

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x  
Northwest Pipeline GP : Docket No. PF09-10-000  
- - - - - x

Blue Ridge Pipeline Project  
Pre-Filing Review  
PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

Goldendale Grange #49  
228 E. Darland Street  
Goldendale, Washington 98620  
Tuesday, August 11, 2009

The public hearing, pursuant to notice, convened at 7:09  
p.m. before a Staff Panel:

JOHN PECONOM, FERC Environmental Deputy Project  
Manager

RUSS REINEKE, U.S. Department of Transportation

DOUG MOONEYHAN, Entrix

COMMENTERS

Ray Thayer, County Commissioner

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

1  
2 MR. PECONOM: Good evening, everybody. I'd like  
3 to thank all of you for coming tonight for this Blue Ridge  
4 Pipeline project scoping meeting. My name is John Peconom,  
5 I'm with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

6 Many of you may be familiar with Charles Brown;  
7 he's the Project Manager for this project. Unfortunately,  
8 Charlie couldn't be here tonight due to family issues, so  
9 I'm filling in. I'm the Deputy Project Manager, as I said,  
10 for this project.

11 Here with me tonight is Mr. Russ Reineke for the  
12 Department of Transportation. Also with me tonight is Mr.  
13 Doug Mooneyhan, who is with Entrix. Entrix is our third  
14 party contractor, who is assisting us with our environmental  
15 review of this proposed project.

16 At the table is Ms. Katie Grange, also with  
17 Entrix, and with Katie is Ms. Elaine Baum, who is also with  
18 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. And I should  
19 point out, Mr. Jan Aarts is also here with Entrix as well.

20 We are here tonight to provide some information  
21 on the federal agency processes that relate to the review of  
22 this project. However, before we begin this meeting, I  
23 would like to ask the applicant, Northwest, to give us a  
24 brief presentation on the proposed project; and following  
25 their presentation, I will continue with the meeting and

1 talk a little bit about the FERC process, and then open up  
2 the meeting for public comments.

3 Mr. Jeremiah Ross, with Northwest, will give us a  
4 brief presentation, probably about five minutes long; and  
5 any questions you may have for Jeremiah or any other  
6 Northwest representatives can be directed to them after the  
7 meeting.

8 MR. ROSS: I'm Jeremiah Ross, I'm the Project  
9 Manager for the Blue Ridge Pipeline. Tonight I'm just going  
10 to do a really short presentation; I'm going to talk a  
11 little bit about our recent scope change, kind of reasons  
12 behind it, and overall scope.

13 Recently we have reduced the scope of the project  
14 from 156 miles to 119 miles. We've cut the horsepower  
15 roughly from approximately 31,000 horsepower to  
16 approximately 15,000 horsepower; so we've cut the horsepower  
17 in half.

18 The main reason for this scope change is really a  
19 reduction in the amount of gas that we are required to move  
20 from our customer's market. This kind of changed; less gas  
21 is needed, so we need less pipe. So just a little  
22 explanation of how that works.

23 Because Blue Ridge is an integrated part of the  
24 Northwest Pipeline system, if we are to expand the system  
25 and get more gas from point A to point B, we aren't required

1 or we don't need to build pipe all the way from point A to  
2 point B. What we can do, depending on the amount of volumes  
3 that we have to move and the pressures that are required  
4 throughout the system, is we can install pipeline loops.

5 What a loop is is just a segment of pipe that  
6 ties into locations along our existing line. These  
7 locations are determined by a hydraulic model that takes  
8 into account the amount of gas that is required to be moved,  
9 along with pressures. So you run the model and it tells how  
10 much pipe we need to install; a lot of times it tells us  
11 where we need to put it among the system.

12 Our recently-filed case was approximately 309  
13 decatherms a day. That case has been reduced, so we're  
14 shipping less gas -- that means less pipe is now being  
15 installed.

16 So all the loops really have been affected. The  
17 Plymouth loop, between our Plymouth and Roosevelt stations  
18 -- and I have a map over here, and I'd put it up on the wall  
19 and point at it, but you really can't see anything so you're  
20 welcome after the meeting to come look at the map; but the  
21 Plymouth loop has been reduced from 32.2 miles to 26.2, so  
22 roughly six miles. The Roosevelt loop has been reduced from  
23 35.4 to 29.6, so roughly 5.8 miles. Goldendale loop 1,  
24 which was 18.4 miles, remains unchanged. Goldendale loop 2  
25 has been reduced approximately nine miles, from 15.1 to 6.

1 Goldendale loop 3, which is 5.1 miles, remains unchanged.

2 So from our Goldendale compressor station, which  
3 is just down the street, to our Willard compressor station,  
4 we've lost about nine miles from that section. We've also  
5 taken off nine miles from the Willard loop. So that's a  
6 total of approximately 40 miles, but it's a reduction from  
7 156 to 119. Along with our reduction in scope on the  
8 compressor stations, we were installing roughly 13,000  
9 horsepower at our Plymouth station; that has now been  
10 reduced to about 4600 horsepower. Our Washougal compressor  
11 station, actually there is no change there; we're installing  
12 approximately 10,000 horsepower. And then we did have some  
13 work up along the 5 corridor by our Chehalis compressor  
14 station; and all that work, the 4.1 miles of 36-inch pipe  
15 loop and the compressor station modifications have been  
16 changed.

17 So if have you have any questions, we'll be  
18 available after the meeting.

19 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, Jeremiah.

20 As I said, my name is John Peconom, I'm with the  
21 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Federal Energy  
22 Regulatory Commission is the federal agency responsible for  
23 the environmental review of this proposed project.

24 The purpose of tonight's meeting, just to  
25 reiterate, is to provide you with information about the FERC

1 process and how we conduct an environmental review of a  
2 project like this. We're also here to hear your comments on  
3 the project and how we go about reviewing the environmental  
4 aspects of this project.

5 We want you to tell us what you think we need to  
6 cover in our environmental review. Several of you have  
7 already commented via mail; we have received well over 25  
8 comments to date on the project. Many of you received in  
9 the mail a Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental  
10 impact statement and to receive comments on the proposed  
11 project; that NOI was sent two weeks ago, approximately, and  
12 part of our scoping process, which was described in the  
13 Notice of Intent is to listen to comments and that's why  
14 we're here tonight.

15 As I said, the Federal Energy Regulatory  
16 Commission is the lead federal agency. When a company like  
17 Northwest proposes to build a pipeline project, they  
18 oftentimes enter into a pre-filing process, which is what we  
19 are currently in now. The pre-filing process is a process  
20 designed by the Commission to encourage companies to work  
21 with landowners, stakeholders, resource agencies, any  
22 stakeholders to identify issues with the project, to refine  
23 the project, to determine ways to lessen the environmental  
24 impact of the project. All these things are done in a very  
25 informal manner, as they have been with the open houses that

1 Northwest conducted, as the comments we have received.

2 The pre-filing process generally runs from six to  
3 several months more than that; this project actually has a  
4 longer pre-filing process, which is in my opinion a good  
5 thing. The pre-filing process, I said, is an opportunity to  
6 informally discuss the project, refine it to some degree.  
7 When the pre-filing process is concluded, a company will  
8 submit to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an  
9 application for a certificate of public convenience and  
10 necessity. They essentially ask, "Can we build this  
11 project?"

12 Along with that application, they provide several  
13 environmental reports which detail what environmental  
14 resources would be impacted by the proposed project. The  
15 Commission then takes that information, along with  
16 information we collect at these scoping meetings, work we do  
17 ourselves, information we've gathered from consulting with  
18 other agencies at the state, federal and local levels. We  
19 take all that information and we prepare an environmental  
20 impact statement; in this case an environmental document.

21 That document is then posted for public review,  
22 it actually will be mailed to everyone that is on the  
23 mailing list here; we'll have another set of meetings where  
24 people can comment on the environmental impact statement.  
25 We will then finalize the environmental impact statement,

1 and that document then goes to the five-member Federal  
2 Energy Regulatory Commission, who will then vote on whether  
3 or not to approve the project.

4 I'd like to point out that as the lead federal  
5 agency, we also work with other federal agencies; the Bureau  
6 of Land Management, the Forest Service, and the Corps of  
7 Engineers are all federal cooperating agencies; we also work  
8 with a number of state agencies. All these agencies will  
9 use our environmental document to one degree or another when  
10 they consider their permits or right-of-way grants or other  
11 documents that they need to as part of their  
12 responsibilities.

13 I'll take just a few minutes and briefly talk  
14 about what is an environmental impact statement. An  
15 environmental impact statement is based on, as I said, the  
16 information that we gather here, information supplied by the  
17 applicant, and our analysis, and we describe the impact that  
18 would most likely result from construction and operation of  
19 this project.

20 The environmental impact statement is required by  
21 the National Environmental Policy Act. We look at such  
22 things as water resources, land use, vegetation, wildlife,  
23 threatened and endangered species, alternatives,  
24 construction methods -- just about everything you can think  
25 of we will attempt to cover in the environmental impact

1 statement.

2 We will also make recommendations, if appropriate  
3 in the environmental impact statement on ways to lessen the  
4 impacts of the project, and those recommendations will be  
5 taken into consideration by the Commission when they vote  
6 whether or not to approve the proposed project.

7 I'd like to take a few moments to further explain  
8 the purpose of tonight's meeting, just to make sure that  
9 it's very clear; is that we are here to collect comments;  
10 the FERC is not a proponent of the project, we are a  
11 proponent of the process, and the process is to conduct an  
12 environmental review. As I said, we're doing this in  
13 conjunction with other federal agencies. Tonight's meeting  
14 is not a public hearing, per se; we are not here to debate  
15 the proposal and make any determinations on its fate; we are  
16 here to listen to your concerns so we can consider them in  
17 our analysis.

18 Pipeline proposals sometimes encounter objections  
19 or people that are not in favor of the project. Some are  
20 general nature, these objections, some are very specific.  
21 General objections to the project are considered by the  
22 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; specific objections to  
23 the project, whether it's in regard to a certain resource,  
24 are considered in our environmental document.

25 As I stated earlier about the Notice of Intent,

1       it was sent out and a deadline of August 30th was designated  
2       for the deadline to submit comments on the project. We will  
3       always take comments on the project; however, it is much  
4       more helpful for us to receive comments early in the  
5       process. That way we can begin to flesh them out and  
6       understand them and address them in our analysis.

7               A speaker's list is located on the table in the  
8       back. I know several of one of you -- well, one of you  
9       actually, signed up to speak, and several of you may be  
10      interested in speaking at a point later on, once this  
11      individual who has signed up has spoken I will ask if  
12      anybody else is interested in speaking.

13              And before I get to the comment portion of the  
14      meeting, I'd like to answer any questions that anybody may  
15      have about the FERC process, in terms of how we review  
16      documents or how we review these proposals. So I'd be happy  
17      to take questions if people have them.

18              I would ask that you state your name for the  
19      record here, and I should have point out that we do have a  
20      court reporter here who is recording everything that is said  
21      at this meeting. Transcripts of this hearing will be  
22      available on the FERC website in probably two weeks, maybe  
23      less.

24              So with that, does anybody have any questions on  
25      the FERC process?

1                   Yes, sir.

2                   AUDIENCE: You said 'hearing' earlier. You said  
3 this wasn't a hearing. What is this?

4                   MR. PECONOM: This is an opportunity for the  
5 public to provide comments on the project. I apologize for  
6 being unclear there.

7                   MR. PECONOM: Yes, sir?

8                   MR. LEKS. My name is Ed Leks.

9                   You mentioned that a special interest comment  
10 would not be considered an environmental issue, but will  
11 still be considered and used as information with your study?

12                   MR. PECONOM: All comments will be considered.

13                   MR. LEKS: Okay.

14                   MR. PECONOM: What I was trying to say is that  
15 saying simply "I'm against the project" is opinion, and  
16 you're certainly welcome to express that. However, when we  
17 do our environmental document, we look for specific  
18 comments: "I don't like the way this water body is crossed"  
19 or "it's going to impact this wildlife species." Those kind  
20 of comments are much more helpful to us. It's much more  
21 difficult to deal with "I'm against the project." It's  
22 harder for us.

23                   MR. LEKS: Maybe I misunderstood.

24                   MR. PECONOM: I apologize if I miscommunicated  
25 that there.

1                   Does anybody else have any questions on the  
2 process?

3                   And I should say, if you do have questions about  
4 the process, we'll be available after the meeting to answer  
5 any questions you have. It can be confusing at times, I  
6 admit; it's a big thing. This is a multi-year process, it  
7 involves multiple agencies; a lot of people are often  
8 confused by it or don't understand it. So I'm happy to  
9 answer any questions you have about the process.

10                  MS. STEIN: My name is Christine Stein.

11                  If you prefer it, you said you will always take  
12 comments; but if you prefer to have them in by August 30th,  
13 where does that leave the process with FERC, with the Blue  
14 Ridge Pipeline project, if you're trying to get a lot of the  
15 comments in by August 30th? Which seems not a whole lot of  
16 time, because I'd like to point out that I noticed today on  
17 the FERC website probably eight people wrote in, just today.

18                  So I'm thinking that, I wonder if that leaves  
19 people enough time. So I'm wondering where the process of  
20 the Blue Ridge Pipeline will be at August 30th by the time  
21 you guys are kind of -- you have a deadline.

22                  MR. PECONOM: I understand.

23                  MS. STEIN: So that's what I'm wondering about;  
24 because up until now there has been comments but not quite  
25 as many, and then all of a sudden in one day there's

1 probably eight new ones for the FERC. So I'm just  
2 wondering about that.

3 MR. PECONOM: I should say we're in the very  
4 early stages of the process, and we were out here with the  
5 open houses that Northwest did a month ago, just a little  
6 over a month ago, and we're not much farther in the process.  
7 Like I said, we're in the infancy of this process here.

8 We assign a date just to kind of get people  
9 moving. If we say comments are open, we certainly do take  
10 comments; but if we put a date on there, I think that gives  
11 people a motivation to get their comments in. We certainly  
12 want comments early. If people have these concerns and they  
13 just never get around to sharing them, and they give them to  
14 us at the last minute or a year later, it's -- the process  
15 has gone a lot farther at that point.

16 So if we can get comments earlier, and August  
17 30th -- if you submit comments on September 1, they're going  
18 to get into the record; and as I said earlier, this is a  
19 very long pre-filing process. So comments will be very  
20 useful for quite some time; and even up until the very end,  
21 comments will be considered. It's just we needed to put  
22 something on the record to get people to kind of get  
23 comments in.

24 So it doesn't change the process, the process  
25 still goes; it's just we want to have them in as early as

1 possible because it helps us. For instance, if someone has  
2 an alternative, if we can evaluate it early and either  
3 determine that it is helpful or it wouldn't be beneficial,  
4 it's a lot easier on us and a lot more beneficial to the  
5 public than having to do that at the last minute when all  
6 this work has gone into another route. So that's the reason  
7 why we have a date on there.

8 Does that answer your question?

9 MS. STEIN: Yes. Thank you.

10 MR. PECONOM: But yes, comments will be taken on  
11 September 1st, October 1st, December 1st. We just try to  
12 get them in as early as possible.

13 All right, well as I said, I'll be available as  
14 well as everyone else with FERC here afterwards. I should  
15 also point out that Mr. Reineke with the DOT will also be  
16 available afterwards to answer questions. I know a lot of  
17 people expressed interest at the open houses to hear from  
18 the DOT. So he'll be available afterwards.

19 All that said, we have one speaker who signed up  
20 tonight, who was wanting to express some comments about the  
21 project. Mr. Thayer, this would be the time for you.

22 MR. THAYER: Ray Thayer, County Commissioner.

23 I would just like to read from our letter of June  
24 9th to the Williams Companies, and make this part of the  
25 record.

1           The Klickitat County Board of Commissioners has  
2 taken the position that the proposed Blue Ridge Pipeline  
3 should stay within the existing pipeline corridor to provide  
4 the least amount of disruption to the residents and  
5 communities of Klickitat County.

6           With the advances in technology which have  
7 developed since the construction of the original pipeline in  
8 the mid-Fifties, mid or late Fifties, the Board of County  
9 Commissioners feel that there should be an acceptable way to  
10 complete the proposed pipeline with the least amount of  
11 impact upon the public.

12           We appreciate your consideration in this matter,  
13 and if you have any questions, please feel free to contact  
14 our office.

15           MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

16           I believe we have that in the record, but do you  
17 have a copy of that I could give to the court reporter to  
18 enter.

19           MR. THAYER: Yes.

20           MR. PECONOM: Great. Thank you very much.

21           (Statement follows:)

22

23

24

25

1                   MR. PECONOM:  Would anybody else like to offer  
2                   comments on the project at this time?

3                   (No response.)

4                   Well, thank you very much for your time.  I think  
5                   it is 7:30-ish now.  What we'll do is I'll temporarily  
6                   adjourn the meeting, and if anybody straggles in and comes  
7                   in later, we can open it back up if other people have  
8                   comments.

9                   At that time I think I'll temporarily adjourn the  
10                  meeting and people who would like to talk to Williams folks  
11                  or FERC folks, we'll do that, and if some people come in a  
12                  little bit later we can open it back up, just to make sure  
13                  that people get the opportunity to comment on the project.

14                  So thank you very much for coming, and that  
15                  concludes this meeting for now.

16                  (Recess; 7:30 p.m. to 7:58 p.m.)

17                  MR. PECONOM:  If I could just grab everybody's  
18                  attention really quickly.

19                  I just wanted to add one more thing in the record  
20                  while most of you were still here.  There was a typo in the  
21                  Notice of Intent, and I know one or two people left, but I  
22                  grabbed them to tell them that.

23                  In the described construction right-of-way it  
24                  said 75 feet, and that really should have been 100 feet.  So  
25                  it's a typo there, and I want to put that into the record so

1 people knew that that was a typo on our part, and that the  
2 general right-of-way width to be 100 feet wide. And I can  
3 talk about that if there are any questions on that, but that  
4 was just a typo on our part.

5 AUDIENCE: May I ask one question about that?

6 If it's 100 feet wide on an existing line, would  
7 it just be 100 feet? If it's existing and it's already 50  
8 feet, does that mean you need 100 more feet, or does that  
9 mean you need 100 altogether, if it's on the existing line.

10 MR. PECONOM: If it's adjacent to the existing  
11 line, it's 100 feet in addition to that, whatever that  
12 existing is.

13 AUDIENCE: So it would end up being 150 feet, of  
14 their pipeline easement.

15 MR. PECONOM: That's the construction right-of-  
16 way.

17 Let me clarify this, because 100 feet is a  
18 nominal, general term. In some cases it will be 75 feet, in  
19 some cases it would be 150 feet.

20 Adjacent to the existing line, suit be  
21 overlapping some?

22 WILLIAMS REP: Yes. Overlap.

23 MR. PECONOM: So let me correct that. So it  
24 won't be 100, it will be -- in some instances it will be  
25 less than 100. And some places, even with the overlap, it

1 will still be.

2 AUDIENCE: And that's the entire right-of-way,  
3 right? It's not like the distance from the middle of the  
4 pipe -- one side of the pipeline, and then the other side.  
5 So it's not like 200, you're talking 100 --

6 MR. PECONOM: 100 wide.

7 AUDIENCE: -- total.

8 MR. PECONOM: Total.

9 AUDIENCE: So that's 50 feet on either side,  
10 maybe.

11 MR. PECONOM: Yes, and that's just during  
12 construction; and then permanent right-of-way would be --

13 WILLIAMS REP: Could be offset; it may not be  
14 right in the middle.

15 AUDIENCE: Yes. Okay. So it's a corridor, then.

16 MR. PECONOM: Exactly, corridor. I just wanted  
17 to clarify the NOI in case people were worrying about that.  
18 So some places it will be 75, some places it will be larger.

19 AUDIENCE: You went on to say that the permanent  
20 would be what?

21 MR. PECONOM: 50.

22 I'm sure there's more than that in some places;  
23 it's one of those variable things. But generally.

24 50, give or take.

25 (Simultaneous discussion)

1 MR. PECONOM: All right.

2 (Whereupon, at 8 p.m., the scoping meeting  
3 concluded.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24