the land around  
13                  Bountiful Boulevard is currently being put to its best  
14                  and highest use. That is providing the necessary  
15                  transportation corridor and access corridor for the  
16                  people who live along that road, for those people  
17                  traveling along that road, and as a necessary utility  
18                  corridor serving the people who live along the road and  
19                  in the proximity.

20                  Now, while Bountiful prefers that no  
21                  additional gas pipeline be constructed next to or  
22                  through the city, we would like to make some comments  
23                  about Kern River's proposed preferred route along  
24                  through the mountain. Since 1975 there have been  
25                  actually two pipelines built through the Wasatch range

1 here. In 1976 the Questar 24-inch line came directly  
2 from Morgan in almost an east-west line across the  
3 mountain, leaving a fairly significant scar that is  
4 still visible today, 33 years later.

5 In 1991 the existing 36-inch pipeline was  
6 placed utilizing part of the Questar corridor, and then  
7 veering more in the northeast-southwest direction.  
8 While the restoration work done along that work and  
9 shown here this evening was a little bit more rigorous  
10 than the original Questar pipeline, the corridor that,  
11 the clear-cut area used to install the pipeline was  
12 significantly wider, and in places in excess of 75 to  
13 100 feet wide. That's a significant amount of  
14 disruption to the hillside, requiring quite a bit of  
15 restoration.

16 Bountiful City would request that if  
17 ultimately their preferred, Kern River's preferred route  
18 is selected, that several things be taken into account  
19 with that. First, we would request that the overall  
20 impact be reduced by keeping the parallel pipe in the  
21 existing clear-cut area as much as possible, by  
22 utilizing the area that's already been disturbed to the  
23 maximum amount possible, and then when the restoration  
24 is done, the restoration be used not only to correct the  
25 impact placed on the hillside by the current

1 construction, but also to enhance the restoration that  
2 was done 16 years ago, 17 years ago.

3 Also when local deviations are taken from that  
4 route, because of the existing route being in areas  
5 where you just can't build adjacent to it, that those  
6 areas and those deviations are placed along routes which  
7 are hidden from the city, that the view shed is not  
8 further impacted by these deviations from the existing  
9 route, and that those routes, this route be chosen to be  
10 disguised, to be hidden both by the natural vegetation  
11 and by the topography. And then restore new and  
12 existing damage by replacing the natural vegetation,  
13 including, as much as possible, large, woody plants such  
14 as the native trees, the native Gambel oaks, big-tooth  
15 maples, and where possible breaking up that parallel  
16 ribbon that is created by the clear cut of the  
17 construction.

18 In conclusion, Bountiful City requests that  
19 both the natural and the human environment be given all  
20 necessary consideration in this process. Thank you.

21 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

22 Our next speaker will be Shanna Schaefermeyer.  
23 Sorry if I pronounce it wrong.

24 SHANNA SCHAEFERMEYER: My name is Shanna  
25 Schaefermeyer. I am the mayor of North Salt Lake. I

1 think you have heard the reference to North Salt Lake  
2 several times tonight. I want to thank FERC and the  
3 Forest Service and Reclamation for being here.

4 My comments tonight are going to kind of  
5 mirror what Paul has said. North Salt Lake is impacted  
6 by both alternatives. We are a city that it's going to  
7 have to go through one way or another. And the pipeline  
8 already exists and runs through our southern boundary,  
9 the existing pipeline.

10 As you consider the preferred route that will  
11 be then somewhat more south of the existing route, they  
12 have done that in an effort to avoid homes that have  
13 been platted and built in that particular area. I think  
14 we will need to really consider the investment people  
15 have made in those areas.

16 The route does go further south and goes into  
17 some open space area that is now in Salt Lake City. The  
18 boundary in that acquisition took place in 2006. And so  
19 that might not show up on too many records because that  
20 is just a recent boundary change. But if open space is  
21 given preferential consideration, then alternatives  
22 through the North Salt Lake residential areas will have  
23 to be considered. You don't have any choice.

24 And I am taking the position that the  
25 residential areas, which will have to go through some

1 existing homes, and may destroy existing homes in  
2 certain locations, is not good policy nor environmental  
3 management. The restoration of the open area, as Paul  
4 said, can be achieved, and there can be -- that  
5 alternative, the restoration can enhance the environment  
6 with restoring the native grasses, the planting of the  
7 trees and the other things. But please do not let just  
8 open space dictate and have preferential consideration  
9 over the location.

10 I also want to now go to the alternative  
11 route. Paul has laid out all of the problems associated  
12 with that. I want you to go through Bountiful Boulevard  
13 now and you are going to continue going south. At  
14 Eaglewood -- just before you get to Eaglewood Drive,  
15 Bountiful Boulevard turns into Eagle Ridge Drive, which  
16 is in North Salt Lake. They are one in the same. So it  
17 would follow Eagle Ridge. Now you have compounded the  
18 problems that Paul said by adding the homes there along  
19 Eagles Landing and all of the other developments we have  
20 along there, plus North Salt Lake's golf course, and  
21 that is the only route you can access North Salt Lake's  
22 golf course.

23 Not only is that compounded, but our whole  
24 water system has to be pumped in this area, and we have  
25 a large water tank there. So you are going to be

1        impacting the distribution of our water that has to be  
2        gravity fed to our residents. So that needs to be in  
3        consideration there.

4                    Bountiful Boulevard going into Eagle Ridge  
5        Drive puts, as Paul said, as many as 4,000, 5,000, we  
6        haven't done an accurate traffic count yet, down to  
7        Highway 89 where most of those residents continue on  
8        south and go into Salt Lake City. So it is a very busy  
9        street, it is a very important east-west corridor route  
10       for both cities.

11                    Of course, I mentioned that you will impact  
12       our golf course as well as Bountiful's.

13                    The residential area and the potential  
14       residential area along that whole corridor is still  
15       being developed, and with the disruption of a pipeline  
16       of this magnitude going through there it really makes I  
17       think for bad policy to consider this route at all. So  
18       I urge you to look not only at open space issues, but  
19       the investment we have made in residential, community  
20       development, and take these things into consideration as  
21       you give the final approvals to this particular  
22       pipeline.

23                    Thank you.

24                    DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you very much.

25                    Next on our list is Bob Linnell.

1                   BOB LINNELL: My name is Bob Linnell. That's  
2 B-o-b and L-i-n-n-e-l-l. I was mayor of Bountiful when  
3 this pipeline came through. I attended the Hanna  
4 Holbrook open house, or whatever name that was, on  
5 March 24, and I have since written a comment regarding  
6 that meeting that I would like to read into the record  
7 tonight.

8                   Before I do, I was interested in Chris'  
9 definition, his opening comment, he said a loop is one  
10 that parallels an existing pipeline. If we are going to  
11 loop it that way I can go home. But if we are talking  
12 about this alternative that doesn't fit within your  
13 definition of a loop I am not ready to go home. By the  
14 way, Chris, you indicated you have got several loops,  
15 and we are just filling the gap. On any of the loops  
16 you put in since 1993, have any of them deviated  
17 significantly from the parallel or have most of them  
18 followed that?

19                   CHRIS BIAS: Most of them have followed that.

20                   BOB LINNELL: So this would be a first, then?  
21 And unless I am mistaken, I don't know, I haven't been  
22 involved with city government for awhile, but at the  
23 time this pipeline came through none of it came into the  
24 city limits of Bountiful. It was all on Forest Service  
25 land and BLM and then joined into public land in Mayor

1 Schaefermeyer's city.

2 Let me, for the record, read in, and nothing  
3 has changed too much since I wrote this on March 24, but  
4 I do want it in the record.

5 "To Whom it May Concern:

6 "I just returned from a meeting at Hanna  
7 Holbrook School in Bountiful where your firm was  
8 conducting an informational meeting. All of the people  
9 from your firm I visited with were courteous and  
10 non-combative.

11 "From the onset of this memo let me reassure  
12 you I have no objection to you putting the additional  
13 36-inch pipeline in your existing right of way. I have  
14 a serious objection to you putting it on Bountiful  
15 Boulevard in the right of way.

16 "I was mayor of Bountiful from 1990-1994. I  
17 am more than passively familiar with the process you  
18 went through to get the present right of way approved.  
19 I conducted all of the multitude of public hearings in  
20 the Bountiful City Council chambers prior to the  
21 approval, and prior to your first gas being transmitted  
22 in the pipeline in 1992. We even had Congressman Jim  
23 Hansen (our congressman at the time) in attendance at  
24 the meeting and some of those hearings.

25 "I don't know if it is a case of corporate

1 amnesia, lack of corporate integrity, lack of  
2 institutional memory or all of the above. I dealt  
3 regularly for many, many months with Bob Keener  
4 (president), Cuba Waddington (project manager), Kirk  
5 Morgan, and Bob Slutter as the process moved forward.  
6 Scott Matheson, your corporate attorney at the time,  
7 (former governor of Utah), made an appearance  
8 representing Kern River at one of our many city council  
9 meetings and stated clearly there would only be one  
10 pipeline coming through the mountains east of our city.  
11 He even stated that you had a 50 foot right of way and  
12 the pipeline would be laid in the middle of the right of  
13 way because there would never be another line. He  
14 observed if that wasn't the case they would lay the line  
15 nearer one side or the other to allow for future  
16 expansion with another line.

17 "In the discussion this evening with your  
18 representative quote, 'We usually need 75 feet to  
19 install a line, but even though we were very cramped we  
20 were able to do it in the 50 -- our current 50-foot  
21 right of way.' If that's the case how in heavens name  
22 do you expect to do it on Bountiful Boulevard that has a  
23 46 right of way from curb to curb, has sewer lines,  
24 storm drains, two water lines, power lines, gas lines,  
25 telephone lines, cable lines and etc.?

1                    "I encourage you to spend your time and energy  
2                    on your preferred route and drop all this talk about an  
3                    alternative on Bountiful Boulevard.

4                    "Please feel free to contact me if you need  
5                    additional information. Bob Linnell."

6                    That was on March 24, nothing has changed, in  
7                    my opinion, and I still feel that -- I recognize, by the  
8                    way, the importance of moving forward. I understand we  
9                    have gas needs around this country, and energy needs, so  
10                   I am not opposed to that, but I have a serious  
11                   opposition to trying to use a city street, with all of  
12                   the things the city engineer and Mayor Schaefermeyer has  
13                   talked about this evening.

14                   Thank you.

15                   DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

16                   Our next speaker is Douglas Davis.

17                   DOUGLAS DAVIS: My name is Douglas Davis,  
18                   D-o-u-g-l-a-s D-a-v-i-s. I am a citizen here of  
19                   Bountiful, lived here my whole life, also a property  
20                   owner in Holbrook canyon, part of the Stringham property  
21                   where the current pipeline actually crosses down the  
22                   land.

23                   I would like to say that I second the comments  
24                   by Paul Rowland. I think it is well stated what he  
25                   said. I want to concur. I actually agree, support the

1 whole idea of a loop system. It is a great idea. My  
2 only comment is if this continues to go on the land that  
3 goes up to Holbrook canyon that it go in the same scar  
4 on the side of the mountain, that they don't create an  
5 additional scar, cutting through the family property in  
6 a new place and creating another one of those scars on  
7 the mountain.

8 And when they do, they put this as close as  
9 they can to the original pipeline, and that they, as  
10 Paul said, enhance the restoration and replace the  
11 natural vegetation that's up there so this preserves the  
12 view shed and the recreational value of the property  
13 where it does cross the owners' lands.

14 We do support this and think this is a great  
15 thing. I appreciate taking a hot shower in the morning.  
16 I do think that we need these natural gas pipelines. I  
17 want to say it should stay as close as it can to the  
18 present scar and that it be revegetated so it is less of  
19 an impact on the view.

20 Thank you.

21 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you very much.

22 Our next speaker is Wendy Fisher.

23 WENDY FISHER: My name is Wendy Fisher,  
24 W-e-n-d-y F-i-s-h-e-r. I am the executive director for  
25 Utah Open Lands Conservation Association, also known as

1 Utah Open Lands. Utah Open Lands holds the alternative  
2 enforcement powers on the conservation easement that is  
3 protecting the open space referred to I believe as the  
4 natural open space. It is also known as the Bonneville  
5 Shoreline Preserve as well.

6 Utah Open Lands feels that there need to be  
7 some additional investigations when it comes to this  
8 preferred alternative in terms of other routes,  
9 primarily because there are other routes that would be  
10 far less impactful, other routes that would go through  
11 areas that are anticipated to be disrupted with utility  
12 corridors and whatnot. As it stands right now the  
13 conservation easement does not allow for new utility  
14 corridors, and, therefore, placing a utility line  
15 through this particular piece of property would be a  
16 violation of the conservation easement.

17 I think it is important to note that there has  
18 been significant public investment in the purchase and  
19 preservation of this particular piece of property as  
20 well. Part of the funding came from Salt Lake City.  
21 Part of the funding also came from a \$24 million bond, a  
22 portion of a \$48 million bond that the residents of the  
23 Salt Lake valley approved to purchase open space. So  
24 there has been a significant public investment in that,  
25 then protected by the conservation easement.

1           The public value of the wildlife habitat, the  
2           geo-antiquity, the scenic, the public recreational  
3           value, the conservation value protected as part of the  
4           Bonneville Shoreline Preserve far outweigh the value of  
5           placing a private utility corridor through this  
6           particular property. Especially in light of the fact  
7           that there are other alternatives and that there could  
8           be additional alternatives that could be considered. So  
9           we would like to express our opposition to that  
10          alternative portion that comes through the open space  
11          protected by the conservation easement.

12                 Thank you.

13                 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you very much.

14                 Our next speaker will be Dee Burningham.

15                 DEE BURNINGHAM: Dee Burningham. I speak  
16                 mostly for myself, but I along with Doug Davis am one of  
17                 the members of the Stringham family, and we are much  
18                 concerned about the impact of this line if it goes with  
19                 the preferred route, even paralleling the existing  
20                 route.

21                 My primary concern that hasn't already been  
22                 addressed, and I do concur with what Paul largely  
23                 addressed, is that mitigation efforts in the past were  
24                 so feeble, and without being unduly critical when I see  
25                 projected on the screen a picture supposedly side by

1 side before and after, they clearly were not before and  
2 after of the same -- from the same perspective, the same  
3 location; but, rather, you had a line that came down and  
4 not the same picture of the same line and the same ridge  
5 line. And I think what that does is that raises the  
6 question, is it really possible to do a better job than  
7 Kern River has done in the past? I think they probably  
8 would admit that they could.

9 So I would like to concentrate on some of the  
10 things that I think are necessary to do that. One, Paul  
11 said you use some of the same major woody plants in your  
12 replanting. That was not done. Not only the beautiful  
13 white fir that are all along a half-mile slope of  
14 Holbrook canyon, where they cleared out and have not  
15 been replaced; but, in addition, there are other large  
16 plants that can be restored, the sawtooth maple being  
17 one and the chokecherry and a number of others.

18 And I would ask the question, if I can get a  
19 quick response from Chris, do you have to leave the  
20 terrain in driving shape? Do you have to physically  
21 drive back across those slopes? Is that permissible to  
22 get that answer?

23 DOUG GIBBONS: Chris introduced me earlier,  
24 Doug Gibbons, G-i-b-b-o-n-s. I am the project manager  
25 and I deal primarily with the environmental restoration

1 project, public knowledge and land efforts. The answer  
2 to your question is, do we need to maintain a road  
3 corridor? In this particular area we need to be able to  
4 maintain access to do future maintenance if we need to,  
5 but we don't necessarily need to be driving trucks up  
6 and down these steep mountain roads.

7 DEE BURNINGHAM: And you don't have existing  
8 roads?

9 DOUG GIBBONS: In most of the area there now  
10 it is not the intention to have the right-of-way be an  
11 existing road. The vegetation that is not directly over  
12 the pipe is not there, so the pipe can be maintained and  
13 protected. That's the purpose for keeping a  
14 right-of-way clear, primarily, in this area.

15 DEE BURNINGHAM: It seems to me that the kind  
16 of original plant life that was in this area is not deep  
17 rooted, is not the kind that is going to go down the 12,  
18 16 feet which your pipeline is buried. And to put back  
19 the same kind of plants that originally were there will  
20 make it so you don't look up that half-mile slope either  
21 side of Holbrook canyon and see this huge scar. If you  
22 can restore the same conifers, the same larger-growing  
23 scrubby oak and sawtooth maples I think that's  
24 significant.

25 And it would seem to me that we need to make

1       sure that Kern River has a firm commitment and mandate,  
2       if you will, to come back and work with the property  
3       owners. Bountiful City obviously is going to be the  
4       primary property owner that you work with across the  
5       area where we are concerned. If there are other private  
6       owners it seems to me they also need to be involved in  
7       ensuring and monitoring the good-faith agreement or the  
8       mandate agreement that you restore as nearly as possible  
9       the same scenic view.

10               The Stringham family is currently in  
11       negotiations with Bountiful City to turn over to the  
12       City for a small purchase price and a significant  
13       charitable contribution to Bountiful City that land  
14       which we own. And if we do that the trail which is  
15       going up Holbrook canyon, it is the plan of the City to  
16       improve that trail, it will be a more-used trail than at  
17       the present time. And for us it is significant that the  
18       scenic view which hikers obtain is preserved and  
19       restored. When I say "restored" it seems to me that if  
20       you are going over the same pipeline you need to remedy  
21       some of the past inadequacies as well as restoring the  
22       disruption that will occur again.

23               Thank you.

24               DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

25               Our next speaker will be Emy Storheim.

1                   EMY STORHEIM: I would like to turn my time  
2 over to Ben McAdams, if possible.

3                   BEN McADAMS: My name is Ben McAdams,  
4 M-c-A-d-a-m-s. I am here on behalf of Mayor Becker of  
5 Salt Lake City and as an advisor to Mayor Becker. We  
6 are submitting to you today, together with Salt Lake  
7 County, Salt Lake City and Utah Open Lands, a letter  
8 expressing some of our concerns with the proposal.  
9 First of all, my comments are related to the segment of  
10 the preferred pipeline route and the route alternative  
11 conducted by Kern River, documented in resource report  
12 No. 10, and my comments will specifically relate to Salt  
13 Lake variation of PD-2.

14                   According to resource reports, maps and other  
15 materials that Kern River has submitted to FERC the  
16 preferred pipeline route referred to as alternative D in  
17 resource report No. 10 parallels the existing Kern River  
18 right-of-way with deviations due to terrain,  
19 geotechnical and residential development constraints.  
20 One such deviation is located in Salt Lake City and  
21 referred to as the Salt Lake variation. This variation  
22 of the preferred route is proposed to go through the  
23 Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, an area that is protected  
24 natural open space and has been protected through  
25 extensive agreements between Salt Lake City, the City of

1 North Salt Lake, Salt Lake County, and Utah Open Lands.

2 The subject property is labeled natural open  
3 space and we refer to it as the Bonneville Shoreline  
4 Preserve. The Bonneville Shoreline Preserve is situated  
5 on the ancient Lake Bonneville shoreline which was  
6 created approximately 15,000 years ago. The Bonneville  
7 Shoreline Preserve portion of Lake Bonneville shoreline  
8 is unique, is really one of the last intact portions of  
9 ancient Lake Bonneville near Salt Lake City. Because of  
10 its unique characteristics it is a rare geoantiquity and  
11 should be preserved. This bench in particular has  
12 scientific and historic value, related to the  
13 exploration of the West and Salt Lake valley in  
14 particular, aesthetic value and community value.

15 For these reasons Salt Lake City, Salt Lake  
16 County, the City of North Salt Lake and Utah Open Lands  
17 have instituted tools to preserve the land in its near  
18 natural state. These tools consist of a natural open  
19 space land, land use zoning, and conservation easement,  
20 and a declaration of restrictive covenants recorded on  
21 the property. We understand those have a different  
22 place in the federal regulatory scheme, but just to  
23 express a local commitment to preserving this land.

24 In order to preserve the near natural state of  
25 the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, Salt Lake City

1 created and implemented a new zoning classification, the  
2 natural open space zoning district. The purpose of the  
3 natural open space zoning district is to protect and  
4 ensure stewardship over important natural open land  
5 areas of city wide or regional importance over the City  
6 zoning ordinance. Salt Lake City's overzoning ordinance  
7 defines natural open space as lands which are  
8 principally undeveloped, with near-native vegetation,  
9 and they include environmentally sensitive areas, areas  
10 of geologic significance, wetlands, stream corridors,  
11 foothills, mountains, shore lands, uplands, of areas of  
12 significant wildlife habitat.

13 Areas of Salt Lake City that are located in  
14 the natural open space zoning district are viewed in a  
15 similar manner as wilderness areas as designated by the  
16 Federal Government. The land uses that are allowed in  
17 the natural open space zoning district are listed in the  
18 Salt Lake zoning ordinance and are limited to those that  
19 reflect the purpose and goal of the natural open space  
20 zone. The only land use allowed in the zoning district  
21 are natural open space and conservation areas, and  
22 specifically this excludes the location of utility  
23 corridors and other uses within the land.

24 The proposed natural gas pipeline would not be  
25 allowed in the natural open space district, and allowing

1 the use would be contrary to the purpose of the  
2 establishment of the zoning district. With the  
3 introduction of the pipeline the land in question would  
4 no longer be principally undeveloped, as stated in the  
5 definition of natural open space; and, furthermore, the  
6 proposed pipeline would have both short- and long-term  
7 impacts to the natural open space area. These impacts  
8 include, but are not limited to, damage to the  
9 geological and geomorphic features on site, the  
10 narrative designation as a geoantiquity, visual effects  
11 during the construction and for the permanent  
12 right-of-way swath that is visually evident along the  
13 pipeline, and introduction of noxious weeds within the  
14 area.

15 Salt Lake City zoning ordinance would not  
16 prohibit the pipeline from other areas, but would be  
17 specifically limited to this natural open space  
18 designation, something that we have created and are  
19 seeking to preserve. When Salt Lake City acquired the  
20 58-acre Bonneville Shoreline Preserve from North Salt  
21 Lake, the warranty deed indicated Salt Lake City would  
22 convey a conservation easement in the property to Salt  
23 Lake County, Utah Open Lands Conservation Association,  
24 to the -- a Utah nonprofit, and the grant of easements  
25 was recorded on August 7, 2007.

1                   So in addition to the stated location and  
2                   intent to protect the property, the recitals identify  
3                   the Bonneville Shoreline Trail which goes through this  
4                   parcel as a significant regional trail, which traverses  
5                   this site and is accessed by the general public, is  
6                   consistent with the agreement, as an important  
7                   component.

8                   The purpose of this agreement that was  
9                   recorded in 2007 was to ensure the property is retained  
10                  forever as part of the Salt Lake City/Salt Lake County  
11                  natural space open area, and, therefore, is in an  
12                  undisturbed condition.

13                  I think it is significant to note because of  
14                  its location on the Bonneville shoreline, as a  
15                  geoantiquity, even disturbing the subsoil will have  
16                  long-term, permanent impacts on the scientific nature,  
17                  the scientific value of this land.

18                  I think it is also important to note this land  
19                  was preserved through significant public contribution.  
20                  In fact, voters improved an open-space bond for the  
21                  acquisition and preservation of an open space in Salt  
22                  Lake County. One of the first projects that was done  
23                  with the money through the voter-approved bond was to  
24                  acquire and preserve the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve,  
25                  of which the Salt Lake variation goes right through the

1 middle of this preserve and bisects it.

2 I would like to make a few comments on some  
3 comments that are in Kern River's resource report  
4 No. 10. First of all, on page 9 of resource report  
5 No. 10 it states that the -- referring to some other  
6 alternatives than alternative A that Kern River  
7 evaluated, Kern River states that the proximity of  
8 alternative A to the Legacy Nature Preserve poses  
9 environmental issues, including the likelihood of  
10 constructing in the city more threatened or endangered  
11 species than would be expected with alternative routes.  
12 The Legacy Nature Preserve was created specifically to  
13 mitigate unavoidable impacts resulting from the  
14 construction of the Legacy highway. As such, the  
15 preserve management plan had provisions limiting the  
16 establishment of new utilities, and would require more  
17 extensive environmental permitting.

18 So while the resource report establishes the  
19 Legacy Nature Preserve as a sensitive area and is one of  
20 the reasons that alternative A is not the preferred or  
21 alternative route, Salt Lake City, North Salt Lake and  
22 Salt Lake County have undergone a similar process in  
23 creating the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve. The  
24 conservation easement, the declaration of restrictive  
25 covenants has been signed by these entities, and has

1       been recorded on the property. This agreement  
2       specifically states, according to the Legacy Nature  
3       Preserve, that no utility rights-of-way should be  
4       located within the properties or granted through  
5       easements after the date of this instrument. So we  
6       believe the same environmental consideration given to  
7       the Legacy Nature Preserve should be afforded to the  
8       Bonneville Shoreline Preserve.

9               Furthermore, on page 11 of research report  
10       No. 10 it describes alternative D, the preferred route.  
11       We believe this statement is not complete, that it does  
12       not address the Salt Lake variation which does go  
13       through the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve.

14              Page 13 describes alternatives summary. While  
15       this may be the case for the overall alternative D, we  
16       believe it is not complete in its analysis because it  
17       does not describe the Salt Lake variation, which --  
18       well, point No. 4 says it devoids nature preserves or  
19       otherwise environmentally sensitive areas. It does go  
20       through the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, really right  
21       through the heart of it.

22              Finally, the alternative comparative summary  
23       provided in appendix 10-A, while the Salt Lake variation  
24       to the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve does not address an  
25       alternatives comparison, under alternative B there is no

1 mention of natural open space area in the land use  
2 column, and there is no mention of local jurisdictions  
3 in the anticipated permitting requirements column. The  
4 Salt Lake variation needs to be closely evaluated when  
5 compared to other alternatives as to environmental  
6 impacts, by means of an environmental impact statement  
7 performed within the National Environmental Policy Act.

8           So we oppose the potential deviation PD-2.  
9 These entities have worked to enact tools such as the  
10 natural open space zoning, and placed a conservation  
11 easement and declaration of restrictive covenants to  
12 protect all of the conservation values, including public  
13 access to the region of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail,  
14 and the unique geoantiquity status of this property to  
15 protect it as a public trust.

16           The property's value to the public extends  
17 beyond adjacent landowners to all those residents who  
18 voted overwhelmingly in favor to tax themselves to  
19 purchase and preserve this open space. The public use  
20 to which the property is dedicated, public recreational  
21 enjoyment, public wildlife viewing, scenic enjoyment and  
22 the protection of ecological value is a higher public  
23 purpose than that of the proposed pipeline.

24           Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County and Utah Open  
25 Lands Conservation Association find objectionable the

1 long-term environmental and geological negative impacts  
2 to the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, and a precedent  
3 would be set in violating the terms of an existing  
4 conservation easement, declaration of restrictive  
5 covenants in order to accommodate the variation of  
6 alternative D.

7           Since plausible, low-cost alternatives exist  
8 for the location of the Kern River pipeline, and we  
9 believe there are alternatives that haven't been  
10 identified at this point where it could be located  
11 outside of the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, but in an  
12 area that has not been designated for current  
13 development, does not have houses or lots in the  
14 right-of-way, that there is an option to avoid the  
15 Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, while still bringing the  
16 pipeline through, we believe that should be considered.  
17 We believe that, we strongly encourage Kern River to  
18 remove from consideration the currently designated  
19 preferred alignment of the pipeline through the  
20 Bonneville Shoreline Preserve.

21           I would like to express the regrets of Mayor  
22 Becker, who is not able to attend today. He is out of  
23 town, and asked me to send his regards. And members of  
24 the Salt Lake City Council, who are also very concerned  
25 with this preferred alternative and who would like to

1 see it preserved. They are not able to join us today  
2 because they are having their open council meeting this  
3 evening.

4 Thank you.

5 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

6 Our next speaker is Wayne Mills.

7 WAYNE MILLS: Thank you very much. My name is  
8 Wayne Mills, M-i-l-l-s, here to speak on behalf of the  
9 Salt Lake City Planning Division. I will make my  
10 comments brief.

11 This is in reference to the Salt Lake  
12 variation portion of alternative D, the preferred route.  
13 That preferred route goes through an area, as mentioned  
14 before, natural open space area. Salt Lake City  
15 committed a lot of time and resources in creating and  
16 implementing a zoning district called the NOS, for the  
17 specific purpose of preserving valuable natural open  
18 space lands.

19 As mentioned before, the only allowed land  
20 uses in the district are natural preservation areas,  
21 such as the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The Salt Lake  
22 City Planning Division's position is that the Salt Lake  
23 City zoning ordinance would need to be amended to allow  
24 the pipeline use in this zoning district, in the NOS  
25 district. And the Salt Lake City Planning Division will

1 not support this amendment because it would undermine  
2 the purpose of the NOS designation of this area as well  
3 as other natural open-space-zoned areas in the city.

4 Thank you very much.

5 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

6 Our next speaker is Julie Peck-Dabling.

7 JULIE PECK-DABLING: Good evening. My name is  
8 Julie Peck-Dabling, last name spelled P-e-c-k -  
9 D-a-b-l-i-n-g. I am the open space program coordinator  
10 for Salt Lake County, and my comments will also be very  
11 brief, since Mr. McAdams did read into the record the  
12 letter from the Mayor of Salt Lake City, Salt Lake  
13 County and Utah Open Lands.

14 In 2006 the Salt Lake County voters  
15 overwhelmingly approved a \$48 million bond for parks and  
16 open space, 24 million for park and land acquisition,  
17 and 24 million for open space. Shortly thereafter,  
18 early 2007, Salt Lake County paid \$1.75 million dollars  
19 for a conservation easement for the Bonneville Shoreline  
20 Preserve. There were several reasons that motivated the  
21 Salt Lake County Open Space Trust Fund Committee, the  
22 Salt Lake County mayor, and the county council to  
23 purchase an easement on this parcel.

24 Number one, it has unique historical  
25 geological formations that make it a geoantiquity.

1                   Number two, it is a wildlife corridor.

2                   Three, it contains native plant species and is  
3 relatively unspoiled by invasives at this point in time.

4                   Certainly, the construction of a pipeline  
5 would compromise the soil and plants and increase the  
6 likelihood of more invasives, as well as individuals  
7 that might choose to use that line for a new and illegal  
8 trail into the Salt Lake City watershed.

9                   As I stated earlier the letter was read into  
10 the record. Salt Lake County is very concerned about  
11 this and opposes the Salt Lake variation alternative D  
12 as it stands now.

13                   Thank you.

14                   DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

15                   Our next speaker will be John Bowman.

16                   JOHN BOWMAN: Good evening. My name is John  
17 Bowman, J-o-h-n B-o-w-m-a-n. I live in Salt Lake City.  
18 I am a professor of geology at the University of Utah,  
19 but I am here tonight speaking as a private citizen, and  
20 I want to urge you to reject the pipeline proposals or  
21 routes that go through the Bonneville Shoreline  
22 Preserve.

23                   This is not just any open space. Tonight I  
24 want to speak to the scientific and cultural value to  
25 our community. The Bonneville Shoreline Preserve

1 contains one of the last undeveloped segments of the  
2 Bonneville bench, the preserved shoreline of the  
3 Pleistocene or ice age Lake Bonneville along the Wasatch  
4 Front. The shoreline is the highest and most prominent  
5 level of Lake Bonneville, formed about 15,000 years ago,  
6 and it is one of the most striking topographic and  
7 scenic features of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake valley.  
8 I simply don't know of any major city anywhere in the  
9 world that is so fortunate to have such a fine example  
10 of a Pleistocene lake terrace here developed in its  
11 vicinity. There is just no other city on the planet  
12 that does this.

13 The geological study of the Bonneville bench  
14 is an important part of the historical and scientific  
15 exploration of Salt Lake valley and Utah. The first  
16 scientific study of the Lake Bonneville benches was  
17 begun in the 1870's by a scientist named G. K. Gilbert,  
18 a protégé of John Wesley Powell, and a pioneer of the  
19 first geological and geographical surveys of the Utah  
20 and the Colorado plateau. He is one of the great  
21 scientific people of the 19th century, let alone an  
22 earth scientist. And he gave us a classic study of Lake  
23 Bonneville. And it was published in 1890 as monograph 1  
24 of the newly established U.S. Geological Survey. This  
25 monograph signified the importance of scientific

1 exploration of the West, and it is considered  
2 unparalleled as a report, and its conclusions have  
3 withstood a century of subsequent study.

4 The Bonneville bench is a rare, world-class  
5 geological feature called a geoantiquity. That term has  
6 been stated here a couple times tonight. A geoantiquity  
7 is defined as a natural record of recent earth history  
8 that documents environmental changes on local, regional,  
9 or even global scales. Geoantiquities are typically  
10 expressed as a surface landscape shaped by processes  
11 such as immersion or deposition of sediment.

12 Now, there are many geoantiquities, but only a  
13 few percent rank as the very finest because of the  
14 completeness of their record and their surface  
15 expression and the well-preserved details within the  
16 subsurface. The Bonneville Shoreline Preserve ranks in  
17 this top percent. It is one of the finest sections of a  
18 Pleistocene lake terrace that exists in the world. A  
19 geoantiquity is analogous to a site or an item of  
20 historical significance, an antique that is rare and  
21 high quality. Because of that it is worth preserving.

22 This analogy is really appropriate. We all  
23 sometimes watch the TV program Antiques Roadshow.  
24 Owners bring items in that at first glance don't look  
25 like much, don't appear to have much value, such as

1 layers of sand and gravel. However, once the owner  
2 learns about the identity and history of this item and  
3 discovers it is valuable, they commit to preserving that  
4 item.

5 The same can be said here in geoantiquities.  
6 We have a valuable one in the Salt Lake City area. This  
7 is the area of the Bonneville bench. It is rare and  
8 deserves protection. It is the last intact surface,  
9 section of high-quality Bonneville bench that exists not  
10 only in Salt Lake City, but in Salt Lake County and  
11 Davis County.

12 These Pleistocene geological features such as  
13 the Bonneville bench are important scientifically. They  
14 give scientists an opportunity to study climate, past  
15 climate, so we can better understand what might happen  
16 in the future. They can help us understand hydrologic  
17 changes, such as lake levels, river discharges and so  
18 forth. They can preserve sometimes geodynamic events,  
19 layers or strata record history of earthquakes. There  
20 is other environmental parameters that were preserved in  
21 the sediment, such as records of fire and changes in  
22 communities here.

23 Finally, because of this information they  
24 provide critical input into policy issues, such as  
25 hazard mitigation and environmental quality. So it is

1 important to emphasize here alteration of the  
2 geoantiquity can destroy any hope of gaining this  
3 valuable scientific information, whether it is on  
4 changing the surface of the geoantiquity or changing the  
5 subsurface, keeping the geoantiquity intact is a  
6 critical issue here.

7 So I guess, in summary, I would like to say  
8 that the Bonneville bench adds great scenic, cultural,  
9 scientific and recreational value to our metropolitan  
10 area, and it deserves to be preserved as undeveloped and  
11 undisturbed open space. So if this section of the  
12 Bonneville bench isn't preserved, there simply aren't  
13 any other good sections left of the Bonneville bench to  
14 be preserved along the Wasatch Front. So I urge you to  
15 keep the pipeline route out of what is really an  
16 irreplaceable section of this geoantiquity.

17 Thank you for your time.

18 DAVID HANOBIC: Our next speaker will be Paul  
19 Reimann.

20 PAUL REIMANN: Thank you for the opportunity  
21 to address you tonight. My name is spelled P-a-u-l  
22 R-e-i-m-a-n-n. I am a retired aerospace engineer. I  
23 was in the early 80's on Bountiful's public utilities  
24 committee for Bountiful's master plan, and we did have  
25 to consider factors like gas lines going over fault

1 zones. Since that time I have had no reason to become  
2 less alarmed, but, rather, more so.

3 I have here a book called "Peace of Mind in  
4 Earthquake Country." Utah is prominently featured. We  
5 have here kind of a vertical fault, of sliding down a  
6 mountain, as it were, a tectonic face. It is a  
7 particularly dangerous zone, as is mentioned in the book  
8 here, one of the most dangerous in the United States.  
9 Much of it is unexplored because it is so deep. When we  
10 are talking about damage that may occur to gas lines  
11 from faults, those faults have to be explored and  
12 understood, and they go way down.

13 My father-in-law was one of the heads of the  
14 geological survey. He gave me a book describing the  
15 earthquakes, including here in Utah, and these are not  
16 simple lines that go from one point to another point and  
17 that's it. There are many, many parallel lines going  
18 off in many different directions. They are not as well  
19 explored as many people would have us believe.

20 I believe our first purpose here is to sustain  
21 human civilization and life. I think that we have to  
22 consider the effect that could happen if we had a  
23 catastrophic explosion of the pipeline, and particularly  
24 if we had a catastrophic explosion of the pipeline that  
25 would introduce a parallel explosion of the pipeline.

1       So on the basis of safety I think that those people who  
2       live along Bountiful Boulevard should be considered.

3               We had a time recently in which there was a  
4       lot of concern about having a parallel or alternative  
5       route in case of a natural disaster such as the  
6       earthquakes that occur about every 450 to 600 years in  
7       this area up to magnitude 7.1 or 7.2.

8               When the Legacy highway was finally built we  
9       breathed a sigh of relief saying at least now if I-15 is  
10      blocked, as it has been a few times, now we have another  
11      path, but in reality that path is not there if the  
12      pipeline were to be blown up on Bountiful Boulevard. I  
13      live somewhat below that, not one of the immediate  
14      residents up there, but I truly can appreciate the  
15      concern.

16              I think some things that have not been  
17      considered here is I would like to know whether or not  
18      there is airline flight -- not airline flight -- but,  
19      rather, aerial flight over the pipeline to look for  
20      damage. My brother used to fly pipeline inspection,  
21      some of the most dangerous jobs in existence, competing  
22      with tuna boat fishermen sometimes. One of my neighbors  
23      three houses up I understand was killed in such a  
24      flight. I don't know where that was. If you have two  
25      pipelines instead of one and you are flying an aerial

1 inspection, how is it possible with the same number of  
2 people to do that inspection as well? That is not  
3 necessarily having to do with the route that's taken,  
4 but just to mention that there are other concerns.

5 Nevada is the target for the natural gas.  
6 Nevada seems also perhaps intent on acquiring some of  
7 Utah's aquifers on its western edge. I do wonder  
8 whether or not there is as much estimated need for  
9 growth in natural gas use or further resources given  
10 recent developments. I hope that uppermost will be the  
11 residents along that route and those who would be in  
12 danger by the additional pipeline.

13 I would have to say that we do have very much  
14 in favor of providing the resources we need, but I think  
15 we need to do it in a way that is responsible to the  
16 lives of people. There are a great number of lives that  
17 can be endangered if this is run in conflict with all of  
18 the other routes and areas of transit that are required  
19 for the public utilities that are required for everyone.  
20 That impacts a lot of people, not just the 43,000 people  
21 of Bountiful, but also North Salt Lake. I hope  
22 consideration for the residents will be uppermost in the  
23 decision that you make.

24 And I thank you for the opportunity to speak.  
25 Thank you.

1                   DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

2                   Our next speaker is Wendy Wolf.

3                   WENDY WOLF: I am Wendy Wolf. I am a citizen  
4 of Salt Lake. That's W-e-n-d-y W-o-l-f. I want to  
5 thank you for the opportunity to speak as a person who  
6 has hiked the trail and value the open space that is  
7 partly considered for the pipeline.

8                   I want to voice my opposition to that part of  
9 the route, because it goes through the Bonneville  
10 Shoreline Preserve, which was paid for by a bond that  
11 was supported by the citizens. It represented our  
12 commitment to open space, and I believe that that should  
13 be a big consideration. When we begin to erode the  
14 easement's power to protect our open space, I think that  
15 that needs to be seriously considered and avoided where  
16 possible.

17                   I want to acknowledge Kern River's attempts at  
18 mitigation, and I know that that's done in good faith.  
19 Some of the people who have spoken earlier spoke of the  
20 scarring that still exists from the previous pipeline,  
21 so I have to say that I don't know how much confidence I  
22 have in the ability to make it look like it did before.

23                   Also, I'm concerned about the damage to  
24 geologic features and the historic record that might be  
25 done and not ever repairable. It seems to me that the

1 issues that Professor Bowman brought up and the fact  
2 that scarring is still visible from the last time seems  
3 to me that, and with the costs also involved in  
4 mitigation, when there might be other routes considered,  
5 seems to me we should make more of an effort to consider  
6 other routes that don't go through this protected area.

7 I thank you for my opportunity to speak.

8 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

9 The next speaker is Michael Fife.

10 MICHAEL FIFE: Hi, my name is Michael Fife,  
11 F-i-f-e. I am a resident of Salt Lake County and on the  
12 Salt Lake City Planning Commission.

13 I want to echo some of the comments made by  
14 Mr. McAdams and Professor Bowman. I believe we have  
15 made a significant investment to this open space. I  
16 think there are other routes that go through maybe  
17 undeveloped residential areas that would be more  
18 appropriate for the pipeline than one that would go  
19 through this open space. It is an area that cannot be,  
20 the remediation is never going to get it back to the way  
21 it is now because that geological formation was created  
22 over thousands and thousands of years. So I just urge  
23 the Commission to look at other routes besides the one  
24 that goes through the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve.

25 Thanks.

1                   DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

2                   Our next speaker is Cat Kivett.

3                   CAT KIVETT: My name is Cat Kivett,  
4                   K-i-v-e-t-t. I like to hike City Creek, the north ridge  
5                   and the south ridge. One of my favorite things to do on  
6                   the north ridge is watch the elk migrate all the way  
7                   from Immigration Canyon in the winter. They arrive  
8                   about mid January and stay for a month. My concern is  
9                   that their winter range could be permanently damaged in  
10                  this area. And there is not very many places that I  
11                  know of in an urban area where you can see such  
12                  incredible wildlife.

13                  My other concern is more safety oriented. I  
14                  walked the designated open space today and noticed there  
15                  is a few wetland areas. These areas are a natural sink,  
16                  and my concern is that gas could pool and collect if  
17                  there was even the smallest leak, and it could percolate  
18                  into the wetlands. And I hope the EIS will address this  
19                  concern very thoroughly.

20                  Finally, I would like to request that the  
21                  pipeline should go anywhere other than through this open  
22                  space where there is a natural sink hazard.

23                  Thank you.

24                  DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you very much.

25                  Our next speaker is Erika Brown.

1                   ERIKA BROWN: Thank you. My name is Erika  
2                   Brown, E-r-i-k-a B-r-o-w-n. I am a resident of Salt  
3                   Lake City. I helped design the Bonneville Shoreline  
4                   Preserve. As previously mentioned it is zoned as a  
5                   natural open space protected by a conservation easement  
6                   which prohibits utility pipelines.

7                   Like the previous people I hike there and  
8                   recreate on the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Having  
9                   trails connect to open spaces is really important, and  
10                  it is a really important connector through the region,  
11                  through the valley. So I value that area as open space,  
12                  for recreation, for wildlife, for ecological value, and  
13                  also for the historic and geologic value. To be honest,  
14                  I learned a lot about the geology of it today. Thank  
15                  you for all of you who helped me understand that.

16                  I guess, finally, my last concern is if  
17                  conservation easements cannot be held up, it really  
18                  concerns me that citizens and municipalities are going  
19                  to lose the ability to plan their communities and plan  
20                  open space. Once open space is gone, it is gone, you  
21                  can't get it back. There is kind of an irreversible  
22                  nature of that, which is my largest concern. So I urge  
23                  you strongly to pursue alternatives that will avoid the  
24                  Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, alternatives that impact  
25                  areas that are not preserved as open space.

1 Thank you.

2 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

3 Our next speaker, I believe, is Bridget, is it  
4 Stuchly?

5 BRIDGET STUCHLY: Thank you. My name is  
6 Bridget Stuchly, B-r-i-d-g-e-t S-t-u-c-h-l-y. I work  
7 for the Salt Lake City Division of Sustainability, and  
8 am also a resident of Salt Lake City.

9 So I wanted to voice my opposition to the  
10 proposed pipeline through the Bonneville Shoreline  
11 Preserve. We put a great deal of money, time and energy  
12 into creating and protecting this preserve and the  
13 trails that are associated with it. As stated multiple  
14 times earlier this 58-acre preserve has been designated  
15 natural open space, and is protected not only by a  
16 conservation easement, but by zoning that prohibits the  
17 construction of utility pipelines.

18 I wanted to echo the concerns of how the  
19 construction of a pipeline would not only disturb the  
20 unique and naturally diverse open space that exists  
21 there, it would also undermine our ability to protect  
22 open space areas by devaluing the designation and  
23 parameters being established specifically to avoid the  
24 development and destruction of these natural areas. I  
25 want to encourage you to evaluate and further

1 investigate alternative routes that will not disturb the  
2 Bonneville Shoreline Preserve, and because we value it  
3 and have all worked really hard to protect it.

4 Thank you.

5 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

6 Our next speaker is Carleton Detar.

7 CARLETON DETAR: My name is Carleton Detar,  
8 that's C-a-r-l-e-t-o-n D-e-t-a-r. I want to thank FERC  
9 and the Forest Service and the BOR for being here and  
10 the opportunity to comment. I am going to also comment  
11 about the Salt Lake variation and my concerns about it  
12 passing through the Bonneville Shoreline Preserve.  
13 Since this has been covered several times already I will  
14 just mention a few points that have not been mentioned  
15 before.

16 I am a resident of Salt Lake City, and also a  
17 taxpayer, so I feel I have a stake in this property  
18 also, because my tax money goes to preserve it and to  
19 support the trails that go through it. I have lived in  
20 Salt Lake City for 31 years now, and I have watched the  
21 disappearance of open space all around the valley, and  
22 that's one of the reasons why I am such a strong  
23 supporter of this is, is that this is becoming soon to  
24 be the last open space remnant, not just a geoantiquity,  
25 which makes it especially unusual as a remnant.

1           One of the things one needs to consider when  
2 putting a pipeline through this area is the unusual  
3 hydrology. There are some springs there which I have  
4 never seen at that elevation in the valley, and the  
5 pipeline may risk disturbing hydrology at that area.

6           The other point, that hasn't been covered  
7 quite as strongly, is the impact on the vegetation which  
8 is there. Particularly, I have noticed that when one  
9 disturbs the soil it opens up a pathway for the invasion  
10 of noxious weeds.

11           And as someone who has spent a good many  
12 evenings this spring on the battle lines fighting  
13 noxious weeds and pulling them all around the valley, I  
14 would say that this is a serious problem, it is not a  
15 trivial problem, and it is not easy to restore.  
16 Restoration is extremely difficult because you are not  
17 only restoring plants, you are also restoring soils.  
18 That's what makes the difference between disturbed soil  
19 and natural soil, restoring the fungi and bacteria that  
20 make up the soil, and the drainage patterns that make it  
21 up.

22           What is going to happen when you disturb and  
23 try to revegetate, there is going to be a stripe of  
24 weeds, a visual scar that goes across this landscape,  
25 that will persist for a good many years, possibly even a

1 couple of centuries. It is going to be the equivalent  
2 of taking a paintbrush and drawing a stripe across the  
3 Mona Lisa, for example. You will see it. It is a  
4 visual scar on the landscape, no matter what you do to  
5 try to restore it.

6 Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

7 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you.

8 Our next speaker is Stan Porter.

9 STAN PORTER: I went from the other side of  
10 the line. I am living in Salt Lake City, I am on the  
11 North Salt Lake City Council. I am not here in any  
12 official capacity. I don't know if I represent the  
13 whole council. We have had a lot of discussions and I  
14 have had some meetings with the Kern River people and  
15 some of the Salt Lake people. So I will just express my  
16 concerns.

17 My first concern was one of the alignments  
18 showed to be parallel to the existing line. And by  
19 doing so we cut a 50-foot easement swath through an area  
20 we just purchased recently as a preserve, open space.  
21 We call it Wild Rose Canyon. We are currently in the  
22 process of developing a park there now. It will be  
23 built the next couple weeks. There is a parking lot and  
24 restroom facility there now. There is a trail that goes  
25 up to the top of the mountain through this canyon,

1 crosses the Kern River easement. So we want to preserve  
2 that. So I would be opposed to the alignment that  
3 parallels the existing alignment.

4 In addition, as it goes over the hill and  
5 comes down, it goes into a residential area that has  
6 just been developed as well, homes that have just been  
7 built in the last couple of years, very expensive and  
8 exclusive-type homes. Also, those are areas that  
9 streets have been put in, all the platting has been  
10 done, all the lots have been set up. That's the reason  
11 I would oppose the parallel situation.

12 We have talked about some mitigation with Salt  
13 Lake City. There is an area that would bring the  
14 pipeline into an area that has not been developed at  
15 this point. It is an area that has been slated for  
16 residential development and the development of a park  
17 and possibly a cemetery. A park and a cemetery, if they  
18 were put on the south side of our city line, would make  
19 a nice buffer to all of this open space which has been  
20 spoken of several times this evening. I think it would  
21 also make a good area to run the pipeline through. We  
22 would want some kind of compensation in such a way that  
23 would help us put in the park and the cemetery, because  
24 we were counting on the development of a residential  
25 area to pay for the park and possibly the cemetery in

1       that area.

2                   One area that was just mentioned, too, we have  
3       the Tongue Springs, it is a water resource for the City,  
4       was the original source of water for the City. If we  
5       got too close to that with any kind of excavation we  
6       could certainly disturb those springs. I'm sure they  
7       wouldn't want a pipeline on top of a spring, either.  
8       That wouldn't make sense. It would disturb the wetlands  
9       as well.

10                  I appreciate the comments that have been made  
11       on the open space as well. It is a very nice area to  
12       view, and appreciate the fact that Salt Lake was able to  
13       preserve that as open space in that area.

14                  And also appreciate the fact that the natural  
15       gas is a resource that provides for cleaner air and for  
16       other type amenities which we all appreciate as well.  
17       So we realize it is probably a needed source of energy  
18       that can provide for a lot cleaner environment.

19                  Appreciate the opportunity to say my piece,  
20       and thank you.

21                  DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you very much.

22                  The last speaker I have here tonight on the  
23       list is Kathleen Stoddard.

24                  KATHLEEN STODDARD: Hi, my name is Kathleen  
25       Stoddard, K-a-t-h-l-e-e-n S-t-o-d-d-a-r-d. I am a co-

1 chair of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Construction  
2 Committee. I have worked on this trail system as a  
3 volunteer for over 14 years. But more than a trail  
4 volunteer I am an outdoor enthusiast. I love spending  
5 time in our beautiful foothills. These foothills are  
6 shrinking daily as development creeps up our hillsides.

7 The Bonneville Shoreline Preserve is the last  
8 remaining pristine geologic area of the ancient Lake  
9 Bonneville. It is priceless and irreplaceable. Digging  
10 a large trench through this area will destroy it  
11 forever.

12 Pictures of restored areas shown by Kern River  
13 earlier showed areas that obviously received more  
14 rainfall in our foothills in normal years, not this  
15 year. Foothills in the proposed pipeline route showed  
16 terrace work that was done by the Civilian Conservation  
17 Corps in the 1930's, and you can still see this terrace  
18 work that was built by shovels, not by bulldozers. That  
19 was over 70 years ago.

20 Some have mentioned planting trees to mitigate  
21 the scarring on the hillside, to hide the scar, but this  
22 pamphlet written by FERC, "What I Need to Know About the  
23 Pipeline," tells us that trees cannot be planted over  
24 the pipeline for fear that the roots will invade the  
25 pipe or the coating on the pipe itself, and, therefore,

1 create a hazard with the destruction of the pipe. So,  
2 therefore, if we cannot use trees or areas to mitigate  
3 the scar, that scar will be there for decades. We will  
4 see it for 70 years, just like the terraces that were  
5 built by shovels, not bulldozers.

6 I strongly encourage Kern River to place the  
7 pipeline along a route that avoids the Bonneville  
8 Shoreline Preserve. We need to save what's left of our  
9 foothills, especially areas as unique as this preserve.

10 Thank you very much.

11 DAVID HANOBIC: All right, that was the last  
12 speaker we had that was signed up tonight. Is there  
13 anyone else who didn't make comments that would like to  
14 make comments tonight?

15 EMY STORHEIM: Hi. Thank you for this  
16 opportunity. My name is Emy Storheim, E-m-y  
17 S-t-o-r-h-e-i-m. I am Salt Lake City Open Space Lands'  
18 program manager.

19 I understand you have been provided with a lot  
20 of information tonight about the Bonneville Shoreline  
21 Trail Preserve. I thought what I would do is provide a  
22 little insight specifically about the conservation  
23 easement. The purpose is to protect this site in  
24 perpetuity. There are conservation values identified in  
25 this agreement which include watershed, wildlife

1 habitat, natural, scenic, recreational, educational,  
2 historic, geologic, and open space values.

3 In addition to the values identified there is  
4 a section which has specific prohibited uses. Those  
5 include any acts or uses that would impair the quality  
6 of the watershed, scenic tranquility, ecologic  
7 integrity, geologic expression, and the general natural  
8 open character and conservation values of the property.

9 Other prohibited uses include commercial uses  
10 of the property, use of the property that would alter  
11 the topography, creation of roads regardless of  
12 temporary or permanent state, utility right-of-ways, as  
13 well as any activities that would impair the  
14 conservation values that I have already mentioned.

15 The implications for disregarding the  
16 conservation easement will set a precedent nationwide  
17 that could impair one of the most effective tools for  
18 protecting open space, not just here in Salt Lake City  
19 and in Salt Lake County, but nationwide.

20 Thank you.

21 DAVID HANOBIC: Thank you. Anyone else  
22 tonight?

23 Okay. I would just like to remind everybody  
24 that if they didn't get the chance to cover everything  
25 they wanted to you can submit additional written

1        comments to FERC. Your comments are given the same  
2        weight whether they are said here tonight or written in  
3        to FERC.

4                    I would like to close the formal part of the  
5        meeting at this time. Quickly, I would also like to  
6        mention our FERC Web site. Within our Web site there is  
7        a link called "e" library. If you type in the docket  
8        number PF09-7 you can use "e" library to gain access to  
9        everything on the record concerning this project, as  
10       well as the findings and information submitted by Kern  
11       River.

12                   On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
13        Commission I want to thank you for coming tonight. Let  
14        the record show that the Apex expansion project scoping  
15        meeting in Bountiful, Utah, concluded at 9:11 p.m.

16                   Thank you.

17                   (These proceedings were concluded at 9:11 PM)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, BRAD J. YOUNG, hereby certify that I attended and reported the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of my stenographic notes thereof, to the best of my understanding, skill and ability on said date.

Dated at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 15th day of June, 2009.

---

BRAD YOUNG  
COURT REPORTER