

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
Jordan Cove Energy Project LP DKT No. CP17-495-000
Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline, L.P. DKT No. CP17-494-000
- - - - - x

JORDAN COVE ENERGY PROJECT

South Umpqua High School
501 Chadwick Lane
Myrtle Creek, Oregon 97457
Tuesday, June 25, 2019

The public scoping/comment session, pursuant to notice,
convened at 1 p.m.

1 VERBAL COMMENTS

2 MR. MATHIS: My name is Ron Mathis. R O N. M A
3 T H I S. Like I said, my name is Ron Mathis. I am a union
4 representative; I'm a business agent for the Local 36. Our
5 territory is all of Oregon and the five southwest counties
6 of Washington. I represent a little over 300 members in our
7 trade. I'm also a delegate on the Lane-Cous-Curry-Building-
8 Trades as well as the Southern Oregon Building Trades, so
9 I'm familiar with the pipeline route as well as the
10 facility.

11 I support this project as well as the members
12 that I represent have sent me here to have their voice in
13 supporting the Jordan Cove Project. We're anticipating FERC
14 to give us a favorable decision. I'm looking forward to
15 getting the project started. Thank you, very much.

16 MR. DAHLMAN: My name is James Dahlman. D A H L
17 M A N. Dear members of the FERC Commission, I strongly
18 oppose the Jordan Cove Liquid Natural Gas, LNG Pacific
19 Connector Pipeline Project. FERC should not issue
20 authorization, a Certificate of Public Convenience and
21 Necessity because the adverse environmental, public safety
22 and other impacts of this project demonstrate the project is
23 contrary to the public interest.

24 Specifically, I am concerned about the following
25 impact: I cannot understand how a foreign company is

1 allowed to take my land through eminent domain for corporate
2 profit. I fail to see what benefit this pipeline serves my
3 local community. I'm a veteran who served my country during
4 the Vietnam war. I was proud to have served. I served to
5 protect the freedoms we all enjoy in this great country. I
6 feel like my rights are being violated through the misuse of
7 eminent domain.

8 After my service time, I came home, went to
9 school, became a teacher. I taught high school, middle
10 school. I tried to instill in my students a love for my
11 country and the many rights we enjoy. After 34 years of
12 teaching, I purchased my property to enjoy what years I have
13 left in peace and the serenity of nature. Now I feel like
14 this Canadian corporation, an evil empire, has descended on
15 me, stripping away my rights, disrupting my planting of
16 trees, ruining my roads, destroying my barn, killing off all
17 the wildlife currently living on my land.

18 I have one of the few paved roads in the area
19 which the pipeline wants to use. This road runs right out
20 my front window and I can't bear the thought of having
21 heavy equipment running up and down this road constantly
22 disrupting my daily life. In addition, this road is my only
23 in and out access. Without use of this road I would not be
24 able to use emergency services if the need arose.

25 Next, my home is very close to a hydrostatic test

1 site which could lead to a landslide on my property. Next,
2 my property value will most likely drop by a third. No one
3 wants to purchase property with a gas pipeline on it. Next,
4 there's a possibility this Canadian corporation could allow
5 a second and even a third company to access this pipeline.
6 In addition, I've heard from landowners in other states with
7 pipelines currently under construction that these companies
8 often don't follow their contracts. This will force me to
9 spend additional funds on legal fees just to get the
10 pipeline to follow its own contract.

11 In closing, I feel this pipeline project is a
12 disaster for landowners and citizens of Douglas County. I
13 strongly oppose this project, and the Federal Energy
14 Regulatory Commission should deny with prejudice the
15 authorization of the certificate of public convenience and
16 necessary. Thank you.

17 MS. DAHLMAN: My name is Joan Dahlman, D A H L M
18 A N. I strongly oppose the Jordan Cove Pacific Connector
19 Pipeline, natural gas pipeline. I'm an affected land owner.
20 Specifically, I'm concerned about how it will greatly affect
21 the beauty of our land that we have. We bought this as our
22 retirement property. It's almost 40 acres. We bought it
23 because of the Douglas Fir trees that are there and the old
24 oak old grove oak trees, and we live at the top of a very
25 steep hill and we like the beauty of the surrounding valleys

1 and mountains. And we are worried about the erosion and the
2 landslides that could happen as a result of the digging and
3 everything that has to be done.

4 Our dream has become a nightmare, as we are
5 constantly fighting this 1,400 pounds per square inch
6 pressure pipeline from being on our property. We and many
7 other people have spent significant amounts of money
8 already, our savings, trying to oppose this whole pipeline
9 project. We feel like we are held hostage because if this
10 project were to get approved, we no longer would want to
11 live here. Once it is approved, we will never be able to
12 sell and if it were approved and built, we know that we will
13 lose a lot financially. Probably a third, that's what we've
14 been told from other people that have been in this
15 situation. We're not excited about having a 90 foot area,
16 clear cut across the middle of our property. And, it's
17 just, the beauty is going to be lost.

18 The pipeline would provide temporary jobs and
19 temporary tax revenue, but our property is going to be
20 ruined permanently. Also, the pipeline will come down a
21 steep grade on our adjoining neighbor's property. Right
22 now, our deck faces that hillside that's going to be
23 affected. So, right now we're looking at trees that come
24 down the hill, but once the pipeline is built, if it was to
25 be built, we would be looking at clear-cut area instead of

1 trees out our deck area.

2 We would like to do improvements on our house and
3 our property but, we're figuring with the losses that we'll
4 take if this pipeline is approved, we don't want to invest
5 any more money. We feel like we've already spent a lot to
6 get this property. We're very concerned about the dangers
7 of forest fires in our area especially with the tens of
8 thousands of trees that came down in February when we had a
9 huge snowfall, which is very usual for our area, and just
10 like the Paradise, California fire we live on a road where
11 there's only one in or out and no alternative routes to
12 exit, and I know that pipelines can explode.

13 We have city water, which easily can be
14 contaminated by frack out from the horizontal directional
15 drilling that is proposed in our local river. There are
16 still 90 homeowners that have not signed, and that's a lot
17 of people that they want to do eminent domain with. It's
18 totally wrong that eminent domain can even be used by a
19 foreign company to acquire an easement from us, and then
20 ship this natural gas to a different foreign country.

21 No amount of money will be agreeable to us. We
22 just don't want this on our property. We receive zero
23 benefit from Jordan Cove Pipeline Project. Once a project
24 is done we'll spend more dollars fighting the pipeline to
25 fix up our damaged property. They want to use our long

1 driveway, which is paved part of the way up the hill, but
2 then the rest is gravel and we know it will never get
3 repaired and fixed the way it looks now. And the people
4 that live on our road, they're the ones that paved out road,
5 they paid for it.

6 Our landowner rights are threatened, as the
7 pipeline would cut our property in half. In addition to
8 that -- up the driveway. The excessive noise and constant
9 flow of traffic from pipeline workers, pollution from the
10 brown dust in the air during the construction and the
11 deterioration of one road our community uses will make the
12 human environment and people's lives locally, pretty
13 unbearable.

14 The one thing I wanted to mention too was, the
15 pipeline, when they come up our hill, they-- it's about 50
16 feet from our house, so we would be watching equipment go up
17 and down our hill for however long it takes them to complete
18 that. I'm concerned about the proposed the proposed
19 hydrostatic testing break on the property uphill from our
20 house, and that that could cause erosion and landslides on
21 our property.

22 To me it's an abomination, all of us affected by
23 this proposed pipeline are being held hostage year after
24 year after year for 14 years. People can't sell their
25 property even if they wanted to. FERC has denied this

1 project before. DEQ has denied the project. Every time
2 it's denied, we're excited, the pipeline is given another
3 opportunity to reapply, so we feel like this could go on
4 year after year after year after year, and it's really very
5 stressful to have to go through this over and over and over
6 again. It's been a total nightmare for us and it's causing
7 a lot of stress and frustration.

8 So please deny this project once and for all with
9 prejudice so that we can go about living a normal, serenity-
10 type life as retired people and not have to be under this
11 pressure all the time.

12 FERC: By the way, do you know the mile post that
13 your property is on?

14 MS. DAHLMAN: Mile post, we're on, do they, oh, I
15 see. It would be on Rice Creek Road. We're mile post 1?
16 1. On Rice Creek Road.

17 You mean on the pipeline.

18 FERC: The pipeline route.

19 MS. DAHLMAN: It's

20 FERC: Do you want to put these on the record, by
21 the way? Your written statement?

22 MS. DAHLMAN: It can be on the record.

23 MR. GORDON: Bruce Gordon. B R U C E. G O R D O
24 N. I live in Milo which, where I live is about a mile below
25 where the proposed pipeline is to cross the river. Now,

1 below that less than a mile, there is a park and we have
2 taken over this park from the county for maintenance, and
3 it's a very important park to the community and for other
4 people too, for swimming and everything. I'm really
5 concerned about ripping up the river, up above here, that
6 will damage this particular park - ability to swim, and the
7 beaches and stuff for the local people and for the other
8 people that come on by. It's a real concern of mine.

9 I've spent 25 years working in the woods in
10 reforestation and I've seen what it's done. Our river has
11 been degraded incredibly. It's basically considered an
12 industrial river because of all the logging and all the
13 other things that have happened. And the fishing population
14 has drastically dwindled. Besides being the maintainer of
15 this park, I'm on a board called South Umpqua Rural
16 Community Partnership. And what we try to do is we have a
17 lot of restoration and other projects. This park also is
18 under that umbrella.

19 And what I've seen is that the fishing has gone
20 down, including the spring Chinook which has just incredibly
21 dwindling numbers. I think the number was 24 returning fish
22 either last year or this year, which is just really
23 pathetic. And any kind of work done, especially so much
24 that is going to be done to the river and the tributaries
25 going into the river will really be impacted; and this river

1 cannot handle the work that would be done for this project.

2

3 So, I'm really concerned about it. I'm concerned
4 about my neighbors who are landowners having their property
5 taken away, for this that they're opposed to, especially
6 since it is not for the public good but is for a private
7 entity. So, I think the damage done by this project cannot
8 be mitigated. There's just no way you can do something at
9 point A to fix point B. It's just, it boggles my mind. I
10 have done mitigation work. I've planted some grasses and
11 stuff and shrubs to mitigate something that was 10 miles
12 away. I'm real confused about mitigation and it just
13 doesn't seem to be the way to go. So, I'm opposed to the
14 project and I hope FERC denies their request. Thank you for
15 your time.

16 MR. HEILMAN: I'm Robert Leo Heilman. I reside
17 2870 Weaver Road. Heilman. H E I L M A N. Robert Leo
18 Heilman. I reside at 2870 Weaver Road, Myrtle Creek,
19 Oregon. What follows is my testimony. It is a poem: To
20 Rid the Woods of Jeremiah's Monsters, by Tim McNulty.

21 Because you see monsters most everywhere these
22 days and today on the path out from the cabin had
23 to carry big sticks to fight them and cried when
24 the weight slowed you down. And even though I
25 haven't seen them, I know they're there, too.

1 So, I make this poem to rid the woods of
2 monsters. All you monster eyes that see only to
3 ravage the poor and voiceless of the world go
4 blind. Hands that snatch the very ground from
5 beneath unborn feet go limp. Teeth that tear at
6 the last thin shreds of what is green and holy
7 around us fall out. Hunger that knows no rest.
8 Eat yourself.

9 You monsters that come flickering out of your
10 bomb shelter souls to strike the life we try and
11 make in spite of you. May you become the bad
12 dreams you push on us and our children and never
13 wake. Meantime, keep out of these woods, you're
14 scaring my friends.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. MCGILLIVRAY: Jeff McGillivray. You want me
17 to spell my name and everything. All right. Jeff
18 McGillivray. M c G I L L I V R A Y. All right.

19 I'm speaking here on behalf of Lane-Coos-Curry-
20 Douglas-Building-Trades-Council. I'm the Secretary-
21 Treasurer. I just wanted to speak in favor of the project,
22 for the family wage jobs that it would create. For a very
23 economically depressed area; both Coos and Douglas Counties,
24 are terrible. We have a lot of members throughout all the
25 trades that travel, either up to Eugene or even further

1 north to Portland every week for work and then return to
2 their families on the weekends.

3 The apprenticeship opportunities down here have
4 been extremely low because of the lack of work. A project
5 like this would create that and it would also create other
6 work, infrastructure work around that. Off the tax bases.
7 And, you know, these projects all have - there's guidelines
8 for them to go by for FERC to go by and everybody, and we
9 just ask that you follow those guidelines and keep the
10 emotions out of it. And that's all I've got.

11 MS. LARSON: Diana Larson. Myrtle Creek.

12 FERC: Spell it for me, too.

13 MS. LARSON: D I A N A. L A R S O N. Myrtle
14 Creek. Reasons to deny the permit: The recent fires and
15 numerous pipeline explosions around the nation. The well-
16 known propensity for landslides along the proposed pipeline
17 route. The impending tsunami, not if, but when. How can
18 anyone seriously think a high pressure gas pipeline through
19 the forests of Southern Oregon is a good idea. A 36
20 diameter, super high pressure pipeline. 1,400 PSI will cut
21 a 100 foot swath of land, 232 miles long across Southern
22 Oregon. I might be wrong on those figures. It's going to
23 affect over 400 bodies of water multiple times. It will
24 cross through 150 miles of forest and 23 miles of pristine
25 shrubs and grasslands. Almost 43 miles of the pipeline will

1 traverse through late reserve old growth trees, causing the
2 harvest of 1,712 acres of ancient forest land. More than
3 two million acres of watersheds will be impacted.

4 Fracking has no place in a healthy environment.
5 Potential impacts include loss of inner tidal and shallow
6 sub-tidal habitats due to the dredging and navigation of
7 access channels. The loss of eel grass beds. The change in
8 hydrology of the water temperature, turbidity, removal of
9 riparian vegetation near streams, wetlands, waterways
10 within the pipeline corridor, loss of spawning habitat for
11 salmonids, and lamprey. Erosion and sediment loading in
12 streams from pipeline construction on steep slopes.

13 The crabbing industry may never, ever recover.
14 Their chances for going over the bar in Coos Bay are
15 limited; at certain times of the year it's almost impossible
16 to get through there and if they're going to have to compete
17 with the traffic with those great big LNG tankers, it's just
18 a nail in their coffin.

19 Oklahoma went from three earthquakes a year to
20 over three per day, 900 in one year. Any decision by the
21 Federal Government or State of Oregon to allow the export of
22 fracked natural gas will harm our County's natural resources
23 and damage Oregon's fragile indigenous environment.
24 Granting permission to export natural gas to a foreign
25 company and competing interests may be perceived as

1 seemingly insignificant; however, it has the very real
2 potential to detrimentally affect the economic future of
3 Oregon and the United States in unimaginable ways.

4 It will affect climate change and contribute to
5 the warning of our planet. Both things some nation's
6 leaders are working to prevent. Putting in an LNG pipeline
7 that would require more fracking is an oxymoron for the
8 direction the world needs to be heading and is wholly
9 against what the State of Oregon's always been about. I
10 understand nothing stays the same forever, but this is just
11 the wrong kind of change for Oregon. The State of
12 Washington said no to the LNG pipeline. Northern Oregon
13 said no to the LNG. Say no for Southern Oregon. No LNG
14 pipeline, final answer. No fossil fuels.

15 MASTER LARSON: Dawsun Larson. D A W S U N. L A
16 R S O N. Deny the permit. My life will be most affected.
17 My future is worth more than money.

18 MS. PARTRIDGE: It's Carolyn Partridge, C A R O L
19 Y N. P A R T R I D G E. And that was it, right? So, I'm
20 here to speak against the issuance of permits CP17-494-000
21 and CP17-495-000 which are required to build the Jordan Cove
22 liquefied natural gas and Pacific Connector Pipeline.

23 So, I'm concerned that the project depends on the
24 use of eminent domain. Impacted landowners have been
25 solicited and pressured for over 10 years. Despite being

1 offered increasing amounts of money to sign right-of-way
2 agreements there are still 94 landowners who do not want to
3 sell. They've even hired an attorney. Native American
4 tribes including the Klamath, the Yurok, and the Siuslaw
5 tribes do not want the pipeline to go through tribal
6 territory and disturb sacred burial grounds.

7 The pipeline will also cross 71 miles of public
8 land. I think that the public land belongs to all of us and
9 as a owner of one share, I would not want to sell my share.
10 Why would our government overlook stream reserve protections
11 and logging regulations we have on BLM and Forest Service
12 land for a foreign country? Actually that is allowing our
13 country to be colonized. If this pipeline is approved it
14 will mean the companies have a right to take land forcefully
15 for private gain. This would be wrong and un-American.
16 Please deny this permit.

17 MS. APPLGATE: My name is Susan Applegate. S U
18 S A N. A P P L E G A T E. I am a native Oregonian but it
19 wouldn't matter what part of the world I'm in. This is an
20 ill-conceived and foolishly dangerous project proposition.
21 It will bring into the atmosphere twice the amount of carbon
22 emissions that we currently produce in Oregon. That has an
23 effect globally. With this project, although they say
24 natural gas, I believe tar sand oil will be probably, be
25 exported out of the terminal, should it be constructed. And

1 we will be exporting to nations that we are in serious and
2 dangerous negotiations with right now; China and North
3 Korea.

4 The world cannot stand to have more carbon put
5 into the atmosphere. The production of this pipeline and
6 terminal will be putting tons of carbon into the
7 atmosphere. The amount of jobs that will be given to local
8 workers, to the union hall people, will be minimum and will
9 be temporary; will not be sustained and long-lasting. I
10 know this.

11 These pipelines are dangerous. When we have
12 wildfires coming across our landscape in these rugged
13 mountains. They're going to heat up those rocks to
14 enormous degrees and pipes will burst, and when we have
15 wildfires and gas lines, we can have explosions that are
16 untold. As well, the union of, or the Oregon Association of
17 Geologists said that this was a very bad idea to put an LNG
18 terminal in a subduction zone on the Pacific. It's asking
19 for trouble.

20 When it explodes, with a tsunami or earthquake or
21 both, the flames will be coming up the river, the pipeline
22 pathway for 30 miles. People around will suffer an
23 explosion much like a bomb. I am opposed to this and I'm
24 thinking that the Trump administration to fast-track all of
25 these proposals. I feel so powerless. Thank you.

1 MS. ROBERTS: Edith Roberts. E D I T H. R O B E
2 R T S. The certificate of need for the Jordan Cove LNG
3 should be denied because (A) adverse environmental public
4 safety and other impacts of these projects demonstrate that
5 they are not in the public interest; and (B) there is no
6 public need for this project. The DEIS does not adequately
7 address the impacts of Jordan Cove LNG to our communities.

8 The DEIS fails to support the conclusion that the
9 projects would have only limited adverse environmental
10 impacts. FERC has not provided maps of the preferred
11 pipeline route to the public nor notified landowners
12 impacted by 14 miles of route changes. In addition,
13 traditional tribal territories, cultural resources, and
14 burial grounds are threatened by the pipeline. Many local
15 tribes are all in opposition to this pipeline.

16 Farmer and landowner rights will be trampled.
17 Hundreds of private landowners will be impacted along the
18 pipeline route. Many of whom will be threatened with
19 eminent domain if they do not settle for permanent use of
20 their land. Farms, fishing, and recreation businesses will
21 suffer as the project impacts waterways nearly 500 times,
22 and damages sensitive to salmon and steelhead habitat,
23 hurting existing jobs and businesses.

24 The drinking water supplies. 150,000 Oregonians
25 could be contaminated by the chemicals used during

1 construction of the pipeline and deforestation of the forest
2 for the pipeline route. Many waterways will be
3 irretrievably destroyed and spraying to inhibit weed growth
4 along the deforested pipeline route, to contaminate both
5 waterways and nearby forests and farmland.

6 Fracked gas is explosive and the terminal would
7 be located in a tsunami zone. The pipeline would be located
8 in wildfire-prone areas and 16,000 people near the terminal
9 would be in a hazardous burn zone. Exporting LNG would
10 raise prices for consumers in the United States by 36 to 54
11 percent according to the U.S. Department of Energy. All
12 right.

13 MR. VINSON: Chad Vinson, V I N S O N. So, I'm
14 affiliated with LiUNA, Laborers. I've been a laborer for 12
15 years. And I was a pipeliner for about six or seven of
16 those years, and I laid pipeline all across the country,
17 natural gas pipelines. And so obviously I'm in big favor
18 for the project. For me personally, I live in Oregon and a
19 lot of my friends live in Oregon and they're pipeliners
20 also. And we're looking forward to this project going so we
21 can all work in Oregon.

22 A lot of times we have to chase pipelines that
23 are all over the place. And being on many different
24 pipelines, I know that the projects can be done safely and
25 environmentally correct. I've worked on many different

1 environmental crews, protecting the environment with
2 different kinds of erosion controls, following the FERC
3 plan, and I enjoy that part of the pipeline. Making a great
4 living, doing it right.

5 And also, taking care of the environment because
6 the environment is really important to me. I'm a fisherman
7 and a hunter, and, you know, even more so I just like being
8 out in nature. So, if it wasn't environmentally sound and
9 people weren't doing it correctly, then I would definitely
10 not be in favor for it. But I believe that it can be done
11 correctly because I've been on many projects that have been
12 done correctly. And I think this project should go the same
13 way. That's all I've got.

14 MR. WALTER: My name is Dorin Walter. D O R I N.
15 W A L T E R. I live in Azalea and I'm for the pipeline. I
16 think it would help the economy up here and I've lived on
17 the Cast, also. We actually have a gas line that runs
18 behind our house. I don't know how many years it was there
19 before we got there but we've been there 40 plus years. You
20 know. As far as I know it's still working well.

21 The timber industry is getting smaller and
22 smaller, you can ask the folks in Glendale. Their mill shut
23 down. They're going to sell out and there's not going to be
24 another mill there. I'm for it. I think it would be good.
25 It's like when they put the dam in on Cow Creek, everybody

1 was against it and the next day after it got filled up and
2 they planted some fish and they were all catching their
3 limits and taking them home and throwing away the ones they
4 caught last week and putting the new ones in. So, that's
5 about all I can say, I guess.

6 MS. GORDON: Joanne Gordon. J O A N N E. G O R
7 D O N. I am very concerned about fire. When there's a leak
8 and an explosion, they won't be able to put the fire out.
9 It will just run through the mountains. I've fought on
10 fires in those mountains. I've lived through three fires in
11 that community and they are very, very hard to put out.

12 I'm also concerned about the effects on water.
13 The South Umpqua River crossing in Milo, near St. Johns.
14 Near the Milo fire department. It could damage the quality
15 of water in our favorite community gathering spot we use for
16 swimming and a community building. Also, people are
17 dependent on that river for irrigating their summer
18 gardens, vegetable gardens, and their crops and one day of
19 contamination can turn into easily two weeks of
20 contamination as it travels down river. I witnessed that a
21 few weeks ago when we had a slide. It was interesting.

22 Our lives depend on the clean water for drinking
23 water. We have no other sources. We don't have a city
24 purification plant. And the damage from the silt from the
25 roads that will have to be built for getting heavy equipment

1 in there. No to mention the increased traffic on the
2 highway. Tiller Trail Highway. To get all the big heavy
3 equipment back out in the mountains and build roads to the
4 places where they've proposed building those pipelines.
5 There are no roads that go directly to the proposed route.

6 So, I see nothing good about this project.

7 MR. COOK: My name is Michael Cook. I'm from
8 Roseburg, Oregon. I think this is maybe the third or fourth
9 time that I've given testimony on this. I just want to say
10 that the very first meeting that I went [to] concerning the
11 LNG project was at a small restaurant in Roseburg, and this
12 must have been about 10 years ago. And there was a lawyer
13 present and there was mostly landowners at this meeting.

14 And the lawyer told the landowners, you will
15 lose. You might think you're going to win. You might think
16 you're going to win. But in the end you will lose because
17 it will get repealed again, and again, and again, and again.
18 Every time it gets repealed they will come and take the
19 points on which they lost and they will refine them and then
20 they will win. He said, "You guys, it's undoubted that you
21 will lose." So, you know, I think what he said at that
22 meeting all those years ago is coming true. This project
23 never seems to die. It gets shot down, time after time
24 after time and it keeps coming back.

25 The one thing that I would like to say though is

1 if this project gets built, 50 years from now, 75 years from
2 now, who mitigates this project? Who digs it up when it's
3 no longer usable? Who is going to? And I'll tell you who
4 that person is and that person is going to be the taxpayer.
5 If this project goes in there should be a back end deal
6 where when it is no longer in use, everything gets remitted
7 or put back to the way it should have been.

8 And lastly, I deeply resent every 15 minutes when
9 I'm watching local television, because I don't have
10 satellite or anything else, every 15 minutes I get to see a
11 Jordan Cove commercial. It's obscene. I have never seen a
12 commercial against the project. This company has spent
13 millions upon millions upon millions of dollars in
14 advertising. That's it.

15 MR. HOEHNE: Bob Hoehne. H O E H N E. I live at
16 Dillard, Oregon. Just right up the road here. 97432.
17 Outside of Winston there. Just keep going and I get going
18 too fast and you're not keeping up with me, let me know, is
19 that how this goes?

20 THE REPORTER: Sure.

21 MR. HOEHNE: All right. I'm very much against
22 this pipeline for numerous reasons, and I'll start off by
23 saying that I worked for the Oregon Department of
24 Agriculture for 29 years, the Plant Division from Salem; but
25 I did Douglas County and I also did insect surveys in Coos

1 County and Curry County; but I mostly did Douglas County and
2 I did Southern Douglas County and I also did Northern
3 Jackson County, up around Shady Cove, Prospect, and Butte
4 Falls.

5 So, I have seen firsthand at how rugged and steep
6 this land is by putting up insect traps and doing these
7 surveys for 29 years in places people would never go. But I
8 was looking on maps, looking for insects and so I got paid
9 to go up and down every little back road, gravel road there
10 is in Southern Oregon in those three counties, four
11 counties. So, I am disgusted to think that they're going to
12 put a three foot pipeline over top these mountains, disturb
13 the wildlife; and I am most disgusted as a lifetime
14 fisherman -- and I support my family and my friends by
15 foraging food by fishing and crabbing -- that they are going
16 to degrade the water quality of our waterways around here.

17 That there is the thing that bothers me, probably
18 the most. Because the fisheries, almost every one are
19 endangered. Threatened or endangered. And in the south
20 river here to be specific, last year the official count with
21 the Forest Service up through Tiller at the fisheries
22 biologists, only 28 spring Chinook salmon came back last
23 year officially. That's close to extinction. So, how is a
24 foreign company going to come into our neighborhood here,
25 after we've been working for years volunteering and trying

1 to bring these fish back, and they're going to put a
2 pipeline and dig up the earth over these rough mountain
3 roads, and put it underneath 300 or 400 streams and rivers?
4 That's disgusting. That's going to push these fish toward
5 extinction.

6 I'm not done there. My son works over in
7 Colorado and sells pickup trucks to the people who are
8 fracking over there and the Wyoming and the whole front
9 range, and he has shown me first hand how this fracking
10 works. And the environmental destruction that it's doing,
11 even though he's selling them pick up trucks. So, I don't
12 think, on top of what I just said, the environmental
13 destruction, that we should be doing this with climate
14 change, which is very real and obvious to many of us who
15 have lived here. The Roseburg area has broken the records
16 for heat for almost five years in a row. So, it's not like
17 breaking a record every couple, five, ten, fifty years.
18 We've been breaking - we already broke it this year. It
19 was in the 90s in May.

20 So, the fact that this is not clean energy. It's
21 cleaner than coal but it's not clean energy. And the fact
22 that the facility over in North Bend where I fish, right out
23 in front, I know this area really well; I salmon fish right
24 out there. The fact it's in a tsunami zone and it could be
25 destroyed by a tsunami, for one thing. And then for another

1 thing to even think about having a facility out there that
2 would eventually be Oregon's most spruing greenhouse gases
3 facility at a time when we're trying to go the other way, is
4 hard to fathom. It's hard to fathom how you federal
5 regulators could any way approve of this pipeline. Just for
6 that right there. But the list goes on.

7 The other aspect of this that affects me
8 personally. I have live out Rice Creek Road on and off for
9 40 years. I have property out there. I got a knee brace on
10 and an ankle brace on now, I can't live out there anymore.
11 I mean, I could, but it's too hard on my body. And so, I'm
12 selling my place. And I see can right where that pipeline
13 is going to cross right through Rice Creek Valley, right
14 outside of Winston-Dillard on the way out to my place. So,
15 that that is going to lower the property value that I worked
16 hard for my whole life. I sheared sheep for 12 years for a
17 living. Worked for the State for 29 years. I DJ'd and
18 taught fiddle downtown Roseburg at the music stores.

19 So now some foreign corporation is going to come
20 in and dig up the land, destroy our water supply and our
21 fisheries, and lower the price value of my property on top
22 of it? I think you can understand why people are very angry
23 about this and disgusted that this project -- we've already
24 spoke at the FERC meetings at UCC ten years ago or
25 whatever. FERC already said no. I highly, highly recommend

1 you say no again. I know there's more reasons, but I
2 probably at up my time but I think you got my message.

3 FERC: If you have more to say there's no one
4 behind you, so feel free.

5 MR. HOEHNE: Yes, well, that's all without notes,
6 I mean, it's just right in front of us. The water quality
7 is one of the biggest things, too. I volunteer to try to
8 help out our rivers and streams. The Umpqua River is home
9 of the Umpqua River Appreciation Day festival that was
10 started 33 years ago because of sewer spills into the South
11 Umpqua River. And so, a couple years after we got it
12 started, John Kitzharber made a proclamation that was signed
13 by Barbara Roberts, the Governor, back in the '90s this
14 would have been, no, this would have been the late '80s and
15 there's a proclamation signed by Barbara Roberts saying that
16 all the hometowns, all the cities, all around Oregon, should
17 celebrate their own rivers that come through their town
18 because we started here on the Umpqua.

19 So, that's how much we love this Umpqua River.
20 It is priceless and precious to us. And people come here
21 from around the world. We live here and we're trying to be
22 responsible and take care of it. So, yes, but the tone to
23 the Umpqua River Appreciation Day Festival, the 33rd annual
24 will be this year, July 20th, at Whistler Bend Park on the
25 North Umpqua River. We have taken around to different

1 watersheds; it's been at River Forks Park and downtown at
2 the Half Shell, it's been here in Canyonville, Stanton Park,
3 it's been on Elkton, the butterfly community out there.
4 This year it's going to be at Whistler Bend Park on the
5 North Umpqua River; and it is a date to celebrate, protect,
6 and honor our beautiful river, rivers here, which are really
7 the lifeblood and the reason why many of us live here is
8 because of the beautiful Umpqua River, whether it be the
9 South, which is right next to us here, or the North, that
10 goes up with the national forest and meets West of Roseburg.

11

12 I have helped out and volunteered with Umpqua
13 River clean up. I've coordinated it for 25 years and turned
14 it over to other groups, but I still volunteer to clean up
15 the river and I don't want to see it degraded. I don't see
16 how possible you could put in this pipeline over this rugged
17 country that I've seen first hand; I guess it's under all
18 these streams and not do a lot of damage to the riparian
19 zone, and to the overall quality of the water.

20 I also am concerned about earthquakes. If there
21 were earthquakes and one of these pipes broke. The
22 corporation says that that won't start a fire, wouldn't be
23 any damage. I don't believe them. And building in a
24 tsunami zone? It's only a matter of time here where we know
25 an earthquake is going to come in again, and it could

1 devastate that and then the ecological aspects of our
2 estuaries out there. Where I said I salmon fish and provide
3 food for my family. I think that probably covers it for me.

4 MR. TAYLOR: I'm Robert Taylor. I live in
5 Roseburg, Oregon. My wife and I moved from Northern
6 California to Douglas County 35 years ago to find a clean
7 place to live. The reason we chose this was because
8 according to the Department of Agriculture, Douglas County
9 scores in the 98th percentile on amenities such as clean
10 water, clean air, transportation, rail, blah, blah, blah,
11 great for agriculture. That's why we moved here. So, I am
12 always concerned about someone messing up our watershed.
13 And, by the way, Douglas County is the only county of over
14 3,000 in the United States, which is determined by a
15 watershed. Every drop that lands in Douglas County is in
16 our watershed. My big fear is, not so much an accident, but
17 some eco-terrorist deciding to blow up the line and
18 poisoning the rivers on the Oregon Coast.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. KREOFISKY: My name is Richard Kreofsky. I
21 live in Glide, and I'm opposed to the LNG plant. I think
22 it's something that Oregon should not have on its coast.
23 It's just going to lead to, if it's a failure down there
24 it's going to lead to habitat degradation. And it's short
25 term jobs. I feel it's very bad for the environment; plus

1 they're taking the land from the people that don't want to
2 give that -- what is the word?

3 FERC: Eminent domain.

4 MR. KREOFISKY: Eminent domain. Yes, they're
5 using eminent domain to get it. I just think it's wrong.

6 That's my comment.

7 [At 5:06 p.m., the verbal comment session closed
8 for this reporter.]

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

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

6 Name of Proceeding: Jordan Cove Energy Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 Docket No.: CP17-495-000/CP17-494-000

15 Place: Myrtle Creek, Oregon

16 Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2019

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

21

22

23 Dan Hawkins

24 Official Reporter

25

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 SCOPING MEETING
3 JORDAN COVE ENERGY PROJECT
4 CAUSE NUMBER CP17-494-000/CP17-495-000
5 SOUTH UMPQUA HIGH SCHOOL
6 501 CHADWICK LANE
7 MYRTLE CREEK, OREGON 97457

8

9 TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2019

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 REPORTER: MICHAEL MILLER

2 MR. MOFFITT: My name is Terry Moffett,
3 T-e-r-r-y M-o-f-f-e-t-t. I reside in Lane County and I
4 live on a ranch and we own timberland, but I worked for 12
5 years for U.S. Senator Gordon Smith, as we were just talking
6 about. And so, my field area was from Lincoln County to the
7 California border, so I had a lot of fishing, a lot of
8 timber, a lot of natural resource issue. And in 2006, the
9 senator sent a letter to FERC asking for support from you
10 folks for the Jordan Cove LNG Project.

11 So, his biggest concern was he wanted the
12 landowners to be treated fairly and you know he didn't want
13 use imminent domain. He wanted them to be paid for their
14 land. So, when I got a call that said would you work on
15 this, I said -- and I took files with me because the office
16 was closing. He didn't win the election.

17 So, I said you know I have a letter here --and I
18 dug it out and that's why I know it was 2006. In that same
19 year, ODF&W, a week before the fishermen were to have gone
20 fishing they closed the fishing season and these fishermen
21 had gone out. They had insured their boats, cleaned their
22 boats, the inland marine people had stacked in lots of
23 equipment for fishermen, and they had the icehouse.

24 So, my point in saying all this -- and we were
25 reauthorizing the Maxensin-Stevens Act that year. So, I sat

1 down with the fishermen and said how can we make this better
2 since we're reauthorizing it. We spent a lot of time on the
3 coast with a lot of lovely home stews and that kind of
4 thing, talking to them, and so just trying to make it better
5 for these areas. So, my point in telling you that is that I
6 don't live there, but the 12 years that I worked there I
7 spent so much time on the coast. We had an issue with they
8 shut off the water to the Klamath Basin and you know that
9 was connected with fish and so we had fisherman and farmers
10 fighting in these rural communities.

11 And so, you know Senator Smith said you know Mr.
12 Roosevelt when he turned on Bonneville, turned on the switch
13 and said more power to the people. And Gordon said that
14 same thing when they turned the wheel on and turned the
15 water on. It was more power to the people in the words of
16 President Roosevelt.

17 So, my purpose in coming today is to say these
18 people need these jobs. I've seen the ports just -- you
19 know they used to ship logs and never government wood. It
20 was private. It was Weyerhaeuser wood. But anyway, this is
21 really important to this community. When I was there
22 Weyerhaeuser had their container plant and that's where this
23 is going to be located in the old Weyerhaeuser site. And I
24 just think that they have been working at this forever and
25 they really, really are so desperate.

1 On the I-5 on the east side and on over here,
2 the people feel like we know what's going on in the I-5
3 corridor, but they feel like they're the other Oregon and
4 Oregon dismisses the fact that we have 19 percent
5 unemployment -- I don't know what it is right now, but at
6 that time where it was like you know 10 here. It was still
7 high in the Valley. So, that's what I'm just asking you
8 people to -- not "you people," that kind of sounds really --
9 you folks. I don't mean that that way.

10 You know Senator Smith got Secretary Gutierrez
11 here from Commerce to meet with the Charleston fishermen to
12 try and make all this better and that's all I'm trying to
13 ask you folks is to try and understand the plight of these
14 people that don't have those jobs any more. In Reedsport,
15 they don't have a baby section any more. I got in a wreck.
16 A logging truck hit me on a stopped bridge, but anyway, they
17 just have gerontology because families are moving away,

18 And having two daughters in the state who used
19 to work on Capitol Hill, one worked for Senator Crapo a
20 while back, but they -- I don't even know what I was going
21 to say now. I am chatty and thank you for listening. I'm
22 sorry and thank you for listening. You know my heart goes
23 out to them, so thank you.

24 MS. SULFFRIDGE: My name it Mitz, M-i-t-z; last
25 name, S-u-l-f-f-r-i-d-g-e. I'm 80 years old. I have 33

1 acres on the proposed 229 mile Jordan Cove Project. My
2 husband and I looked and found the perfect piece of property
3 so we could build a retirement home on. It was on the
4 mountain in Dillard, Oregon. We named it Honey Run Lane.
5 Only one thing was it was 1,200 feet above sea level.

6 His brother had a caterpillar, so they worked
7 pushing out the road to the top, a lot of switch backs to
8 get to the top then. They started digging out and pushing
9 out electric lines for the pipes, electricity, water pipes,
10 telephone lines, and sewer drain fields and then we built a
11 two-story house.

12 One morning I looked out the window and there
13 was a cow elk grazing in the front yard, a red-tailed hawk
14 which I named Buster -- Buster Keaton. And then the next
15 year he took a mate and I named her Diane -- Diane Keaton.
16 Then they lived in the BLM that was right next door to my
17 property. This man that we knew, a friend of the family
18 that worked at BLM used our road to come to the top with
19 mice in his pockets to feed red-tailed hawks and there's
20 wildflowers and lady slippers and it's just not right for
21 the Canadian company as the power to come through imminent
22 domain, plow through our beautiful State of Oregon.

23 My husband passed away March 1, 2017 after
24 putting up and worrying every day and he died on the
25 property and it was at night and I didn't find him until the

1 next day. Anyway, he didn't want it -- he hated after we
2 put all of property, worked on it our whole life -- our
3 whole mature lives. And my grandchildren -- I have gobs of
4 grandchildren being 80 years old. I've got six
5 granddaughters, no boys, and then they all had two children
6 apiece and so now I finally got a couple of boys, but they
7 play on the land the pipeline is coming right up across my
8 neighbor's property cutting my neighbor's property in half
9 coming through under -- I guess they're going to go under my
10 waterline and I got city water to my house, but it's real
11 steep, so they had to -- my husband had to build a big
12 cement tank -- great big. It holds a lot of water and then
13 we have a pump to pump it from the cement thing over to my
14 house. And when the pipeline comes, I don't know how
15 they're going to get across this because it's already buried
16 in the ground, but I don't know if they're going to go over
17 it or what and then it's going to come up the middle of my
18 road on one of the switchbacks, right up the middle of the
19 road and taking 100 feet. It goes clear across. And then
20 they're going to cut across the bottom part of the top -- my
21 house is right on the top of the mountain and it goes
22 across my drain field -- my sewer drain field and then goes
23 right through -- like I have a round circle drive. It goes
24 through two different roads 'cause you know it's a circle
25 drive. And my little grandkids they have little electric

1 cars and stuff and my one little granddaughter has cerebral
2 palsy and she can't walk, so she has this -- so, she can
3 play with the big kids with her little car. Then it goes
4 right cross there and then drops over and goes to Willis
5 Creek, but last time we saw the maps -- I didn't know this,
6 what the "H" meant on my map.

7 I've gotten written down on this, but I can't
8 read this 'cause it's a lot more -- it's more than three
9 minutes, but I want to give it to somebody so you can --
10 okay. Well, that's all. Thank you.

11 MS. AUSTIN: My name is Karen Austin, K-a-r-e-n
12 A-u-s-t-i-n. Thank you for taking my testimony this
13 afternoon.

14 I'm concerned about the fact that Pembina does
15 not currently have binding contracts for the LNG they plan
16 to produce. Having no market for LNG was FERC's reason for
17 denying the permit for this project in 2016. Why has FERC
18 not denied the project this round for the same reason?

19 Pembina is reported to have funding to cover
20 only 40 to 60 percent of construction costs for this six
21 billion dollar project. Will FERC require assurance that
22 this company has funding to complete their project and to
23 complete mitigations before they grant Pembina a permit?
24 They should.

25 The mitigations described in the DEIS from

1 Pembina's report are inadequate and raise doubt as to this
2 company's ability to actually mitigate the environmental
3 impacts of their project. The 139 conditions that FERC
4 included the DEIS are a sign that Pembina has done a sloppy
5 job and does not take their role seriously. Will FERC take
6 their responsibility seriously and deny this permit if
7 Pembina does not prove they can accept the complexity,
8 importance, and cost of mitigation of their environmental
9 impacts?

10 I would like to see FERC do a more complete
11 analysis of the Coos Bay jobs created and lost due to this
12 project. There will be a number of construction jobs
13 created with the project, but FERC should complete analyses
14 of long-term local jobs lost and gained, including jobs
15 associated with tourism and fish and crab harvest, which are
16 jobs likely to decrease if the project is completed.

17 FERC should include a more complete analysis of
18 the impacts to our climate. This project will surely
19 encourage an increase in fracking wells outside of Oregon
20 and should be acknowledged in the FEIS and the affect of
21 leaked emissions at the well head and all along the pipeline
22 should also be disclosed. Thank you for your time.

23 MR. CHRISTIAN: My name is Lou Christian, L-o-u
24 C-h-r-i-s-t-i-a-n. So, I am here today on behalf of myself.
25 I am a member of the Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 290.

1 We build these types of projects. They provide work for us
2 and our apprentices for journeymen. The apprentices of our
3 local they also do pipeline-type construction and we are
4 looking forward to this project as a source of work for our
5 members and myself included. My son is also a steamfitter
6 and it creates work for our members.

7 I lived my life in Oregon and went to high
8 school in southern Oregon, so we live and work here and want
9 to see the project done with our environmental regulations
10 that we have in the country and in the states. We have a
11 good project and minimizes any of the negative impacts of
12 the project, so I am very supportive of this project and I
13 do live in Torquin, Oregon now, but I did, like I said, live
14 in southern Oregon, when to high school at Central Point, so
15 for those reasons we want to see the project. We also want
16 an environmentally responsible project, so thank you.

17 MS. CHANDLER: My name is Elizabeth Chandler,
18 E-l-i-z-a-b-e-t-h; Chandler, C-h-a-n-d-l-e-r. So, I have
19 been following this proposed disastrous project for five
20 years. I have many concerns. Today I want to address the
21 message that it is sending to our youth if this project is
22 approved.

23 All of us deserve a livable planet. We are in a
24 climate emergency. To go as everything is okay and build
25 more infrastructure to transport fracked gas is an act of

1 negligence and I believe that it's criminal 'cause they
2 better, so there is an intent to harm. To continue building
3 pipelines tells our youth that their health, well being, and
4 futures mean nothing. It teaches them that it is okay to
5 destroy their future for temporary profit gain.

6 More than ever, we need to help youth connect
7 with nature. We can model how to protect nature. FERC can
8 model love for community by their decision, not profits over
9 people. Our youth are struggling with how to cope during
10 these chaotic times. Show them the way with the decision
11 that truly conveys that their futures matter and they are
12 valued. Thank you very much.

13 MS. MCGEE: My name is Debra McGee, D-e-b-r-a
14 M-c-G-e-e, and I live on Lusk Road in Eugene, Oregon. I am
15 66 years old and I spent life as a public school counselor.

16 So, this is my third FERC commenting experience
17 regarding the Jordan Cove Pacific Connector Pipeline. Two
18 times the FERC said no to this project because the harm to
19 the people and the planet overruled profits of a foreign
20 corporation shipping fracked gas to global markets.

21 Frankly, I am concerned that this third attempt
22 to permit this harm may be rigged. This regulatory agency
23 may be inclined to say yes to do the bidding of a Trump
24 Administration, an Administration that is hostile and
25 violent toward people and toward the environment.

1 The only change from the previous two FERC
2 denials is that the climate emergency has grown worse, more
3 hurricanes, tornadoes, floods; people burned to death in
4 California fires, all of these things are made worse by the
5 climate crisis.

6 I live in Eugene where 4 of the 21 children who
7 are suing the government for violating their Fifth Amendment
8 rights o life, liberty, and property live. As a counselor
9 and a mental health professional, I see and feel the fear
10 that these children are experiencing due to the climate
11 crisis. Children who understand what is happening to them
12 and their future are terrified and sad. Some of these
13 children have been hospitalized for depression and suicidal
14 ideation. These children are leaving their schools to
15 protest the actions of us adults in power who are allowing
16 their future to be destroyed.

17 This is traumatizing for all of us. We are
18 living in the sixth great extinction. Two hundred species
19 worldwide are going extinct today, yesterday, tomorrow,
20 every day. This has occurred in my lifetime. I implore you
21 as ethical human beings to deny this project; to quote the
22 indigenous wisdom, time to change or day. The decision you
23 make will be life or death for many. Please decide for life
24 for all of us, for our children, and grandchildren. Thank
25 you for listening. Have a good rest of your day.

1 MS. HITZ: My name is Betzi Hitz and I spell
2 that B-e-t-z-i, and my last name is Hitz, H-i-t-z. And I
3 represent myself today. I strongly oppose the Jordan Cove
4 Liquefied Natural Gas LNG and Pacific Connector Pipeline
5 Project that is CP17-494-000 and CP17-000.

6 FERC should not issue the authorization and
7 certificate of public convenience and necessity because the
8 adverse environmental, public safety and other impacts of
9 these projects demonstrate that the projects are contrary to
10 the public interests. Additionally, the DEIS fails to
11 support its conclusions that the projects would have only
12 some limited adverse environmental impacts. FERC,
13 therefore, cannot proceed without revisiting its analysis
14 and any revised analysis must be made available for further
15 public comment prior any FERC decision to grant the pending
16 application.

17 Specifically, I am alarmed concerning the fact
18 that the export of liquefied natural gas and continued
19 fracking to obtain natural gas for that purpose would make
20 climate change worse. The export terminal would become
21 Oregon's largest emitter of greenhouse gases. The project
22 would emit the same amount of climate pollution as 7.9
23 million non-electric vehicles or 15.4 Boardman coal plants,
24 the last of which is set to close in 2020 because of
25 pollution concerns.

1 And fracked natural gas is as bad as coal
2 because it leaks methane gas along its entire life cycle
3 during extraction, transportation, storage, liquefaction,
4 and use.

5 We are in a climate emergency. We need to stop
6 burning all fossil fuels. We have a responsibility to leave
7 a stable climate to our children and grandchildren,
8 including my daughter and two-and-a-half year old
9 granddaughter and to all living things. Thank you.

10 MS. MUNCH: Carol Munch, C-a-r-o-l M-u-n-c-h.
11 I am a property owner. I live on Upper Kamus Road at the
12 two mile marker. My concerns for this pipeline are
13 personal, of course, but also they're public.

14 I'm concerned for our wildlife, our fish, our
15 rivers. I'm very concerned about all of that. We live on
16 80 acres and we grow mostly trees. In fact, it's all trees
17 and the part of our property it would go through is the
18 wettest part of our property and we use that to grow cedar
19 trees and that would all be disturbed and taken out because
20 we couldn't be able to use it any more.

21 My husband and I are both elderly. My husband's
22 81, I'm 75, and this is a burden on our lives to have to
23 deal with this for over a decade. We highly object to the
24 possibility to Canada would be able to come in and take our
25 property away from us by eminent domain. They should not

1 have imminent domain over the United States for any reason.

2 And our family has been on this property since
3 1946. We would like to continue to have our family on this
4 property for years to come. The trees on our property we
5 depend on those for part of our livelihood and in case of
6 our medical needs in the future. We also have a rental on
7 our property and the pipeline would come within a driveway
8 width of that rental. We have three wells. I'm concerned
9 about the water; what it might do to our water, the water
10 underground with all the construction and what not. We have
11 a pond on our property. That also could be disrupted.

12 And I guess that's about all I have to say.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. CLARKE: My name is John Clarke,
15 C-l-a-r-k-e. I live at 1102 Twin Oaks Lane, Winston 97496.

16 I'm going to start with -- I'm using for my
17 reference an application that Jordan Cove submitted to
18 Oregon Department of Energy for the siting of the power
19 facility and so that's where my information is coming from.
20 I'm going to start with -- this is something -- this drawing
21 is a drawing that was in the Draft EIS. It's Figure No.
22 2.1-2 and it shows the facility -- the gas processing
23 facility, but what is missing in this map is the placement
24 of the three ground flares, two aiming towers which we know
25 violate the airport air space, one smokestack, which also is

1 higher than allowed and also there's a fin-fan aerial
2 cooler. This cools the refrigerant gases and I'm going to
3 give a couple pictures here when you generate -- when you
4 put steam or hot air into a damp, cool atmosphere it creates
5 steam and depending on the climate conditions outside it
6 determines how much steam is being generated.

7 The plant is the same plant. The pictures were
8 all taken between Christmas and New Year's. They were all
9 taken at noon and the temperature outside was 40 degrees and
10 I want those entered into the record.

11 There was a thermal plumb study done for the
12 other facility, but in the FERC process they said that there
13 are no longer any thermal plumbs because the energy facility
14 is not part of the project and this is there and I'll have
15 that submitted. So, they're saying that they don't have any
16 thermal plumb, but they are still generating power. They
17 need -- at a minimum they need 40 megawatts of power.
18 That's just to run the plant. And when they're loading
19 ships, they need 50 megawatts of power; yet, they have made
20 -- the steam generators generate 300 megawatts of power or
21 more, so they're building in a lot more power than they
22 really need for some reason.

23 So, what I'm hoping that FERC will do for me is
24 get a drawing that reflects what is actually there so that
25 the other federal agencies and stuff can have access to

1 accurate information without having to go through and find
2 one line here and one line there. So, I want that entered
3 into the record also. And these other papers are just
4 having to do with the airport. I would like them also
5 entered into the record.

6 Now, I have this and in this it talks about the
7 aerial cooling system, the fin fan. Now, the information
8 that I'm going to give is information I got at the Open
9 House that we had here in Myrtle Creek. And I talked to a
10 project engineer for Jordan Cove and he told me that the
11 cooler had between 80 and 90 of these very large fans built
12 into the ceiling. They would draw the air in from
13 underneath the piping, strip the heat out of the refrigerant
14 gas and then the refrigerant gas would go back into reserve
15 -- into the storage facility of it and it would repeat that
16 stuff.

17 But that's why I submitted those pictures of how
18 much fog is generated out of a mill that doesn't even have a
19 stack. And yet, they're going to have one stack which is in
20 the air space, but they show it as -- and it's in here and I
21 submitted it yesterday, the 24th in Coos Bay. I can also
22 leave this one, if you want, but I don't see any real reason
23 for that because it'll already be on the record.

24 Then I'm going to move onto the LNG cargo
25 carriers and the range of the carriers is from 89,000 cubic

1 meters of LNG to 217,000 cubic meters of LNG. They gave a
2 chart of vessels that have been approved by the Coast Guard,
3 but they're approved for being able to pass through the
4 channel and they had no consideration for height because
5 they didn't have to go under a bridge or any of that. So,
6 the one dimension that is missing in this chart is what is
7 known as the air garaft, which measures from the water level
8 to the top of the stack and that is missing on that.

9 They only gave the FAA one measure. There are
10 15 measurements and they ended up with 13 presumed hazards.
11 So, that's a concern to the FAA, but they have to have --
12 they won't go through and look for this. It has to be
13 submitted to them and I have to have a source to do that.
14 So, I'm going to ask that FERC would get that information
15 for those carriers. And I think that's going to do it.
16 Thank you so much.

17 MS. KREMER: Hello, my name is Sandra Kremer.
18 My address is 191 Weigle Road, mailing P.O. Box 713, Myrtle
19 Creek.

20 MALE SPEAKER: Spell your name.

21 MS. KREMER: It's Sandra Kramer, K-r-e-m-e-r.

22 When the original pipeline was proposed, it was
23 going to go up Weigle Road and that's across -- it's not on
24 my property. It's across the road from me. And the
25 pipeline was going to go up and on the corner was going to

1 be Carves Branch meter station. Well, I live right along
2 Carves Branch and the way I get my water -- I have a shallow
3 well. My water comes from right where the pipeline was
4 going to be dug. It goes across a shale rock towards the
5 creek and I have a 12-foot shallow well and I have wonderful
6 water.

7 So, I was told that if they dig over there I
8 would no longer have water. Well, on Weigle Road there are
9 four wells, just going down the road. We would all have
10 lost our water. So, I wrote letters from Governor
11 Kitzhaber, all the commissioners, everybody about my
12 concern. Then for the previous pipeline people I had some
13 gentlemen come out and the one guy came and he agreed with
14 me that he talked to his engineers and, yes, it would ruin
15 my water.

16 So, they proposed taking it off of Weigle Road
17 and it was going to go down Highway 99. It's a ways down
18 from my house and so I was gentlemen out here and they said
19 that that is the current proposed route. So, my concern is
20 -- they said it's not the final route and so I just wanted
21 to make it known if the pipeline did go back to the original
22 version of Weigle Road there would be a whole bunch of
23 people that would lose their water, so I just wanted that
24 put into the record.

25 And one of the commissioners -- I didn't hear

1 from any of them, but one of them did say that if the
2 pipeline did go up my street I'd better get a lawyer. So, I
3 don't have the money for that, so I just hope that it stays
4 the way it is. Okay.

5 And my other thing was -- I'm sure you guys
6 probably know all about this, but in 2003 there was a
7 12-inch pipeline put from Roseburg to Coquille. Mastex,
8 Inc., a big company, built the pipeline. They were fired
9 because -- I'm reading this from our local paper from the
10 time.

11 It said the project was dogged with problems
12 since the summer of 2003 when the 60-mile long 12-inch
13 pipeline was laid. The stream beds were filled with erosion
14 from the -- and sediment and the company finally had to fire
15 them. They hired another company that came in and they
16 found 50 flaws in the pipe. The pipe had to be dug up and
17 this was only a 12-inch pipeline. And so, I'm really
18 fearful of a 36-inch pipeline, three times as big and
19 erosion. And when you go over to the coast, you can still
20 see this huge area where everything was just taken down to
21 make way for the pipeline.

22 And so, I just hate to think what it's going to
23 look like when a 36-inch pipeline goes through because this
24 is a beautiful area you know and it'll be scarred forever
25 when they take down those trees. And going underneath a

1 river so many times, I mean between the Umpqua and Rogue
2 River how many times does a pipeline go under the river, a
3 lot, and so I really worry about that too and the damage
4 that will be done to the environment from this.

5 And I know that it's going to bring jobs for the
6 contractors, the people that will be digging the pipe, but
7 the people that are going to be building the pipeline are
8 going to be coming in from other big pipeline companies or
9 at least I hope they are. I hope they don't have local
10 people that have never worked on a pipeline building this
11 36-inch pipeline. So, the jobs are just going to be
12 temporary, but the scars will be left forever on the
13 environment. So, that's all I wanted to say. Thank you.

14 MS. HAWKS: My name is Victoria Hawks,
15 H-a-w-k-s. My address -- my home address, 2900 West Oriole
16 Drive, Roseburg 97471. My name is Victoria Hawks. I'm a 50
17 plus years resident of Douglas County. My husband and I own
18 Hawks & Company Realtors in downtown Roseburg and for 50
19 years a ranch on Dodson Butte which is located between
20 Dixonville and Myrtle Creek.

21 I'm a past Roseburg City Councilor, currently
22 serving on the City Planning Commission. Eight years
23 previously I served on the Douglas County Planning
24 Commission and am pleased to say I voted no to allow the
25 pipeline to be placed in Douglas County.

1 Here are the reasons why I'm opposed to it.
2 One, it does not make sense to me for a Canadian company to
3 have their product travel through Oregon when they could
4 much more easily travel through Canada to the Pacific Coast.
5 Two, I've heard they tried to go through Washington and
6 California and were denied. Three, I was told repeatedly
7 the consideration of loss of property value was not to be
8 considered and also wouldn't make a difference anyway.

9 As a real estate broker, this couldn't be
10 further from the truth. We've had clients who were offered
11 a very small amount for an easement which would visually
12 impact their property for dozens of years. No one would
13 want to look out their front window at what would remain of
14 their carefully planted home wood lot.

15 Four, we have personally shown parcels over the
16 years were we are required to disclose the existence of
17 long, varied pipelines. More often than not, the buyers say
18 no thank you. Five, the pipeline in Douglas County upon
19 which the County Planning Commission could vote was related
20 to the coastal management area on the Westside of Camas
21 Valley. When I listened to a volunteer firefighter express
22 his concerns, it cemented my opinion.

23 As the mother of a Seattle firefighter who began
24 his career as a volunteer working with Douglas Forest
25 Protective Association and having experienced first-hand the

1 Roberts Creek Road and Myrtle Creek Complex fires in 1987,
2 which destroyed seven miles of fencing on our ranch, I might
3 know more about the "what ifs" of wild land fires under
4 normal circumstances, let alone with volatile fuel pumping
5 through it. I couldn't imagine how a volunteer force could
6 possibly be effective in managing an explosive situation in
7 the middle of timberlands.

8 This is not to say they wouldn't give it their
9 all. When asked during the planning hearings who might be
10 located nearby to shut off, shut down the flow of the
11 pipeline in such an instance, the person who represented the
12 company said nobody would be here. My question who then and
13 when.

14 Six, lastly, I have seen and heard all the
15 advertising about how beneficial this will be beneficial for
16 our communities. I fail to understand how removing hundreds
17 of thousands of trees and valuable farmlands from
18 production, be spoiling rivers and streams, disrupting
19 wildlife, and forever changing the pristine beauty of
20 hundreds of miles of our state to the benefit of a foreign
21 company and their foreign customers makes any logical or
22 financial sense to the citizens of Oregon.

23 MR. BUCKLEY: My name is Stephen Buckley,
24 S-t-e-p-h-e-n B-u-c-k-l-e-y, and I am here in opposition to
25 the pipeline basically because once the toothpaste is out

1 it's very hard to put it back in the tube. We can be
2 promised the pie in the sky, but we won't know what's going
3 to really happen till it's over and all is said and done.
4 The environmental impact there's no way that they know what
5 it's going to be and you can't, again, undo it.

6 The employment that is going to happen, in my
7 opinion, is going to be people from out of the area. It's
8 not going to stay, also the tremendous impact to landowners.
9 There're just too many "ifs." Not to leave on the back
10 burner the fact that even though the commercials say that
11 they can withstand any natural disaster that we haven't had
12 yet, we don't know what's in the future. And just the whole
13 idea behind this and what very well could happen and will
14 happen we just don't know and it's not to our benefit to
15 have natural gas flow out of our country to other countries
16 and us have to put up with everything that's going to
17 happen to make it possible. Thank you. Thank you very
18 much.

19 MS. JACKSON: Rowena Jackson, R-o-w-e-n-a
20 J-a-c-k-s-o-n. I am a member of the Klamath Tribes. I am
21 water from Klamath and Crater Lake. What happened to the
22 respect for sacred land and clean energy? We deserve a
23 town, a state, man camps for hire. Just like in Canada, our
24 women and children are now at stake. We can no longer
25 ignore the missing and murdered indigenous women, an overdue

1 epidemic red flag I repeat man can't mend.

2 No LNG export terminal or frack gas pipeline.
3 It would make climate change worse, another bad sign. A
4 certificate of need for Pembina is pure greed. It's a
5 God-given right to live on land without more contamination.
6 Our certificate of need it is a given to protect and love
7 our fish for all my relations and next generations.

8 Another shout out to Kate Brown and state
9 agencies to not let us down. We are real people.
10 Corporations are not. Lobbyists and special interests are
11 not in our favor. Man camps for hire and temporary labor
12 keep our women and children safe, not bought. No more
13 stories of a human trafficking survivor. If we don't work
14 together and not be advocates, what message does this send
15 to all perpetrators? What does it say in this society? It
16 is all of our responsibility to look more closely at missing
17 cases in Indian Country. Your decision can help prevent
18 sexual encounters without consent.

19 I am asking for safety for persons with existing
20 PTSD experiences, a fair and tear, that is my intent.
21 Sexual assault is the fault of the perpetrator, the person
22 committing the assault. It is the responsibility of all
23 individuals within the community. Let's not be enablers and
24 be strong advocates. No means no. United we stand as I
25 raise my hand.

1 MS. EATHERINGTON: My name is Francis
2 Eatherington, E-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-g-t-o-n. So, I am a member of
3 Oregon Land Trust. Our property is near Milepost 85 of the
4 pipeline and it comes within maybe 200 feet of our water
5 well. And even though the pipeline is off our land, it will
6 impact our land heavily you know and so I know you have
7 mitigation for federal lands, but what'd you have for
8 private lands? Is there any way we can be assured that if
9 the company ruins our well we're compensated or they have to
10 pay for it? Do they have any bonding or do we have to prove
11 that -- how do we have to prove it?

12 So, as far as impacted landowners, you have very
13 little information in the DEIS about how we go about
14 negotiating with the company; especially, if the pipeline is
15 immediately off our property. It is following our southern
16 boundary, so it's within a couple hundred feet of our house
17 and our well and so it heavily impacts our property. But
18 how can we get the company to respond to our concerns or you
19 don't know?

20 MS. MUNOZ: This is a one-way conversation.

21 MS. EATHERINGTON: Oh, this is a one-way
22 conversation?

23 MS. MUNOZ: Yes.

24 MS. EATHERINGTON: And then there is a block
25 valve near our property and I mean this thing has been

1 threatening our property since 2005 and so we have submitted
2 you know a number of scoping comments and DEIS comments.
3 And every single time we ask how will you protect those
4 block valves in the event of a wild land fire.

5 Now, your DEIS says, oh, the ground is
6 insulated. It won't hurt the pipeline at all. And belief
7 me, there are fires in southern Oregon. So, we say, well,
8 what about the above-ground section of the pipe near our
9 house, but they don't answer that question. You know we've
10 put in scoping. We've put in DEIS. And every time they
11 respond to comments they ignore that comment.

12 My question is how do we get them to respond to
13 that comment, right? How do we get them to answer us on how
14 block valves will be protected in the event of a forest
15 fire? These are above-ground sections of a very explosive
16 gas pipe that's right near our place and so why can't they
17 answer us? Is there an answer, right? And then they say
18 that the pipeline is buried, but what if they put these
19 flash piles along the right-of-way to keep the ATVers out
20 and what if that flash pile burns for a long time? Won't
21 that compromise the pipe underneath the ground? And so, I'm
22 mostly very -- I would like them to tell us how we get them
23 to respond to our comments about this wild land fire.
24 That's my biggest comment. Please respond to how you're
25 going to protect the above-ground sections of the pipe,

1 block valves, from a wild land fire and how you're going to
2 drive through a logging road through a flaming fire to go
3 out there and turn them off.

4 And you know this pipeline blocks our only
5 access route in and out of our property, our only access in
6 and out of our property. And if you start a fire, we've got
7 nowhere to go.

8 MR. QUINN: Joseph Patrick Quinn, Q-u-i-n-n and
9 I'm today am speaking as the Volunteer Conservation Chair
10 for Umpqua Watersheds, Inc., a 501(c)(3) outreach education,
11 restoration, conservation, nonprofit with offices in
12 Roseburg and I am also a member, a volunteer on the
13 Executive Council of the Coquille Watershed Association, but
14 I must emphasize that I am not authorized to speak for the
15 Coquille Watershed Association, only as an individual
16 member.

17 First, I want to say -- echo the sentiments of
18 the ODFW member of our Watershed Council to say that this
19 pipeline will cross roughly half a hundred, 50 some odd
20 stream crossings from tidewater to the crest of the coast
21 range. We, both organizations, struggle to keep riparian
22 buffers on these streams and waterways.

23 The Watershed Association plants trees, they
24 fence livestock out; they put structures in the river.
25 Umpqua Watershed we fight with BLM not to reduce the

1 riparian buffers. We fight with the Board of Forestry in
2 Oregon. Often, they have no riparian buffers. This
3 pipeline will leave all of those streams, 90 feet wide, with
4 nothing on both sides of the stream. To us, we volunteers,
5 that is nothing less than a slap in the face.

6 Number two, safety, the first priority of
7 government, elected government and its agencies, whether
8 it's implicit in statute, or implied -- reasonably implied
9 is the safety of its citizens. And despite these expensive
10 color ads on the television set, there is no way on God's
11 Earth that this outfit can make that pipeline proof against
12 the 9.0 earthquake just west of my house. It has to zigzag
13 up an 1100-foot escarpment that would be subject to
14 landslides, never mind an earthquake. And then to site that
15 liquefaction plant and those frozen tanks in a tsunami zone
16 to say that they can take tug boats and get that ship out
17 into the channel and turn it bow on before the first wave
18 hits 20, 25 minutes if there's a big earthquake happens
19 while they're loading that ship is preposterous. It's going
20 to turn that whole area into a disaster zone. People are
21 going to burn to death and there's nothing any fire
22 department or anyone else can do about it.

23 So, environmental grounds, very destructive,
24 these waters are already listed under the Clean Water Act,
25 so many of these streams and rivers. Thank you.

1 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Stacey McLaughlin, S-t-a-c-e-y
2 M-c-L-a-u-g-h-l-i-n. I'm a property owner impacted by the
3 Pacific Connector Pipeline and the Jordan Cove LNG Export
4 Project.

5 I want to share the facts that you are not
6 hearing from Jordan Cove and that are not included in the
7 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And that is that they
8 are not providing mitigation measures on private lands.
9 They are not advising landowners of the inherent risks of
10 this project. They are not telling us that they are
11 impacting our domestic water and/or that they know that
12 there are wetlands on our properties.

13 The concern that keeps me up at night as a
14 landowner is my personal well being and that of my family.
15 The risks to my personal safety are huge and Pembina
16 shamefully minimizes these dangers, claiming that a 36-inch,
17 high-pressure gas pipeline transmitting non-odorized gas
18 won't spill because it isn't a liquid. They do not share
19 with me what the risks are regarding explosion and the
20 consequences of that.

21 And I will point to recent events in California
22 where entire towns were devastated by corporate utilities
23 not maintaining their systems. I will point to the
24 Transmountain Pipeline where individual landowner properties
25 are now being liened by contractors not paid by pipeline

1 contractors.

2 Pembina's callous insinuation that it's not a
3 liquid and therefore it is safe is deceptive and dangerous
4 to the people that they are impacting, pipeline construction
5 in the area that live will be a Class One pipe, which is the
6 lowest possible safety standard. What this means is that
7 they are using thinner pipe to transport the gas at a higher
8 pressure with buried depths being as shallow as 18 inches,
9 depending on the location because fewer people are expected
10 to die. Any death is a significant death.

11 Pembina's claim that temporary construction jobs
12 is good of us is yet another harmful distortion of the
13 truth. Our communities need long-term solutions, not quick
14 fix, temporary issues. I'm afraid for the women and the
15 children in our community with respect to human trafficking
16 and what man camps and the influx of construction workers
17 from outside our communities will do for our children and
18 our women.

19 There will be no permanent jobs at all in my
20 community. Only 15 estimated permanent staff for the entire
21 pipeline project, 6 in Coos Bay, 5 in Medford, and 4 in
22 Malin. And I quote that this is in page 4-604 of the Draft
23 Environmental Impact Statement. Even more misleading are
24 their economic claims of economic enhancement for our
25 communities when those taxes are temporary taxes.

1 As stated in the Draft Environmental Impact
2 Statement, and I quote, "Property tax payments will vary
3 over time due to pipeline depreciation and changing tax
4 rates." Pembina has put the project on the market to sell a
5 40 to 60 percent interest in their share to reduce their
6 financial risk and I quote Mike Dilger, CEO of Pembina. "We
7 are a thirty-five billion dollar company. We are not big
8 enough to build a ten billion dollar project; therefore, we
9 are offering our share of this project, 40 to 60 percent,
10 for sale."

11 Pembina also indicates that they will be
12 investing in our community to the tune of one hundred
13 million dollars to restore the almost extinct Coho salmon.
14 My admonishment to them is that they will be taking over
15 100,000 acres of impacted property for the Coho salmon in
16 this project and that is directly from the DEIS. But more,
17 is the fact that a foreign corporation can take a U.S.
18 citizen's land for private profit with the threat of
19 imminent domain.

20 My husband and I have worked all of our lives to
21 have what we have and we've spent an extraordinary amount of
22 time building our sanctuary for them to come in and be able
23 to take it without any consideration of all of our sacrifice
24 in our lives. I'm also concerned about the number of
25 easements -- excuse me -- the number of pipelines that can

1 be included in that easement. It can't just be one project.

2 I will direct FERC's attention to, and I will
3 include this in the record, the transcripts from both of the
4 2019 stock calls and investor day events whereby they
5 indicate that they are investing in natural gas liquids of
6 all types, including different petro carbons and they have
7 their pipeline projects and easement well underway in order
8 to facilitate that economic interest of their company, which
9 will receive no -- which will provide no benefit to the
10 State or Oregon or to the individual property owners that
11 they will be using eminent domain against.

12 MS. HEYL: My name is Linda Heyl, H-e-y-l. I am
13 a 64-year-old mother, grandmother, retired public health
14 nurse practitioner, and resident of Eugene, Oregon.

15 At a gradual level, I ask FERC to consider the
16 negative impacts of this project on two specific important
17 local organizations that may have been overlooked. How will
18 the Jordan Cove Project impact the educational work of the
19 Oregon Institute of Marine Biology, the OIMB, which is
20 located in Charleston, Oregon across from the proposed
21 construction site on Coos Bay?

22 The University of Oregon has been teaching and
23 conducting research in Marine Biology on the southern coast
24 of Oregon at this facility since 1924. Undergraduate and
25 graduate students, as well as visiting professionals live,

1 study, and work at this permanent, year round facility for
2 education and research about coastal and deep water
3 habitats. The campus includes classrooms, state-of-the-art
4 lab facilities, a small fleet of ships and boats, and
5 housing and dining facilities for students and researchers.

6 I'm proud to say that my son graduated from this
7 program and benefited greatly from those facilities that I
8 feel that Jordan Cove would greatly harm. So, how would
9 changes to the shipping channel, the construction of the
10 plant, and the operation of the export facility effect work
11 of OIMB and the health and safety of the staff, the
12 students, the visitors to the campus? If FERC has not
13 already consulted with the UO, University of Oregon,
14 administration about OIMB, I ask you to do that.

15 Secondly, the South Slough of the Coos Bay
16 estuary, located just south of Charleston, is one of only 29
17 coastal sites in the National Estuarine Research Reserve
18 System designated to protect and study estuarine systems.
19 Established in 1974 through the Coastal Zone Management Act,
20 this reserve represents a partnership program between NOAA
21 and the Oregon Department of State Lands.

22 Estuaries provide unique habitats for hundreds
23 of species and serve as irreplaceable breeding grounds and
24 breed environments for juvenile animals. The EIS reviewers
25 must consult with NOAA and the relevant Oregon State

1 agencies to assess the potential negative effects on the
2 stewardship, research, training, and education with which
3 these agencies and sites are charged.

4 But the primary reason that FERC should deny
5 this permit is that all use of fossil fuels must be
6 curtailed extremely rapidly everywhere on Earth to hold
7 planetary warming at somewhere near 1.5 degrees Celsius.
8 This is the moral obligation for every person alive at this
9 time, myself, and you and you, among others. Whatever
10 capacity you, yourself, are working in I ask you to use
11 your influence and connections of that position and your own
12 good judgment and good heart to increase the likelihood of
13 permanent denial for Jordan Cove.

14 And finally, I ask that the public education
15 displays like we see here today include enough context about
16 issues that the public can read and understand what they are
17 about. I did not find that to be true today. This
18 incomprehensible method enables BLM and the Forestry Service
19 to tick the box of public education, but it did not fulfill
20 the true purpose and obligation that they hold and thank you
21 both for your work.

22 MS. MARK-YOUNG: Susan, S-u-s-a-n; Mark,
23 M-a-r-k; Young, Y-o-u-n-g. I want to say thank you for the
24 opportunity to comment, as the State of Oregon has an
25 important decision to make regarding the pending application

1 for the LNG pipeline. I'm opposed to granting this permit.

2 I listened to smart people, like the scientists
3 who state that in order to address global climate change we
4 need to shift to alternative fuels. Fracked natural gas is
5 a dirty product. I oppose imminent domain use by foreign
6 corporate entities for projects that will not benefit
7 Oregonians. There is risk to landowners, as the facility in
8 Coos Bay is in an earthquake and tsunami zone.

9 Next, big money, like Jordan Cove, et al., is
10 bombarding locals with is misleading ads. Next, state and
11 local monies should be directed to projects which empower
12 local. And I want to finish by saying that my drive from
13 home to Winston for groceries would have me crossing the
14 proposed pipeline three times. Please say no to this permit
15 request. Sincerely, Susan Mark-Young.

16 MR. SULFFRIDGE: My name is Larry Sulffridge and
17 I live on Rice Creek Road, 238 Rice Creek. And I'm not on
18 the pipeline, but it's right next to me. It was when
19 Williams you know had it -- Williams -- and they sent me a
20 deal and basically say that they was going to probably use
21 imminent domain to use my place you know. So, anyway, the
22 people next to me, I think, are going to go for it you know
23 whatever the -- you know.

24 But anyway, I run cats for 25 years for DFPA in
25 Roseburg, Douglas Forest Protection and firefighting. So, I

1 don't understand how they're going to put a pipeline here in
2 Oregon when we have fires. I mean I don't know if you've
3 been around fires too much, but they're hot when you get a
4 major fire and it ain't gonna work. And the ground out
5 there at my place is so steep how in the heck are they going
6 to -- and you know it's going to be about 100 foot. I
7 understand about a 100-foot right-of-way. It's so steep
8 dropping over there they can't do it. I've run cat all
9 life. I got equipment and I just don't understand how they
10 can do it and where are they going to put all the timber
11 when they get into big timber? See, what I mean. Where are
12 they going to put this stuff at you know I mean on steep
13 ground? You know like Billy goat ground.

14 So, that's kind of what I wanted to say and the
15 imminent domain would be different if it was a freeway or
16 something, but this is out of Canada. It shouldn't be. You
17 know they're just wanting to step on us little people and
18 push us out of the way, so I had to say something 'cause you
19 know I guess that's about all I can say. I can say more, but
20 it probably won't help.

21 MR. SCARMINACH: Michael Scarminach,
22 M-i-c-h-a-e-l S-c-a-r-m-i-n-a-c-h. I'm the business
23 manager for International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers,
24 Local 659, based here in Medford, Oregon. Our jurisdiction
25 covers the majority of southern Oregon and eastern Oregon.

1 We represent electrical, gas, city services, manufacturing,
2 and Telecom. We have approximately over 2,000 members.

3 The skill set for ourselves that will be
4 included in this project, as well as the other trades that
5 will be involved, are of the highest quality and the highest
6 standards that they offer in the country. The safety of
7 this project is imperative to all of us, our families as
8 well, and we feel that the crafts that we'll be providing
9 are of the highest of standards. The economic impact to the
10 state it is imperative that we need at this time and we look
11 forward to it and thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: My name is Jeffrey Brown,
13 J-e-f-f-r-e-y; Brown, B-r-o-w-n. So, thank you for allowing
14 time for testimony. My name is Jeff Brown. I live and work
15 in Douglas County. I'm an assistant business manager for
16 Local 659 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical
17 Workers and represent union members throughout Oregon and
18 northern California.

19 IBW Local 659 is a hiring hall union that
20 dispatches workers in electrical trades and we are
21 supportive of the LNG project. My interest in the LNG
22 project is economic. Douglas and Coos Counties lag behind
23 many other areas in the Northwest in their economic
24 recovery. Part of that lag has been attributed to the lack
25 of high-paying jobs and the skills gap between applicants

1 and required job skills.

2 The LNG project will provide living-wage jobs,
3 not only during construction, but will extend into ongoing
4 maintenance and operations, living-wage job opportunities
5 desperately needed in rural Oregon. While the IBW has the
6 resources to attract and dispatch many of the skilled
7 workers that will be required to build and operate the LNG
8 infrastructure, it will also increase opportunities to train
9 a new generation of skilled workers.

10 Projects of this size allows for an influx of
11 people into the apprenticeship programs that develop the
12 skills required to earn a journeyman's status necessary to
13 perform skilled work in a safe and efficient manner. These
14 apprenticeship opportunities narrow the skills gap. Even
15 after this project has been completed the skills learned
16 will be directly transferrable to other jobs, both in and
17 out of the surrounding community.

18 Many of our IBW members are experienced working
19 on FERC-licensed projects and use to working under strict,
20 environmental regulations. IBW members have a history of
21 environmental respect and have committed to the IBW Code of
22 Excellence which is designed to bring about the best in
23 construction members and demonstrate to our customers that
24 IBW members will perform the highest quality of work,
25 utilize their skills and abilities to the maximum and

1 exercise safe and productive work practices.

2 We look forward to making the LNG product (sic)
3 a realization in helping complete it in a safe and efficient
4 matter, all while being good stewards of the environment and
5 exercising respect to affected landowners and local
6 communities. Thank you.

7 MS, RYAN: Kathy Ryan, K-a-t-h-y R-y-an. And
8 my main concern is imminent domain. I don't believe that
9 this should qualify for using imminent domain because
10 exporting natural gas to foreign countries rather than using
11 it right here in our country is not beneficial to the people
12 of the United States. And I'm not a landowner. I'm a close
13 by landowner, but -- you don't go through us, thank God.

14 MS. HANRAHAN: Carol Hanrahan, C-a-r-o-l
15 H-a-n-r-a-h-a-n. So, I am not a landowner. I know a lot of
16 people who are. I'm a starting now?

17 MR. PECONOM: Mm-hmm.

18 MS. HANRAHAN: Okay. And I'm against this
19 pipeline and the liquefied gas facility on Coos Bay and
20 North Bank because they are not good for the environment,
21 for the state, for the nation, and for the Earth. They're a
22 pollution in a can, more or less.

23 MR. BUNCE: My name is Alan Bunce, A-l-a-n
24 B-u-n-c-e. I do not live along the pipeline, but I live on
25 the main Umpqua River downstream from many of the crossing.

1 I have over a 13-year experience now with the pipeline and
2 the companies that are trying to put it forward.

3 I have a diverse background. I first learned
4 about the pipeline while I was on the Board of Directors
5 with the Partnership for the Umpqua Rivers, the local
6 Watershed Council. The pipeline company came to us trying
7 to get buy-in from the stakeholders. We had concerns about
8 the many river crossings and the impacts that it would have
9 on the streams.

10 And some of the crossing we already knew were
11 going to impact areas where we had already spent quite a bit
12 of money doing restoration projects -- salmon habitat
13 restoration projects.

14 Another part of my life was working with a spill
15 cleanup company and I learned through various sources and
16 doing my own investigating that there is no spill response
17 company that can respond to this if there is a liquefied
18 natural gas spill in North Bend at the terminal. I've
19 worked with the RRTNWAC, which is the Regional Response Team
20 Northwest Area Committee, which is made up of the EPA and
21 the Coast Guard.

22 They're responsible for any coastal or bay spill
23 responses and I've worked with them for several years and I
24 have kept abreast of the taskforce that they formed. They
25 have never had a taskforce that looked into LNG.

1 Now, we've talked about it and we've discussed
2 it and I know for a fact that there is no response team that
3 can respond to liquefied natural spill. If we did so, it
4 would be just like sending firefighters into the Twin
5 Towers. They're not ready for it and there's nothing you
6 could do. You just have to pull people back.

7 A liquefied natural gas spill will come out.
8 It's super cold because it's super cooled. It will spill
9 out and quickly expand and overtake thing or anybody. You
10 can't let it touch you. It is right on the edge of the Bay.
11 It'll go into the water. And it'll start to warm up and as
12 it warms up it'll rapidly expand. You've seen Bill
13 Nye/Science Guy and you know chemists on TV dumping
14 chemicals in the thing and watching it overflow the beaker
15 and run across the room or table or something. That's what
16 this will look like.

17 It will quickly expand. It will suffocate
18 because it displaces oxygen. It will suffocate anything on
19 the Bay, fishermen, mammals, anything. When the oxygen to
20 fuel ratio is right, it will be explosive. This is
21 something that could potentially with an incoming tide move
22 all the way into downtown Coos Bay area before it ignites.

23 So, there was a -- one of the local timber
24 companies, Roseburg Forest Products owns the facility -- the
25 chip facility that's right next to it and they will be

1 leasing property to the company for their site. And so,
2 they have quite a bit of money in this project and they want
3 to see it happen. One of their heads at the mill was the
4 head of the Coos Bay Response Cooperative, which was
5 supposed to be -- on paper it was a spill cleanup --
6 emergency spill entity in Coos Bay.

7 From what I've seen, from what I've looked into
8 in my attempts to communicate with them, it's just a shell.
9 So, I'm telling you there's nobody capable of responding to
10 this. So, you know given that and you know with our
11 changing environment and the threat of forest fires you know
12 we're seeing these pipelines all around the world having
13 problems. And in my former live I was a welder and you know
14 I know things happen; especially, metal under stress -- we
15 are running this through the Tiecore landslide area and it
16 is one of the most vulnerable areas on that's prong to
17 landslides in the whole West.

18 So, you know we're talking about an area that is
19 going to make the pipeline very vulnerable with seismic
20 activity. So, that's all I have to say.

21 MR. JACKSON: Gary Jackson, G-a-r-y
22 J-a-c-k-s-o-n. And I am not a landowner where the pipeline
23 goes through, but I am an adjacent landowner in the Myrtle
24 Creek area at one of the crossings. Okay, so I guess I'm
25 here to address FERC here today in this matter and promoting

1 this pipeline and hoping that they would approve this
2 permit.

3 There's a lot of good qualities that come from
4 this pipeline and a lot of them have to do with
5 environmental. There's been a lot of talk about the
6 greenhouse gas affects and that type of thing. The purpose
7 of using this gas is to do away with a lot of those
8 greenhouse gas affects and get rid of the coal, quit using
9 the coal, quit mining the coal, and ship this gas to those
10 Asian countries that are now dependent on coal and cut those
11 carbon footprints down. And it's a lot easier to manage the
12 emissions from the gas than it is the coal and a lot easier
13 to clean up.

14 I understand that there's some process that's
15 going on right now working a filtration system where they
16 can remove up to 90 percent of the existing residue that's
17 there. And you know if they can do that it's by far the
18 best way to go. But anyway, you know just as a far as the
19 global environment goes that this is going to be huge in
20 saving the environment for everybody, not just here in the
21 United States, but worldwide. Saving the ice caps, that
22 type of thing.

23 You know if we could do it green that would be
24 fine, but you know with the solar power and the wind power
25 that would be fine, but when is that going to happen? In

1 the meantime, what are we going to use for a bridge fuel?
2 How are we going to get to that point? We can't just chop
3 it all off today and start with that stuff. It's going to
4 take 50, 60, maybe 100 years to make this transition, but
5 who knows. So, you know in the meantime let's use this
6 fossil fuel that we have available to us -- this clean
7 fossil fuel we have available to us and utilize it to the
8 best of our interest. Thank you. That's it.

9 MS. WILBUR: My name is Kimberly Wilbur,
10 K-i-m-b-e-r-l-y W-i-l-b-u-r. I've lived in Douglas County
11 for 30 years and I'm very concerned about the erosion of
12 landowners' property rights with this pipeline, but much
13 more than that I'm very concerned about the environmental
14 risks involved.

15 I don't think that Pembina has the landowners or
16 the environment in mind when they send us these slick,
17 non-recyclable paper flyers in the mail trying to convince
18 us that their idea is wonderful. And I really don't
19 understand why Americans and private property owners need to
20 help subsidize shipping natural gas to China. According to
21 the person who's in the White House right now, China is not
22 even really our friend, so why would anybody want to do
23 this? I'm just confused. I've been coming to protests
24 against the LNG for I think about 17 years now and it seems
25 like it just keeps popping back up like a bad dream.

1 So, I appreciate the time that it takes to
2 listen to these comments and whoever listens I appreciate
3 you being willing to listen and I deeply hope that this
4 pipeline is never built. If it is built, it would sure be
5 nice to know who's going to dismantle it when it's no longer
6 needed. That's something that doesn't seem to be answered
7 either. So, thank you for your time and no LNG please.

8 MS. BUDDENHAGEN: Mary, M-a-r-y, Buddenhagen,
9 B-u-d-d-e-n-h-a-g-e-n. I'm not on the direct route of the
10 pipeline, but I am near it and my land is definitely
11 affected by it because our water that we use for our farm
12 and our drinking, et cetera, it comes from the Coquille
13 watershed and it is this beautiful, pristine, old growth
14 watershed that is very steep and has a lot of unstable land,
15 landslides, et cetera.

16 The reason the Forest Service has not cut it all
17 down is because of that. It's so risky to put roads and
18 pipelines and things through it. And part of the danger is
19 that there's a lot of old mercury mines up there and mercury
20 tailings and obviously mercury in the soil. And we are very
21 concerned about our whole irrigation system. I mean not
22 only me, but all the neighbors because all the inevitable
23 sediment and highly likely mercury in our water is not going
24 to be very good for our stock, our gardens, our orchards, et
25 cetera, and for the poor people that use it for drinking

1 water.

2 So, I'm about three miles from the proposed site
3 of the pipeline and my other concern is that we live on a
4 very narrow one-lane road. The reason we bought out there
5 is because it's very quiet and peaceful and there's nobody
6 on that road. And the thought of all that machinery and
7 heavy equipment -- I mean I can't even imagine how they
8 would get it up there without rebuilding the whole road and
9 therefore probably taking some of our land. I don't know,
10 but it just seems crazy on a small scale to do that.

11 So, the main point, looking at the big picture
12 that I find really difficult to justify is the fact that
13 this is not for the American people. It is a foreign
14 company sending our precious, nonrenewable resource overseas
15 to some other country. I just cannot understand how that
16 could make sense to anyone. They're telling us that we will
17 not get one drop of this natural gas. Americans will not
18 get one drop of this natural gas. Now, I can't understand
19 how anybody can think that that is sane.

20 Okay, we hear rumors. You know nobody tells us
21 the whole story, but my understanding is partly why it's
22 been you all, FERC, has denied it before is because the
23 market fell through or the market's questionable. So, the
24 rumor has it that Japan wants to buy this natural gas
25 because of Fukushima and they saw how dangerous it is to

1 have nuclear power, so they want to transfer over to a
2 renewable power and in the meantime they want to bridge
3 energy, our LNG, to do that which means that it is a limited
4 amount of time that they're going to potentially want our
5 LNG.

6 And I think that their idea is a really good
7 idea and that we should be doing the same thing and using
8 our own LNG as a bridge to transfer it over to renewable
9 resources. And all of you people on FERC I don't know if
10 you've really paid attention and looked into your
11 responsibility of making decisions for us, but there is a
12 lot of evidence that we are having climate change and that
13 burning fossil fuels is not helping the situation. So, it
14 seems kind of crazy to invest this huge amount of money,
15 risking Americans' property for one thing -- I mean taking
16 American property for foreign gain that's just crazy.

17 You know I grew up in Honduras and I watch an
18 American company take the people's land and pollute their
19 water and impoverish them for the gain of some big
20 corporation, the United Fruit Company, and it's such a
21 turnaround that now I am one of those people where some big
22 corporations are trying to steal my land and pollute my
23 water.

24 I'm not that old. I mean I'm old, but geez,
25 things have really changed around a lot in my lifetime now

1 that we are suffering the same situation. So, I have 30
2 seconds left.

3 Coos Bay, Coos Bay is Oregon's best harbor. For
4 us to sacrifice it to some foreign company that is going to
5 close it down for our people and endanger our environment --
6 the environment there is incredible, it is so complex. It's
7 such a beautiful ecosystem. For us to allow it to be
8 compromised like this is just unconscionable. I could go
9 on.

10 Taking lands from Americans for this is just
11 completely un-American. I hope you will take your
12 responsibility seriously. You are, I think, working for the
13 American people, right? Thank you.

14 MR. MOLL: I am Timothy Moll. That's spelled
15 T-i-m-o-t-h-y M-o-l-l, and I'm a lifelong resident of
16 Umpqua Valley and grew up here fishing, swimming in the
17 river and I love this area. I'm against this pipeline
18 because of the impact it's going to have on the locals, the
19 environment, and it's for a foreign country. I feel like
20 what's a foreign country doing coming in here and using our
21 land and we're not going to see too much profit off it.

22 So, I just think it's not in the best interest
23 of Oregon or the local community. And it's not worth it to
24 our lands, to our water sheds; the amount of damage just
25 building the pipeline, let alone, after it's in, the

1 possible repercussions that could happen from it. It's not
2 worth it to us and I think it's a bad idea for our
3 community.

4 MS. EATHERINGTON: My name is Francis,
5 F-r-a-n-c-i-s; my last name is Eatherington,
6 E-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-g-t-o-n. You know I own property near
7 Milepost 85 of the pipeline and we are in what's considered
8 to be a Class 1 area and the Pipeline Safety Standards are
9 higher for Class 4 and they're they lowest for Class 1. In
10 our area, you will allow the company to use thinner pipes,
11 bear it as high as 18 inches and it likely will be buried 18
12 inches because we have high rock area and there's less
13 inspections, less wells, and further distance between -- and
14 there's a whole slew of cost-saving measures you allow the
15 company to take when there's fewer people.

16 And I'm kind of mad about that because why; is
17 it because only a few of us will die if it blows up as
18 opposed to the higher safety measures in Class 4 which is in
19 Coos Bay where you protect more people? I feel my life is
20 as important as their lives over there. I think that the
21 EIS failed to consider the impacts on rural people from a
22 lower safety standard.

23 Now, when we commented on this in 2015, the
24 response was, oh, that's ODOT's thing. FERC has nothing to
25 do with class standards. True, but NEPA requires that you

1 analyze the impacts of all agencies that have influence on
2 this pipeline. It's you who do the environmental impacts
3 and so it's you who have to analyze the impacts on rural
4 people from lower safety standards and you don't do it. You
5 haven't done it in the past two EISs and I would appreciate
6 it if you would consider us as value -- our lives as
7 valuable as those in a higher density area and that you
8 consider the impacts on rural people from having lower
9 safety standards in a Class 1 area.

10 And don't say that, oh, that's ODOT's thing,
11 therefore, you don't have to consider it in the EIS. You
12 do, even though it's ODOT's trip and they're the ones that
13 define the classes. Class 1 was defined in Oklahoma on flat
14 ground. It wasn't defined when they're going to put the
15 pipeline on a landslide strewn slope right above our house.
16 You know it wasn't defined for western Oregon with all our
17 earthquakes that we have in rural Oregon; yet, Class 1 --
18 you're going to lower the safety standards for us when we
19 are in the most dangerous areas. We are in the fire-prong
20 area here in southern Oregon.

21 Our forests burn often and naturally. These
22 forest fires come naturally and they come often; and yet,
23 you're going to have the lowest safety standards here in a
24 fire-adaptive forest. It just doesn't make sense that you
25 don't even analyze the impacts of having lower safety

1 standards. I understand that you're hands are tied and you
2 can't require them to have the same safety standards, but
3 you can do the environmental analysis of having the lower
4 safety standards in rural Oregon.

5 Most of this pipeline is going to be in rural
6 Oregon and they're going to save tons of money by having
7 thinner pipes. They're just going to save tons of money.
8 You should disclose how much money they will save. I think
9 that's important to know what our lives are worth, about how
10 much money they're going to save by having a Class 1
11 standard.

12 Also, I do believe that the DEIS really put
13 short change to our property values. It said that it won't
14 influence our property values at all, but really they should
15 look more into that because I do believe that our property
16 value will be greatly diminished by having a high-pressured
17 gas pipeline within feet of our house and within feet of our
18 water well and above our water well where you have to dig a
19 trench -- okay, it's only 18 inches, but I mean if it was
20 deeper you're really going to impact the flow of water into
21 our water well.

22 And so, there's no impact analyzed in the EIS
23 because you don't analyze the impacts on private landowners.
24 You don't say you know that this private landowner has a
25 well right here and it could be contaminated. There's

1 nothing in the EIS about impacts to private landowners, only
2 impacts to federal lands; yet, over half of this pipeline
3 goes through private landowners' home. And you know what,
4 that company says 82 percent of the landowners have signed.
5 That's a lie because we have been checking with the Douglas
6 County and the Coos County and the Klamath County records
7 and we know it's only about 60 percent of the landowners
8 that signed.

9 We know that there's close to 100 landowners who
10 haven't signed and the company is lying or they're somehow
11 skewing the facts when they say 82 percent. You know it's
12 really hard when they put all these advertisement on TV of
13 things that just aren't true, but anyway, I guess that's not
14 a part of the DEIS.

15 Mostly, I wanted to complain about the Class 1
16 area and for us to be really lower-class standards for rural
17 people in Oregon. Did you know that rural people have lower
18 safety standards than urban people? Have you heard of this
19 Class system before? So, anyway we don't like it. As a
20 rural Oregonian in a Class 1 area, I don't like it that you
21 are not analyzing in the EIS impacts on me from a Class 1
22 area. Thank you.

23 MR. LOZNAK: Alright, well, my name is Alexander
24 Loznak and it's A-l-e-x-a-n-d-e-r L-o-z-n-a-k, and I am a
25 community member and a recent graduate of Columbia

1 University. And I just want to start by stating my firm
2 opposition to the Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector Project
3 on the grounds that the project is going to exacerbate
4 climate change as well as violate local property rights.

5 But the main focus of my comments is on a few
6 points where I think the Draft Environmental Impact
7 Statement missed a few significant environmental impacts of
8 the project. So, specifically, I would like to see the
9 Final Environmental Impact Statement address greenhouse gas
10 emissions from forest clearing for the pipeline route. I
11 would like to see the Final EIS address the indirect
12 greenhouse gas emissions from the project. The current EIS
13 does address the direct emissions from constructions and
14 operations, but as far as I have seen, looking through it,
15 it does not address upstream emissions from natural gas
16 extraction, including methane leakage, and it does not
17 address downstream emissions from transportation and
18 ultimate combustion of the fuel. And those categories of
19 indirect emissions are probably bigger than the direct
20 emissions on the project, so I think this is something that
21 really should be included in the Final EIS.

22 I also want to point out that there's a draft
23 CEQ guidance that came out recently. It's not final, but
24 the draft does actually suggest that agencies analyze and
25 quantify both the direct and indirect greenhouse gas

1 emissions from projects.

2 I think the Final EIS should also consider and
3 quantify the social cost of carbon emissions and greenhouse
4 gas emissions from the project. This is something where
5 there have been multiple federal court cases where courts
6 have required agencies to disclose and quantify the social
7 cost of carbon from projects. So, you know I would like to
8 see that in the final version.

9 I would also like to see the Final EIS consider
10 the impacts of climate change on the project. There is a
11 brief mention in the draft of the risk of landslides
12 increasing due to climate change, but the Final should also
13 take into account the risks for increased wildfires. We
14 have a longer and more severe wildfire season in the West
15 and the Final needs to look at how that might exacerbate the
16 risk of accidents and even explosions related to fire.

17 Finally, a couple of other things, I think the
18 Final EIS should also consider stranded asset risk. So,
19 this project is a multi-billion dollar investment into new
20 fossil fuel infrastructure and the Draft EIS does not seem
21 to adequately consider how that investment may become
22 stranded due to climate and energy policies being
23 implemented to reduce fossil fuel use and consumption. So,
24 there's a huge risk to the company, to the investors, and to
25 the community that could ultimately become dependent on

1 revenues from this project; that that investment could
2 become stranded. That includes the possibility of new
3 climate legislation at the state level in Oregon, such as
4 HB-2020, which is currently under consideration.

5 Finally, I think the last thing that I wanted to
6 point out is significance. So, I think the Final EIS needs
7 to make a determination as to whether the climate change and
8 greenhouse gas emissions impacts of the project constitute a
9 significant environmental impact under NEPA. I believe
10 that's everything I wanted to say, so thank you.

11 MS. PAGE: Constance Page, C-o-n-s-t-a-n-c-e
12 P-a-g-e. So, I lived in Fairbanks, Alaska for quite a while
13 and we all know about the Exxon Valdez and what an
14 incredible mess that was and how it's still not cleaned up
15 really. The effects are still there. And from then on it
16 seems to have just been spill and break and spill and break
17 every since. I look at the pipelines, I look at the mines
18 that don't get cleaned up, the messes that go to the
19 taxpayers, which I -- you know what'd you call the Superfund
20 -- the Superfund sites they just seem to be so huge and so
21 expensive and it seems like people aren't getting them
22 cleaned up.

23 I'm worried about the water which is, of course,
24 everyone's worry. This is just the most beautiful, pristine
25 area. I don't own land that would be affected by it, but I

1 certainly know people who do. It would sicken me to have a
2 pipeline going through my line, but that's not my issue, I
3 guess.

4 I'm concerned about our loss of wildlife and
5 their habitat, fish -- and I guess I don't understand why
6 we're letting Canada come through our land; destroy our
7 area, to send it to China. I have not been convinced in any
8 way about the amount of work that would be -- that we would
9 get in Oregon. And even if we do get work for a short
10 period while they're building the pipeline, it is way more
11 worse what the effects could be in the long term and so I'm
12 totally against the LNG. And I guess that's all I have to
13 say.

14 MR. PETROWSKI: My name is Stanley John
15 Petrowski, S-t-a-n-l-e-y, John, P-e-t-r-o-w-s-k-i. I'm the
16 President and Director of the South Umpqua Rural Community
17 Partnership, which is a 501(c)(3) organization whose
18 constituents fill most of the South Umpqua Basin,
19 geographically. And I wanted to make a statement on behalf
20 of our constituents that we are in opposition to the
21 pipeline for sociological and environmental and ecological
22 reasons. That's pretty much the gist of it.

23 We have spent approximately twenty million
24 dollars doing habitat restoration in the South Umpqua Basin
25 and we feel that this project jeopardizes our work,

1 increases our work, and threatens species that are very much
2 a matter of concern at this juncture; namely, the Upper
3 South Umpqua spring Chinook and the Umpqua chub, the Umpqua
4 chub is not found anywhere else in the world, except this
5 Basin and there are six tributaries in the Basin that are
6 impacted by this pipeline.

7 So, for that reason and the fact that we are
8 seeking to cultivate an economy based on tourism and we feel
9 that the project will degrade our prospects for that. So,
10 that's pretty much my statement.

11 MS. COUNCIL: So, my name is Jennifer Council,
12 C-o-u-n-c-i-l. I'm a board member of Oregon Women's Land
13 Trust, which is on -- it's now just been removed from the
14 pipeline route directly, but we're now -- it now runs just
15 south of our property. We're a 501(c)(3) organization with
16 a mission that includes conservation and education and we
17 have a piece of land, we're the caretaker where the pipeline
18 has moved to now that we're glad it's not going to cut down
19 the forest. It now crosses the only egress we have from the
20 property on a small logging road. So, that means if there
21 is a fire there is no way out. There's no way out. The
22 only other direction is to clear cuts up the road, which are
23 dead end roads.

24 And if there were to be a fire that came out of
25 that section of the pipeline, our property is pretty much --

1 think of it like a little sub-watershed in itself. It's
2 almost a bowl with a rich line that wraps around it, so fire
3 tends to go uphill. So, we would be the uphill. And so, if
4 a fire were to start in the small tree plantation through
5 which the pipeline's going and the pipeline caught -- the
6 fire would sweep up that hill and we would not have an exit.

7 So, that's our biggest concern. We're in a
8 small, rural fire district with very limited fire resources.
9 I just don't feel like sufficient resources are being
10 allocated or will be allocated for the 50 years subsequently
11 that that's going to be in operation. So, we're like many
12 landowners stuck in rural areas with inadequate fire
13 protection.

14 The Stouts Creek fire started near us and it was
15 actually one of our members who spotted that that fire
16 started over what would've been a block valve had Pacific
17 Connector been able to put that pipeline in back when they
18 originally wanted to. The block valve would've been there.
19 So, in other words, the amount of gas that would've fed that
20 fire would've been double what you're anticipating because
21 the block valve itself would've burn up and been
22 inaccessible. We've made that comment and I don't think
23 it's adequately addressed.

24 So, I think all the planning is for a fire that
25 burns the amount of gas that runs between two block valves,

1 but not the amount of gas that runs between three block
2 valves.

3 Another issue we raised before the DEIS was the
4 issue of man camps and sex traffic and the impacts on woman
5 and you did address it in the DEIS, but you addressed it
6 largely in relation to Native American women because it was
7 raised by the Tribes, but it was also raised by us and so,
8 we talking about impacts on women, in general.

9 I heard the Douglas County -- and that's our
10 local -- of Human Trafficking Taskforce talk and they spoke
11 specifically about this project and their concerns and
12 there's no reference to you working with the Douglas County
13 Human Trafficking Taskforce, which is a coordinated group of
14 local law enforcement, local social services and -- I
15 forget, but I mean they're a very professional.

16 So, I don't feel the questions are adequate --
17 you talked about how it was really -- the issues really
18 applied mostly to places that turn into boom towns. This
19 isn't really a boom town, but what I heard the Human
20 Trafficking Taskforce say is that the traffickers basically
21 look for these projects. They follow them like fleas. They
22 know where they are. They show up with woman and drugs and
23 then they locate wherever people are staying, whether it's
24 the dispersed RV parks you'll have the pipeline workers on
25 or the man camps in Jordan Cove and that brings with it all

1 those implications.

2 And actually, in the DEIS, you say --
3 unfortunately, it comes on the break of a page, so you
4 reviewed various articles and you say "These articles focus
5 on links between semi-permanent work camps and the negative
6 impacts on female Native American populations. The influx
7 of large numbers of well-paid male oil workers in the North
8 Dakota camps coincided with increased sex trafficking, rape,
9 and physical violence."

10 So, that's just stated, so does that mean
11 there'll be money to fund help lines and crisis centers and
12 rape kits and social services and support? None of that's
13 covered. So, I know I've got limited time, but there's
14 another thing that came up that I have not seen before,
15 which is liability. I've never seen that the landowner,
16 should there be an accident -- we're already liable if
17 there's an accident if the property burns down for the
18 firefighting costs.

19 But we are apparently liable, according to
20 Pacific Gas and Connector now for not just the firefighting
21 cost, but the remediation of the pipeline. So, if an
22 accident happens and you've taken our property by imminent
23 domain and there is damage to the pipeline due to a fire, we
24 are now liable for the cost of rebuilding that pipeline.
25 That's in the DEIS. That's insane. And that fire, if you

1 hadn't taken our property by imminent domain, would not have
2 been at the scale that it would be, given that there's a
3 pipeline that we did not want, that we cannot accept, and
4 that we can't even say yes to because of our 501(c)(3)
5 missions.

6 So, we're suddenly acquiring a liability that we
7 have no power over, an insane liability to be liable for
8 rebuilding the pipeline makes no sense to me. There was
9 another comment about how if landslides pipelines move there
10 would be the -- you know they would try and stabilize it and
11 such and such, but if they couldn't stabilize it the third
12 line of defense would be to reroute the pipeline, but with
13 no explanation of what process would that be if you have to
14 reroute the pipeline off of the right-of-way. And there are
15 landslides. The pipeline goes through landslides near us,
16 so it's a real concern that that might be a real issue.
17 Thank you very much.

18 MS. EVANS: My name is Suzy Evans, S-u-z-y
19 E-v-a-n-s. I live in Milo. I am a landowner. Our property
20 is about four miles from the proposed pipeline. As many
21 landowners, I am deeply concerned and have been for all 14
22 years about this project.

23 For one thing, we have been burned out and had
24 serious fires in our area in Milo and of course all about,
25 but we lost our place, our home, and everything we owned in

1 one of the first fires. This was in '87, so it wasn't the
2 Stout Creek fire. But in that fire the fire came so close
3 to our home that it cracked windows. I mean we just managed
4 to save the house on that one. And you know we're in a very
5 geologically unstable area; particularly, triggering or the
6 potential of triggering problems with a highly danger gases
7 that explode. It just seems like an absurd situation
8 really to continue and it's unnecessary.

9 There's really no demand for it. I'm not going
10 to talk real long, but the explosiveness of the fracked gas
11 is really -- you know it's one of many concerns. The export
12 terminal besides not being needed would greatly add to the
13 climate pollution in our state and that's not what our state
14 is all about. I've got lots of concerns, but I'm not much
15 of a public speaker, but I truly think that FERC should deny
16 this permit and should've already done it long ago. And I
17 don't understand why this continues over and over again.
18 So, I'm one of many concerned homeowners and concerned
19 local citizens. Thanks.

20 MS. SMITH: So, my name is Jane Smith, S-m-i-t-h
21 J-a-n-e, and I'm against the Jordan Cove Project because I'm
22 concerned about the loss of land value rights. As
23 Americans, the majority of Americans our largest assets are
24 in our land and in our homes and the loss of land value
25 because of the easements is going to impact, not only the

1 current generation of who owns that land, but all future
2 generations of who may inherit or buy at a lesser value that
3 land.

4 So, I think with all the multitude of dollars
5 that are lost generations of resale for years and years to
6 come will more than -- is more valuable to us as American
7 than whatever dollars the Canadian company is going to make
8 selling to a foreign country. And feel like our government,
9 the FERC, should be taking care of keeping Americans' land
10 value rights at the forefront of their decision making and
11 that it should take precedence over any future gains by a
12 foreign company.

13 There's apparently several folks in many, many
14 states that have been -- had their land taken by imminent
15 domain and have not been paid by Williams, by the company
16 that's building the pipeline that Pembina is now
17 representing. So, these folks are having to go to court in
18 order to get the money for their easements. They're taking
19 the easements and then deferring the payments for the
20 easements and that is truly -- it's just -- it's too
21 horrific to even consider if it was my land or your land.
22 I'm done.

23 MS. GWYNN: My legal name is Helen, H-e-l-e-n;
24 Elizabeth, E-l-i-z-a-b-e-t-h; and my last name is Gwynn,
25 G-w-y-n-n. I have lived in this area 43 years. I live on

1 land and I'm also for very many years I have been a board
2 member of the Oregon Women's Land Trust, so I'm involved in
3 multiple piece of land that are valued so much because of
4 their ecological importance, wildlife habitat, forest
5 restoration, and the lands that I care about so much and are
6 involved with are like postage stamps in an array of clear
7 cut and tree plantations.

8 And the timber industry just did a clear cut
9 within yards of my home and the forest impacting our water
10 line, among other things. So, I'm not a pro-logging
11 Northwesterner. I'm someone impacted by it. But I have to
12 say I've been working against this pipeline for as long as
13 the effort's been going on; what, 15 years.

14 And it was so interesting because years ago
15 there would be a public meeting and there would be you know
16 a handful of locals, but really mixed. People who'd been
17 loggers and people who have built pipelines together with
18 people who are back-to-landers like me and such a mix of
19 citizens coming together to say no way and the crowds have
20 gotten bigger and bigger and bigger as more and more people
21 in southern Oregon has grasped the impact of what this
22 pipeline would effect.

23 And for me, one of the most enormous pieces of
24 the puzzle is the affect on the planet and on climate
25 change. The terminal at Jordan Cove would become Oregon's

1 biggest emitter of polluting gases.

2 I don't have the data in front of me. I'm not
3 sure whether we're talking carbon dioxide or methane. I
4 know that methane is very much involved in the production
5 process, both for fracking where this case is going to come
6 from. It's fracked gas from up north from start to finish
7 that fracking is the source of this gas, that the process of
8 building the pipeline impacts streams and forests and rivers
9 and wildlife and homesteads. It's just monstrous. It's one
10 of the worse -- and I recently heard -- at another hearing I
11 heard one scientist say it is one of the most horrible ideas
12 that anybody ever invented about resource extraction.

13 And Washington said no to it and California said
14 no to it, so here's now Oregon's turn to be able to stand up
15 and say no about this pipeline. So, for me, the affect on
16 the climate is front and center. And it's not just
17 theoretically. It really would happen and it would be in --
18 the Jordan Cove terminal itself would be built in the middle
19 of a tsunami zone and it would totally change the estuary
20 life at the mouth of the river there in Coos Bay, so it's a
21 dreadful idea.

22 It has limited, short-term jobs that would be
23 available to construction workers and then they would go
24 away and then that's it, some maintenance for 30 years and a
25 lot of gas going into the atmosphere, a lot of gas coming

1 out of the ground in dangerous ways with fracking and then
2 going to Asia. It's nonsense. It's total nonsense to me
3 and I'm really proud of this effort to stop it. We've
4 stopped it for 15 years. FERC has not been able to get this
5 thing rolling and various versions of the Canadian companies
6 have not been able to get it going.

7 They do expensive, glossy advertisements. They
8 have a lot of TV advertisements and they have the money to
9 do that, but I think that the morale rectitude and the
10 attention to what it means to live on this planet that's on
11 our side. We have maybe 10 years to get off fossil fuel.
12 Natural gas may be a little bit cleaner than some of the
13 rest, but not if it's fracked and not if it's frozen and
14 sent across the ocean.

15 The impact of the shipping and the freezing is a
16 whole other cost, environmentally. So, it's a stupid idea
17 and we have to completely reinvent the wheel about how to
18 use renewable energy in order to have a habitable planet
19 within 20 years. So, I think that's my schpeel.

20 MS. HART: My name is Mirinda Hart,
21 M-i-r-i-n-d-a H-a-r-t. My comment's on the Draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement. It's a huge beast, but I
23 feel that it's not as comprehensive as it could be. And I
24 have some concerns that I feel particularly need to be dove
25 into in more depth. That includes the impacts -- the

1 changing direction of the water to get it out of their way
2 to put the pipe in and then putting it back, what the impact
3 means for our salmon, our Chinook salmon, our North Pacific
4 lamprey and our other fish wildlife that live in those
5 waters. How will it affect them when their home is picked
6 up and moved and put back?

7 And I also have concerns about the Draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement could dive a little deeper
9 into our wildfire issues here in Oregon. We have huge
10 wildfires. And I have concerns, not only with the natural
11 gas pipeline and how it would react in one of our fires, but
12 I also have concerns that what happens if that pipe --
13 something goes wrong with that pipe and it's surrounded by
14 wildfire and nobody can get to it to fix it or to address
15 whatever is happening with it. And whether that's regular
16 maintenance or an actual, oops, we have an issue, those are
17 things that are very concerning to me, and I feel like
18 should be address. The last thing we want to see here in
19 Oregon is more devastation and more destruction and death
20 around the fires. They're pretty intense already as it is.

21 And back to the water, in addition to moving the
22 water, also the horizontal drilling, how does that impact
23 our salmon and our quality of our drinking water? I've
24 lived here in Myrtle Creek my entire life and already our
25 waters are so much lower than they used to be and already we

1 can't go swimming earlier that we used to 'cause algae is
2 looming and what does that mean for our water quality
3 because this is also the water we drink and that comes into
4 our homes and what does that mean for us if this hurts our
5 water in any way.

6 We have such precious, precious amounts of this
7 resource available to us and every year with drought and
8 fires it becomes even more so and I just -- this gamble on a
9 precarious situation is pretty heavy and I think that the
10 Draft Environmental Impact Statement could go more in depth
11 into looking into that and I just urge against these
12 projects for the future of our lives because I like living.
13 It's pretty swell. Thank you.

14 MR. PECONOM: What did you mean by horizontal
15 drilling?

16 MS. HART: In some places they're going to move
17 the river and others they're going to do the drilling under
18 it, like I think in four places.

19 MR. PECONOM: They're going to drill under the
20 Klamath. They're going to drill under Coos Bay and they're
21 going to do a direct pipe under South Umpqua, which is
22 technically a boor and not horizontal drilling.

23 MS. HART: Okay.

24 MR. GOW: My name is Bill Gow, B-i-l-l G-o-w.
25 I'm an affected landowner. The pipeline crosses my property

1 a couple miles from my property. I've been in this fight
2 for about 15 years against this mess.

3 Okay, I'd like to start out with getting into
4 what happened today in Canada where they give them \$278
5 million to -- the Canadian Government did to the Kitimat
6 Project to fund that and that money is artificially keeping
7 Canadian gas very, very cheap. The price at Alkol Hub has
8 gone down every year for the last I don't know how many
9 years.

10 So, now all of a sudden because of Canadian
11 politics, which I am not involved in. I have no say in
12 Canadian politics. They are going to try to take my land
13 through eminent domain so that they can find a place to
14 release their gas -- get their gas out of the country. And
15 I don't think -- my 4th Amendment, 15th Amendment, all my
16 due process rights are being trumped because of the fact
17 that this is a Canadian company that has a screwed up
18 government that is playing right in the hands of causing me
19 to be taken with eminent domain.

20 I think it's really important that FERC look at
21 the fact that Canada caused this problem. I didn't cause
22 this problem and I don't have any say -- I'm not a voter in
23 Canada. I don't have any rights in Canada. I mean you know
24 am I going to be the one -- you know like I said out there,
25 and I was serious, are the Royal Canadian Mounted Police

1 going to come arrest me or is it -- you know I mean is this
2 Canada or is this the U.S. and is it going to be Canadian
3 imminent domain or is going to be the U.S. imminent domain
4 to take my property?

5 I think it's really important that we look at
6 what the government is doing for Kitimat and they could turn
7 around and do the same thing into the United States by
8 throwing all that money in there and paying because they had
9 a bunch of stack stuff they couldn't build and the
10 government's paying for it so that could keep the project
11 going. And they could be some of those same things -- and I
12 have no vote and I have no rights in Canada, but yet, what
13 the Canadian Government wants to do to me is going to
14 directly affect me. Okay, that's one point I really want to
15 get across.

16 Another thing is, is the pipeline runs to the
17 terminal, okay, so the other customer for this pipeline is
18 the terminal and so they're basically selling the gas to
19 themselves. They have nobody else that's buying the gas and
20 under FERC's standards they say that they must have
21 customers to sell the gas to when they build the pipeline
22 and the only customer that they have are themselves and I
23 think that's a violation of the FERC process to be able to
24 use themselves as their own customer and I think FERC needs
25 to take a long, hard look at that and see why they are going

1 to allow that to happen.

2 I don't see how they could allow it because it's
3 one of their criteria and now it's going right in the face
4 of their criteria to own all the pipeline themselves. The
5 fact that they don't have any binding contracts from the
6 terminal that really bothers me. So, basically, they want
7 to use eminent domain against me for no market, basically.

8 I could give Jordan Cove a binding contract -- a
9 non-binding contract. Matter of fact, I'll make an offer,
10 give them a non-binding contract and say I'll buy all their
11 gas and that is what they're using which means absolutely
12 nothing. It has no claws in that bear. There's nothing in
13 it and that's not right that they can do all this stuff with
14 non-binding contracts. A non-binding contract means nothing
15 and for them to keep shooting their mouth off about having
16 these non-binding contracts to me is completely ridiculous.

17 There's nothing about this project that makes
18 any sense economically. I've been in this fight for 15
19 years. My life has been completely disrupted and there's no
20 compensation to me for what's going on and I haven't gain a
21 dang thing. It's cost me money, personally -- time, money,
22 problems, time away from my family and there is no
23 compensation to me and somebody in this FERC process needs
24 to start looking at -- I wouldn't wish this process on my
25 worst enemy. I'm telling you that's how bad it is,

1 sleepless nights trying to get your head around it.

2 And I'll tell you another thing is when you walk
3 into this process you have no idea what you're getting into.
4 I didn't know a DEIS from a -- you know from a volley ball
5 game. And you know I think people need to realize when
6 these companies in here there is no level playing field and
7 they just run over the people in these area and these people
8 get major advantage. We are kind of lucky in a way that
9 this process has been around long enough that we've been
10 able to move our educational level up to some degree, but
11 it's still hard to get your head around, just like when the
12 Draft Environmental Impact Statement come out.

13 Hell, it was 18, 20 inches off the ground. We
14 figured out -- when I finally got a hard copy, which was two
15 weeks into the process because I don't have a computer that
16 would even download it, do any of that kind stuff, I had to
17 read something like 77 pages a day just to get through it,
18 not to gain anything or just to get through it, not making
19 any comments or anything and I think that's really, really
20 unfair and I think this FERC process needs to be really,
21 really looking at very hard to try to figure out a better
22 way to teach people. And you can't go down into Roseburg --
23 I'd even make this statement.

24 I don't think you can go in the State of Oregon
25 and find an attorney that is up to speed on the FERC

1 process. I would say out there -- and a lot of people went
2 and hired attorneys that were the local divorce attorney or
3 whatever and it did them absolutely no good. They just
4 spent their money. And I think FERC needs to look at a
5 different way to run these things so that the people are
6 treated more fairly.

7 And right now the company's going around and
8 saying that they got 82 percent of the landowners and that's
9 malarkey. They got about 60 percent of them. And I've
10 talked to lots of them. Even though they signed, they're
11 still 100 percent against the project. They just got tired
12 of being harassed and bothered and harassed and bother that
13 they final gave in.

14 A lot of older people -- you know a big majority
15 of us landowners are older people -- 60 plus you know,
16 including myself. And I think to put that kind of burden on
17 somebody that's trying to live in I guess the sunset of our
18 life is really, really unfair and I think -- I don't have
19 all the answers how we could change this process, but we
20 need to get to where there's a lot leveler playing field.

21 And you know, as Republicans, I cannot believe
22 that Republicans would be in the favor of taking private
23 property for private gain 'cause that's not what imminent
24 domain was put on Earth for. It was put on for public need
25 and necessity and they've just skirted that issue and now we

1 have a Canadian company that wants to use imminent domain
2 against me, an American citizen, to take my land. And you
3 know I just can't understand -- I mean whose rules are we
4 going to follow? Are we going to follow Canada's rules or
5 are we going to follow U.S. rules?

6 And I think we need to really get our head
7 around how this project is going to have a long-term effect
8 on the natural gas industry and I think the FERC Commission
9 -- I would hope that the FERC Commission would take a long
10 and hard look at this project as a unique project that
11 doesn't fit in just a same drawer as all the rest of them
12 and I think they really need to take a hard look at this and
13 say are we going to continue to let foreign come here and
14 run over American landowners. Thank you.

15 MS. HANSEN: Okay, M. A. H-a-n-s-en, 548 West
16 Hickory, Roseburg. Okay, well, I just was handed this and
17 it kind of shocked me. I have a degree in Planning. I'm an
18 international programmer and accountant, so I've been around
19 and I can write EISs, so this is an EIS.

20 FERC is supposed to be an independent regulatory
21 agent or regulatory commission that reviews and develops
22 other developments by other entities. Accordingly, the
23 project proponent is the source for identifying the purpose
24 for developing and constructing a project.

25 Now, we are talking about what I heard today and

1 I have heard different figures in this, but this is a kind of
2 a high one, that this is a ninety billion dollar company. I
3 really think that they could've come up with something
4 better than this to try and talk FERC into accepting this
5 project.

6 In the application Jordan Cove states that the
7 purpose of this project is to export natural gas supplies
8 derived from existing interstate national (sic) gas
9 transmission systems linked to the Rocky Mountain region and
10 western Canada to overseas markets; particularly, Asia.

11 Okay. I'll just stop there for a second.

12 Number one, has anybody seen any contracts from
13 anybody in the United States which would be the Rocky
14 Mountain region? We do not believe -- and I've been
15 studying this for 15 years. I was the second person who
16 started fighting this pipeline. I own three properties. It
17 is not proposed to touch any of my properties. It's wrong
18 for America, especially. It's going to throw us on the
19 world market for our own gas. And right now Asia -- well,
20 quite a while back Asia was paying 14 percent more than us.
21 I'm hearing that it's in the twenties now for our own gas.

22 And they say we're going to get taxes. A while
23 back ^^^^ well, actually, years ago I was told by the
24 project manager that they were being forgiven for three
25 years for the taxes. And when you build a pipeline, it

1 starts -- I mean it starts depleting in value right away, so
2 their taxes are just going to go down, down, down. So, they
3 have already admitted that they're not going to hire
4 Oregonians to build this pipeline or the terminal.

5 And in one place I asked them how many people
6 were going to be employed on this after the pipeline was
7 built and you're bye-bye and nowhere around and they said
8 six people and they wouldn't guarantee they'd be Oregonians.
9 And I said, look, you're going to take our land, imminent
10 domain, for six jobs that might be from somebody from out of
11 town? That doesn't make sense.

12 I have done the math on the jobs. There are
13 negative, negative, very big negative jobs going to be
14 related to this pipeline and we're going to lose more
15 industries and jobs than they are ever going to provide.
16 And that is so easy to figure out and prove.

17 So, then, according to Jordan Cove, the project
18 -- I can't believe this. According to Jordan Cove, the
19 project is a market-driven response to increasing natural
20 gas supplies in the U.S. Rocky Mountains and western Canada
21 production areas and the growth of international demand;
22 particularly, Asia.

23 They cannot get a customer overseas. The last
24 DEIS that FERC denied was because they had no contracts.
25 And they said, oh, we'll get Japan. Well, they have not

1 gotten Japan and we don't know who in the heck they're
2 after. I mean it would nice to see some contracts -- well,
3 I mean I don't think they don't have any contracts and think
4 that they have to come with some contracts. Why this is
5 even putting us through all of this -- I mean we're all in
6 prisons here.

7 And even though it's not on my property, I am so
8 against it that I spend day and night about it. I go to
9 every place that the Jordan Cove people show up, all four
10 counties. I've been traveling for 15 years with this outfit
11 you know and it just gets worse.

12 In its application Pacific Connector states "The
13 purpose of this project is to connect the existing
14 interstate natural gas transition systems of GNT and Ruby
15 with the proposed Jordan Cove LNG Terminal."

16 Now, if that is the best need that they can come
17 up with, I mean I can't even imagine FERC is even giving
18 them two seconds to consider this. If that is the best that
19 a ninety billion dollar company can come up with for a need
20 to take our land, imminent domain, and wipe out fishing
21 industry, both our freshwater fish industry -- I'm a water
22 monitor and I also have a degree in Environmental Studies
23 and I monitor water.

24 And you get out there and you start taking water
25 out of one tributary and putting it into another tributary

1 are killing those fish and you are killing those fish.
2 They're going to take whatever portion of pipeline they have
3 at the time, fill it full of toxins to kill whatever's in
4 the water, suck that water out of this tributary, including
5 the eggs, the fry, everything, even the part of the
6 environment into that pipeline and they're putting it in the
7 next tributary. They are right there killing two
8 tributaries to either the South Umpqua River, the North
9 Umpqua River and they are two major rivers. They are
10 separate rivers. And that's in Douglas County and the Rogue
11 in Jackson County.

12 They're doing this to the tributaries. You
13 don't kill the tributaries. You kill all the fish and when
14 that gets into the mainstream that kills those fish. It
15 goes out into the ocean and it kills there. Nobody, nobody
16 should touch anything this way. This is just a
17 kill/kill/kill and it is extremely bad for our environment.

18 And my understanding is that is what FERC is
19 supposed to be studying here is impacts on our environment.
20 That is the bottom line. As I say, I write EISs. I write
21 EISs and EIRs because I write in California too -- in
22 California their Environment Impact Reports. Here the
23 Environmental Impact Statements -- I mean statements, I
24 guess, EISs.

25 So, anyway, I just find it appalling that these

1 people can keep us in prison. We're literally in prison on
2 our own properties. I mean I'm in prison for my neighbors
3 and I'm in prison because it's affecting the economy of all
4 these four counties immensely and these are valuable
5 counties to the rest of the State's economy and it's just --
6 here's a good example.

7 I've got a lot of neighbors and they always kept
8 their places pristine, just pristine. You go through there
9 now it is like a dump yard. It's like a junkyard. They're
10 not painting their places. They're not rebuilding anything.
11 They're not repairing anything because they don't want to
12 live there with a pipeline. They don't want to leave there
13 with any kind of an easement across their property.

14 Do you know that if Jordan Cove wants to they
15 can sell that easement to anybody in this world? They can
16 use it for their pipeline, but if their pipeline doesn't go
17 through they can sell it to anybody, anybody in this world.
18 That is what scares me. All of a sudden, you got a bunch of
19 Russian pipelines running through the country.

20 You know I mean I've lived in about every
21 country in this world. I've been in about every country and
22 -- I'm an international programmer, so you get everywhere,
23 believe me. And I speak languages and stuff and I'm all for
24 everybody you know, but when you've got what's supposedly --
25 supposedly people who want to be your enemies you don't open

1 your land to them because you're opening your land. When
2 you sell an easement that's it. You got no say; yet, you
3 get to pay the taxes on it. Isn't that wonderful? And you
4 have no say on that land. So, that is something to really
5 consider.

6 This is what you're considering. You're not
7 really just considering the impact on the environment.
8 You're considering the impact on the economy and that turns
9 into impact on environment. Everything turns to impact on
10 the environment, everything.

11 You know these people used to do a lot to
12 improve the creeks on their land, may sure that the
13 blackberries are out of there and that things are good fish.
14 They're not doing anything now. Why do it? They don't want
15 to live there and they can't sell it. And the money they
16 put into improving it they're not going get back 'cause
17 nobody wants to buy it. Nobody wants to buy this land.

18 This is 15 years of being in prison you know and
19 FERC can stop it. They've stopped it twice, but they
20 stopped it -- what is it? It was no something and you got
21 to stop it and say this is it. You know FERC always gives
22 them the chance to take care of this little thing. Well,
23 the one thing they said is get yourselves some clients.
24 They're not proving that they have any clients.

25 They say for Asia. That's a big statement.

1 Where's the contract? You know we're going to tear up
2 three, four counties of a -- you know part of the United
3 States, tear up four counties. That's tearing up the people
4 who live there, the people who own those counties and you
5 don't have any customers. You got no proof and you may
6 never put this pipeline in. Now, you've acquired all this
7 land, all these easement. Now, you can sell them to anybody
8 you want to. And believe me; they could get some money just
9 for selling those easements.

10 And we are very, very suspicious of this whole
11 thing ^^^ that this whole thing is just an investment fraud
12 because these people don't have a brick and mortar building
13 to go to. They really don't exist. And this is the second
14 outfit in Canada and nobody checks this out. You know we
15 can harp it and harp it, but we don't know if anybody's ever
16 checked it out, but other people can make decisions about
17 our land.

18 I mean how can people just make decisions about
19 our land and totally don't understand what's going on? What
20 the real thing that's going on here. In the meantime, we're
21 in prison you know. They keep saying, oh, we'll get out
22 such and such a date. Oh, okay, then they give us another
23 date.

24 Okay, six more months of being in prison, of our
25 children not know are they going to when they graduate are

1 they going to stay here and work for us and get keep this
2 land going, which has been their ^^^^ it's been their plan
3 along to -- you know to be like we did.

4 We took over from our folks and our kids would
5 like to. No, I can tell you family after family that's been
6 totally torn apart over these things because their kids
7 couldn't wait for it. They can't stake their children on
8 being on land that nobody wants and they can never sell.
9 And you know it's like they would continue to be a prisoner
10 on their own land -- so-called land with this easement
11 through it, if that went through. It just goes on and on.

12 I mean I've been involved in it for 15 years. I
13 could write quite a few books about this and I have written
14 many books, so this is an unbelievable story. It's so
15 unbelievable that our government agencies just keep doing
16 this to us. It's just like we have no say. We have
17 absolutely no say whatsoever.

18 Yeah, pay your taxes. Just keep paying your
19 taxes you know, but we're not going to give you a darn thing
20 for it. That's kind of where it's at and I could go on till
21 you shut me up.

22 MS. MUNOZ: You might want to wrap it up.

23 MS. HANSEN: Well, I think I've said my thing.
24 My thing is most people who have the authority over our land
25 that we've paid for and blood, sweat, and tears for don't

1 have a clue, really just don't have a clue. We have people
2 in the project -- I've heard people tell people that, oh,
3 the 6,000 trees that you planted up there so that you
4 wouldn't have a landslide when somebody come by and clear
5 cut, well, yeah, we want to put the pipeline through there.
6 So, we'll mitigate and we'll move them to a better spot.

7 Telling these people -- the people telling them
8 were from Philadelphia, the streets of Philadelphia. Never
9 saw a tree in their life. Wouldn't know one if they fell
10 over them. And they're telling them, oh, well, we'll just
11 move those 6,000 trees to a better spot. I'm the treasurer
12 of the Native Planning Society of this region and we have
13 one of the rarest flowers in the world up on a ridge. It's
14 called the *Calochortus coxii*, and one of our members
15 discovered it. That's why it's *coxii* 'cause his name was
16 Cox, so anyhow, they put two "I's" behind and that gave it a
17 Latin name, so now you can speak Latin. Didn't think you'd
18 learn something today, did you?

19 Well, anyhow, so I said something to them about,
20 well, what'd you going to do? You put that pipeline through
21 probably the most extinct -- well, not extinct. What'd I
22 say before? Rare -- the most rare flower in the world. And
23 they said, oh, we'll mitigate. We will move it to a better
24 spot.

25 Now, you don't have to be a native plant expert

1 to know that a native plant grows where it grows only
2 because -- and this flow grows where it grows 'cause there's
3 a special serpentine road in that area and this is the only
4 plant that can survive there and this is the only place it
5 can survive and this is a five-mile, noncontiguous area on a
6 serpentine ridge near here, the only place in the world and
7 they're going to tell us they're going to mitigate and move
8 it to a better spot.

9 You don't move a native plant, first of all.
10 They'll die. That's what they do. They die. So, now
11 you've just wiped out the biggest field of them in the world
12 for why; for greed, so another country -- and my dad's a
13 Canadian, so I'm okay with the Canadians -- so another
14 country can get rich. I mean another so-called business in
15 another country can get rich. And we haven't seen real
16 proof yet that they're even a business; that they're not
17 just investment fraud and why isn't that getting checked
18 out?

19 We're desperately trying to save our land. We
20 don't have time to do all that crap. Excuse me. So,
21 anyhow, you're done with me. Am I free to go?

22 MS. MUNOZ: You're free to go.

23 MS. HANSEN: Thank you.

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

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

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

Name of Proceeding: Jordan Cove Energy Project

Docket No.: CP17-495-000/CP17-494-000

Place: Myrtle Creek, Oregon

Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2019

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

Michael Miller

Official Reporter

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 SCOPING MEETING
3 JORDAN COVE ENERGY PROJECT
4 CAUSE NUMBER CP17-494-000/CP17-495-000
5 SOUTH UMPQUA HIGH SCHOOL
6 501 CHADWICK LANE
7 MYRTLE CREEK, OREGON 97457

8

9 TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2019

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 REPORTER: DAVID DOWNEY

2 MR. ADAMS: Frank Adams, F-r-a-n-k A-d-a-m-s.

3 I am Frank Adams, a 72-year-old Marine veteran and father
4 and grandfather. I have been a resident of Tenmile, Oregon
5 for 38 years. Tenmile is in Douglas County. I served three
6 tours in Vietnam from November '66 to March 1969. I suffer
7 numerous ailments due to exposure to Agent Orange during
8 that time. I served my Military obligation without
9 question, as I served my country and provided rights for
10 others in other countries.

11 I, at the very least, have earned the right to
12 own my land in the country I fought so hard for and have a
13 foreign country come in and take my land and tell me how I
14 can or cannot use it. In 1981, my father and I purchased
15 this land of five and a half acres at 1731 Ireland Road,
16 Tenmile, Winston. That fall he died and his ashes are
17 spread on our land.

18 I raised my three sons here and developed this
19 land until they went away to college. When I look over the
20 land, I think of the hardships and hard work that went into
21 develop our farm. I think of how Pembina Pipeline wants to
22 destroy it all against my will. My sons and their families
23 come often and visit and enjoy the open fields to run and
24 play on these acres.

25 The 36-inch pipeline goes right through the

1 middle of my property, an area of 100 feet by 300 feet.
2 There's also a proposed work area to the north, which covers
3 several acres of grassland I use for grazing my cattle. The
4 cattle provide meat for sons and their families for the
5 year. This pipeline route comes really close to my orchard
6 and my grapevines, which is likely (sic) will destroy.

7 I use about eight acres of the neighbor's
8 property for grazing and fire suppression. That proposed
9 line goes through the middle of her land also. I have a
10 well on my property and it produces very limited amount of
11 water. In 38 years, I have never run out of water. The
12 source of my well is in the mountains to the west. Any
13 digging, blasting, or trenching will jeopardize my water
14 supply for my cattle and home use.

15 The route taken by the pipeline down the hill
16 will impact runoff and open the door, so to speak, for
17 slides and the channeling of water away from my well source.
18 This runoff will also seal up the seasonal creek and empty
19 into Tenmile Creek.

20 What are my major concerns? The route taken, my
21 water supply, my privacy, loss of grazing land for my
22 cattle, drilling another well in a proposed gas line area,
23 and placement of a septic system, maintenance of the gas
24 line via spray and herbicides, danger of fire in
25 construction area, and danger of fires on the right-of-way,

1 the use of imminent domain, the taking of private land for
2 foreign use to sell gas to Asian markets is not good for
3 me, Douglas County, or Oregon. It's not in public interest
4 for our area or the United States.

5 These foreign countries wouldn't allow this sort
6 of thing to take place in their country. There are many
7 forms of stress. Several that have hit me hard are
8 financial, to have myself and my property represented.
9 Second is the constant threat of imminent domain. The third
10 is what Pembina will use via payoffs or other underhanded
11 tactics to get extensions and sway public opinion.

12 It's my opinion and others to request that FERC
13 deny the certificate of public convenience and necessity for
14 this project. This time it should be denied without
15 prejudice. Three strikes and you're out. Frank Adams.
16 Thank you.

17 MR. ADAMS: Clarence Adams, C-l-a-r-e-n-c-e
18 A-d-a-m-s. I live at 2039 Island Road. I'm an affected
19 landowner. And first of all, I'd like to protest FERC
20 discrimination of all the older folks who are along the
21 pipeline route who could not adequately address the DEIS
22 because of the lack of paper copies sent out; did them a
23 great disservice. Some of those are very intelligent, but
24 they have to have stuff to work with. So, that's my first
25 main comment.

1 For Jordan Cove Project, the terminal itself, to
2 me, there's not enough information on the ships coming into
3 the Bay. It seems like they kind of gloss over the fact
4 that those ships are coming in and they do the -- you know
5 some of the stuff that's surrounding -- because they have to
6 because of the dredging and the safety zones and all that,
7 but they don't address what ships are coming in that I could
8 ever see, so I'd like to know what ships are coming in.

9 Also, the lies spread by Pembina just recently
10 that they have 82 percent of the landowners, I'd like to see
11 like you did on the last DIS (sic), have them breakdown
12 where they're coming up with that number, whether it's
13 miles, acres, number of parcels, 'cause under our figures
14 it's more like 60 percent of landowners, not parcels. So,
15 we've got at least 90 people that aren't signing it. It's
16 going to be imminent domain or nothing.

17 So, it's very important that that gets spelled
18 out and hopefully -- I know FERC can't regulate the
19 companies, but it just frustrating to see all the lies and
20 half truths that come out on their TV ads, radios, and
21 papers and that kind of stuff that we can't really address.
22 So, to me, that's an unfair advantage to the company that I
23 don't know how to address it, other than cribbing them, but
24 I know you can't, but it's just not fair.

25 So, I had a couple other things too. Now, I'm

1 drawing a blank. I will submit written comments, but I
2 didn't do anything about tsunami and dangers. And I don't
3 think the terminal's going to be adequately protected by the
4 tsunami. I mean they're on a big sand spit on sea level,
5 for Christ's sake. Even with berms, I think once the
6 tsunami starts coming in the tide goes out, ship get bottom
7 out. I think that things are going to happen bad when the
8 tide wave comes in. That ship is just going to be just a
9 big battering ram, either way, on the Henderson Mark side
10 where they still have a berm or the berms that are
11 protecting the tanks. I think you know they're just not
12 going to be able to do. Thank you.

13 MS. KNITTLE: My name is Christa, spelled
14 C-h-r-i-s-t-a. My last name is Knittle, spelled
15 K-n-i-t-t-le. I strongly oppose the Pacific Connector
16 Pipeline and the Jordan Cove Terminal because they will harm
17 Oregonians and be big polluters.

18 Also, exported gas is going to drive up energy
19 prices and the pipeline is an unjust use of imminent domain.
20 And the whole -- the projects will harm the sustainable jobs
21 that are well established here in Oregon in the areas of
22 fishing, tourism, and recreation.

23 We're in a climate crisis and scientists tell us
24 we need to stop burning fossil fuels, so we need to end our
25 dependency on fossil fuels and go to renewable energy, which

1 we have the technology and the resources to do and there are
2 more jobs in clean, renewable energy, and those are safe
3 jobs too. So, we need to be going to renewable energy.

4 The pollution caused by these projects is huge.
5 These pipelines explode and leak and in a forested area that
6 is already subject to wild fires the pipeline will just --
7 there're potential fires that will be hard to access by fire
8 crews and the habitat of 32 endangered species will be
9 affected as well as Tribal territories and burial sites of
10 Tribes. Our public forest will be impacted and also 700
11 parcels of private land.

12 Also our drinking water will be polluted by this
13 project and this is water that is also used for farms and
14 recreational purposes. The stream temperatures will rise,
15 which is harmful to fish. And this will happen in 400
16 waterways, so there's no benefit to Oregonians from this
17 project. And in fact, it will further stress economically
18 stressed communities.

19 MS. STRUSS: My name is Barbara Struss,
20 B-a-r-b-a-r-a S-t-r-u-s-s. My name is Barbara and I have
21 lived in Douglas County for 54 years. I am particularly
22 worried about the possibility of leaks. We know that the
23 pipeline leaks have happened all the time. We do not need
24 any more gas, coal, or oil. We know that we need a quick
25 transition to clean energy to mitigate the worst impacts of

1 climate change.

2 Over the past few years, we have seen larger and
3 more severe wildfires in our communities. Rural communities
4 like mine will be the hardest hit by climate change. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. HOPKINS: Travis Hopkins, T-r-a-v-i-s
7 H-o-p-k-i-n-s. I'm in support of the project. I figure if
8 the place -- if it displaces some trees, we can replant
9 them. Any animals that face distress through fire and
10 weather it'll be more than the trees being moved for
11 temporary time. So much has been taken for the people that
12 have the least to give. Most of the time these people are
13 the hardest working families that multiple generations grew
14 up around their families, create a southern Oregon economy,
15 and grow it. Thank you.

16 MS. HINE: Hi, my name is Patricia,
17 P-a-t-r-i-c-a; Hine, H-i-n-e, and I'm just a witness. I'm
18 number 31. I'll be back.

19 MALE SPEAKER: Okay, witness 31. Okay.

20 MS. HINE: Well, thank you for the opportunity
21 to comment during this public input phase. It seems to be
22 at least an attempt to have a democracy conversation about
23 the process. And although I've been following this for some
24 four years now, the more I find out about our federal and
25 state regulatory agencies the more I'm becoming worried that

1 they have been captured by the industries, which they are
2 trying to regulate.

3 And I'm not an unpatriotic citizen. I'm a
4 retired naval officer, who's deeply worried about the
5 direction of our country and the world. And I don't want to
6 give anybody a lesson about leadership, but what I think
7 that we understand and everybody know it is that we trust
8 the institutions that we rely on to keep us safe and I think
9 that is destabilizing when we don't sense that we're being
10 -- that we don't have you protecting the safety of people
11 and not corporations.

12 So, in my mind, the instability that we're
13 experiencing now is because we've lost faith. We've lost
14 trust. So, I'm not here to comment about what kind of fish
15 there are or what kind of water quality, but I am here to
16 say I believe we need to protect the interests of people and
17 not the powerful interests of the corporations that's
18 seizing control of our institutions.

19 So, I'm just here to ask you to remember why are
20 in these jobs. I'm asking you to think outside the box now
21 because there are some new facts on the ground about our
22 ecosystems and the warming planet and the fossil fuel
23 pollution that's causing it. It means we're going to have
24 to de-carbonize our lives. It means we're going to have to
25 do it in a very short period of time, like 10 years. That's

1 what the science is saying and it's going to be making a lot
2 of us have to step back and do things we've never done
3 before. I dare say sacrifice.

4 So, I'm dedicating the last chapter of my life
5 to bringing about this rapid change that I think we need.
6 It's incredibly short of time and we're running out. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. MURDOCK: My name is Lewis Murdock,
9 L-e-w-i-s; Murdock, M-u-r-d-o-ck. I think the whole thing
10 is a terrible idea. It's going to leak somewhere; they
11 always do. And certainly don't think it's going withstand
12 the big one when it comes. It could get side over 50 feet
13 or something, then what? How fast is the automatic cutoff
14 work? Don't know.

15 And I think it's very bad for the animals.
16 They've got trails and paths that they've been using for
17 years and years and you're going to disrupt a lot of them.
18 And how many acres is this thing involve -- a 90-foot swath
19 across the state? You got any idea?

20 MS. MUNOZ: This is just for your comment, so we
21 can't talk out in the meeting.

22 MR. MURDOCK: Well, alright. I think it's bad
23 for the environment. I don't think we want to see propane
24 or natural gas burned anywhere. Particularly, if we send it
25 over to the orient and carbon dioxide comes back across here

1 and I'm just outraged by the proposed legal process whereby
2 a Canadian company comes in and uses imminent domain to grab
3 United States property. I think it's all wrong. Okay, end
4 of comment.

5 MR. BRADFORD: I haven't had time to study the
6 project in a lot of detail, but I do have a map and I've
7 visited a couple of points along the map. My main concern
8 is stream crossings. I understand there's 350 or 400 stream
9 crossings and wetlands along the pipeline areas. Where it's
10 on the road probably aren't a big deal, but places where it
11 does go across a stream or a wetland deserve significant
12 study.

13 And I understand there's some information in the
14 EIS and I will try to review that in the next week or two.
15 When are comments available through; when can you comment --
16 cutoff? Okay, well, anyway, so that's my main comments.

17 The port facility down in Coos Bay also looks
18 like it has a number of environmental challenges. The
19 pipeline where it goes across the Bay will be significant
20 and the wetlands at the crossing and on the far side where
21 the facility is going to go would be quite significant, so I
22 just want to make sure that in the event that this is
23 approved that it's studied well beforehand and that the best
24 route and so on are selected.

25 MS. GARRISON: Pam, P-a-m; Garrison,

1 G-a-r-r-i-s-o-n. And I wanted to talk about basically --
2 I'm an alcohol and drug counselor and a psychiatric nurse
3 and I want to talk about some things that happened. I'm not
4 just going to give it from my opinion. The Physicians for
5 Social Responsibility have written a paper this June on what
6 happens when fracked gas comes into a healthy community,
7 which is really, really interesting. And the things that I
8 picked out of it are the alcoholism rises, drug use rises,
9 mental illness rises, suicide rises and that's for
10 everybody.

11 The other thing that bothers me about it is
12 having worked with a lot of traumatized people in my life is
13 that when the man camps come in there's a big impact on the
14 young women in the community -- I didn't talk to you
15 yesterday, did I? Okay, you're looking at me the same way
16 she did -- because they don't have partners with them.
17 They're here. There's all these young woman. All these
18 young woman have never seen them, a small town, and it's
19 going like, oh. We all used to be young, right? And you
20 know there's unwanted pregnancies. There's sexually
21 transmitted diseases. There's overdoses. And also, the man
22 camps bring in lots of drugs that may not be here or in the
23 volume that they'll be bringing them in because they will be
24 bringing them in and they always do.

25 And I just think it's just -- from that human

1 perspective from a medical background this what -- I mean it
2 all bothers me, but this is what I focus on is that the
3 trauma. There's going to be a lot of trauma related to
4 mostly young people from this thing and I just think it's a
5 terrible idea.

6 And I really don't have anything else to add,
7 except the fracked gas is a threat to the healthy
8 communities by the Physicians for Social Responsibility is
9 really worth reading. It's very long, but I just picked out
10 the high points or actually the low points. So, that's all
11 I have today. Thank you for doing this.

12 MR. CARPENTER: For the record, my name is Chris
13 Carpenter, C-h-r-i-s C-a-r-p-e-n-t-e-r. So, I work with
14 the Oregon and southern Idaho District Council of Laborers.
15 We represent about 2500 working men and women around the
16 State of Oregon. We just wanted to show up, make sure that
17 we make clear our very strong support for the Jordan Cove
18 Energy Project and the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

19 We've been watching jobs in this area kind of
20 leave for a long time with the pulp and paper mills and the
21 timber industries leave and we need to find some way to do
22 that and bring those jobs back. We think that this is an
23 incredible investment opportunity that -- with Pembina
24 coming in and we think that the tax incentives with about 60
25 million per year in the local property taxes and about 50

1 million per year in state taxes is a huge opportunity for
2 the area.

3 We're also are looking about just over 6,000
4 construction jobs at peak construction, as well as over 200
5 permanent jobs on the site, as well as an estimated 1500
6 permanent jobs in other industries around this, so we just
7 see this as like one of those king of once in a lifetime
8 opportunities for southern Oregon and we see this as kind of
9 probably the best chance that this area is going to have for
10 a long time to bring those jobs and kind of that livelihood
11 back.

12 The last thing that we kind of look at is you
13 know we are environmentally mindful as well in looking at it
14 as a global struggle on this issue with the ability to help
15 provide foreign markets with cleaner burning natural gas.
16 We see it as a big opportunity in terms of kind of trying to
17 affect global climate change on that scale. So, for those
18 reason we are in strong support of approval of the process
19 or of the projects and hope that the permits can get issued.

20 MR. RYAN: My name is Tim Ryan, T-i-m R-y-a-n.
21 Okay, my concern is with the decommissioning of this
22 pipeline and I hope you guys have addressed that and also
23 what happens to the right-of-way once the pipeline is no
24 longer in use. I feel that the right-of-way should go back
25 to the piece of property it came off once it's

1 decommissioned. It shouldn't be left there as a
2 right-of-way for another use because this -- it's original
3 use was for a pipeline. And as we all know, everything has
4 a life expectancy.

5 And the other thing is I would like to see this
6 thing decommissioned in the proper manner so that the
7 taxpayer doesn't end up paying for it. Because as we all
8 know, how these thing work the last owner goes bankrupt and
9 the taxpayer gets stuck cleaning up the mess. So, if this
10 is addressed in the beginning, we won't have these problems.
11 That's what I got to say.

12 MR. LAFLEY: It's Luke Lafley, L-u-k-e
13 L-a-f-e-y. My name is Luke Lafley. I'm the business
14 manager of Boilermakers Local 242. I represent
15 approximately 380 members and their families. I support
16 this project on many levels.

17 First, jobs. I've had members have to leave the
18 State of Oregon to find work often for months at a time,
19 leaving their family behind. This project will provide many
20 jobs for the construction effort, as well as operations.
21 This will bring millions of dollars to the local communities
22 providing funding for infrastructure and social services.

23 Also, I've had members in the last year actually
24 move to California, Washington, North Dakota, et cetera, to
25 find work. The economic benefit of this project far

1 outweighs the "what ifs" and "what if that happens."
2 Technology and craftsmanship provide the safest environment
3 for the community and workers. Our government has the
4 strictest regulations and oversight to maintain the
5 integrity of all involved.

6 My second reason for supporting the project is
7 the environment. Liquid natural gas is a key component to
8 our society as well as the world's. It is used to provide
9 power and is used in every manufacturing process at some
10 level. It is here to stay. If we truly care about the
11 environment, then we should have a facility like this here.
12 We have the strictest regulations and oversight to be the
13 most environmentally-friendly facility on the global scale.

14 If this project was built overseas, the global
15 impact would be higher. Also, the owners of the related
16 facilities have the environment as their number one
17 priority. The environment has a higher priority than
18 safety. That is why you hear the term "environmental,
19 safety, and health" in that order. Construction workers are
20 trained on safety and how not to get hurt, but they also
21 receive training on how to protect and preserve the
22 environment.

23 I've heard the statement made that we care about
24 is jobs. This is not true. Many of my members spend their
25 free time in the great outdoors fishing, hunting, biking,

1 hiking, et cetera, and they care about the environment just
2 as much as the opponents. The advantage we have as
3 industrial construction workers is we have had the
4 opportunity to build and operate facilities like this with
5 very little impact on the environment. It can be done.

6 Change is difficult for some people. To say no
7 is far easier than to step back and say maybe this is good
8 for all of us. I've been involved with other controversial
9 projects. After completion the opponents saw the results
10 and agreed that it was a good thing. It is a difficult
11 thing for people to step down from their soapbox once they
12 have ascended it.

13 The Oregon Trail once brought people and
14 families here to prosper. For members of my organization,
15 the Oregon Trail is going in the other direction. Thank
16 you.

17 MR. ASHUM: My name is John Ashum. I wanted to
18 testify in support of the Jordan Cove Project and the
19 Pacific Connector Pipeline. My issues are with organized
20 labor and with the economy in southwest Oregon.

21 This corner of Oregon has been depressed for the
22 last three decades and anything we can do to build up the
23 southwest corner of Oregon is going to be beneficial to the
24 people who live here. Coos Bay is the only deep-water port
25 in the State of Oregon, other than the Port of Portland.

1 Well, Yaquina Bay in Newport is, but it's not -- it's so
2 small you can't turn two boats around at the same time.

3 We need to rebuild Coos Bay. We need to bring
4 economic activity back to this corner of the state and I
5 think this project -- it's perhaps not the best idea, but I
6 think it's a good idea and I think we should build it.

7 I am personally acquainted with a number of the
8 people who are going to speak in opposition to it. I
9 believe that their concerns are -- I believe that their
10 concerns do not bear the merit that they think they do. I
11 shouldn't say anything more than that because they are my
12 friends and I do have a relationship with a number of them.

13 The awkwardness of having the Port of Portland
14 be pretty much a rudder for breaking bulk in the State of
15 Oregon is short-sighted and it's something we should build
16 out of. There are four bridges that will collapse when the
17 big one comes. The Port of Portland is going to be closed
18 until they clear all three -- the Railroad Bridge in
19 Vancouver, Longview, the Astoria Bridge, and the St. John's
20 Bridge are all going to collapse.

21 This project is open to the sea. It will be
22 able to function even we do have to rebuild from something
23 cataclysmic. It's time that we do what we can to
24 reinvigorate southwest Oregon and it's time that we do what
25 we can to pump some energy into Coos Bay itself and all of

1 southwest Oregon, but Coos Bay will have to be the breaking
2 ball point, the pivot point for the project. That's about
3 all I really had to say. So, thank you for having these
4 hearings and I'll get out of your hair.

5 MS. EATHERINGTON: It's Francis, F-r-a-n-c-i-s;
6 my last name is Eatherington. It's spelled
7 E-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-g-t-o-n. You know I spoke before about our
8 property near Milepost 85 of the pipeline and the pipeline
9 comes to within feet of our house; although, it's not on our
10 land. It's on Seneca land. It goes right along our
11 southern boundary and so we have got no recourse to protect
12 ourselves because we can't negotiate with the pipeline
13 company, right? They aren't going to talk to us. We're not
14 on the route.

15 But our water well is within a couple hundred
16 feet and our house is within a couple hundred feet of the
17 pipeline, right? And so, they don't even know we have a
18 well and they aren't asking us if we have a well. And so
19 then the pipeline goes up a Seneca clear cut above our house
20 that was clear cutted about 10 years ago, massive landslides
21 after they clear cut and the pipeline is going to go right
22 above these landslides, right? I was so shocked when they
23 said that was the route and we live right below that and
24 we've got no recourse to hold them accountable for any
25 damage to our property.

1 You're going to have mitigation Forest Service
2 lands and mitigation on BLM -- no, no mitigation on BLM
3 lands, but mitigation, but no mitigation for private
4 landowners and no requirement bonding to hold them
5 accountable if they damage our property. What? We're going
6 to sue them? We don't have money to do that. They're a
7 big, multinational energy company. How are we going to sue
8 them if they damage our property? That's not going to
9 happen. And so, I'm really upset. We're an impacted
10 landowner in many ways, but in many ways we have got no say
11 so in what they do to us. They go over our only access
12 road, right.

13 Now, we're also next to BLM property, right?
14 We're next to a BLM Lake Secession Reserve and I understand
15 that they're going to clear cut that Lake Secession Reserve,
16 100-foot wide clear cut, plus they're going to put temporary
17 extra work areas on that Lake Secession Reserve and there's
18 a fish-bearing stream and they're going to clear cut over
19 the riparian buffer that BLM requires on that fish-bearing
20 stream, right? And I understand that BLM is not allowed to
21 ask for mitigation, as of January or July 2018, there's a
22 new BLM policy that they can't ask for mitigation, right?

23 So, if you look in the DEIS, you know there's
24 three inches of mitigation for Forest Service lands, zilch
25 for BLM lands because BLM is not allowed to ask for

1 mitigation. Now, of course, BLM can accept offered
2 mitigation, but do you think Pacific Connector would offer
3 to pay anything? No, why would they? Why would they?

4 You know they can clear cut through our wildlife
5 reserves, through our stream site reserves and not pay a
6 penny toward damages, not a penny. And because the BLM is
7 not allowed to violate their forest plan, which, of course,
8 doesn't allow clear cutting and riparian reserves and LSR,
9 the BLM is going to change their forest plan to make it
10 legal to clear cut that. Since they can't ask for
11 mitigation, they have to change their forest plan to make
12 legal. They're going to give Pacific Connector Pipeline an
13 885-acre reserve. They're going to give a foreign
14 corporation their own private reserve on our BLM lands, on
15 our wildlife reserve, on our stream site reserves protecting
16 Coho salmon. They're going to clear cut them and they're
17 going to make it legal for a foreign corporation to take
18 this land as their own reserve. It's called the Pacific
19 Connector Reserve. It's a district-designated reserve.

20 And you know what, there is no map. I went out
21 there and asked Alan for a map. He says, oh, I can look in
22 Appendix C, but you know what Appendix C it's so low
23 resolution you can't see where 885 acres is. I want to know
24 where the reserve is and there's no map. How can they have
25 a NEPA document for this big BLM land management change and

1 have no map? Okay.

2 MS. RADON: My name is Summer Radon, S-u-m-m-e-r
3 R-a-d-o-n. Dear members of the FERC Commission, I am an
4 Oregonian and citizen of Douglas County who strongly opposes
5 the Jordan Cove Liquefied Natural Gas and Pacific Connector
6 Pipeline Project. FERC should not issue authorization and
7 certificate of public convenience and necessity because
8 diverse environmental, public safety and other impacts of
9 these projects demonstrate that the projects are contrary to
10 the public interest.

11 Additionally, the DEIS fails to support its
12 conclusions of the projects would have only some limited
13 adverse environmental impacts. FERC, therefore, cannot
14 proceed without revising its analysis and any revised
15 analysis must be made available for further public comment
16 prior to any FERC decision to grant the pending application.

17 Specifically, I am concerned because the
18 projects will significantly harm Oregon's essential natural
19 resources, increase the risk of catastrophe during fire
20 season and undermine citizens' rights and defiles our
21 homeland that is sacred to us.

22 Construction of this pipeline will seriously
23 damage ecosystems throughout the region and will push the
24 entire health of our watersheds to the brink. Keystone
25 species that indicate the overall health of the region would

1 be directly impacted by this pipeline, as it would cut
2 through our freshwater streams and waters. Wildlife and
3 their habitat depend on stability in the natural world.
4 Nothing says instability like an LGN pipeline across the
5 land.

6 With our forestlands already stressed due to
7 other industrial factors, the looming possibility of further
8 fragmentation and degradation in our watershed is a threat,
9 not only to wildlife, but to our human communities. The
10 obvious must be recognized. With a growing population, the
11 availability of clean water must not be undervalued. Water
12 quality is a right that should not be bought or sold. These
13 projects simply do not align with our planet's dire need to
14 transition to clean, ecologically-friendly, sustainable
15 energy sources.

16 Another serious problem that the Pacific
17 Connector Pipeline Project poses for our community here in
18 Douglas County is increased health and safety risks during
19 our notorious fire season. Several factors, including land
20 management issues and climate change, make our homeland
21 subject to severe wildfire conditions much of the year.

22 Constructing a liquefied natural gas pipeline
23 through this sensitive land would be a double-edged sword.
24 The pipeline could very well ignite a major wildfire and
25 wildfires could trigger a pipeline explosion. With most of

1 our county land subject to active forest management and
2 crowded growth of trees, the amount of treatments needed to
3 mitigate fuel hazards along the pipeline would be immense.
4 Our communities and firefighters will be at increased risk
5 with the addition of this pipeline to the landscape.

6 Beyond natural resource and disaster issues, I
7 am concerned because the pipeline project, no matter where
8 the proposed route changes to, will desecrate the cultural
9 treasures that lie within the land. Numerous Tribes with
10 territories, burial grounds, and cultural resources
11 throughout the pipeline route have stated their opposition
12 to this project.

13 The unrelenting push for this project and
14 projects like this around the country further reminds us of
15 broken promises that have resulted from the national move
16 westward from the East Coast. One of America's most beloved
17 founding fathers, George Washington, said to the Senate in
18 1789 of an early treaty being broken that was made between
19 young America and indigenous people.

20 He said the treaty with the Cherokees has been
21 entirely violated by the disorderly white people on the
22 frontiers. Yes, our ancestors moved West over the eastern
23 mountain range and in time the entire continent has been
24 settled, but 230 years later, I'd like think that we have
25 reflected, humbled our lineage, and have acknowledged those

1 past faults, more or less.

2 Today, the people on this continent are
3 comprised of a combination of indigenous people, settler
4 decedents, and people from everywhere in between and far
5 away. Even us of European heritage understand that the
6 Earth where we are rooted sustains us and all life. Rather
7 than disorderly white invaders it is now corporate greed
8 that continues to push and violate the collective whole.
9 With nowhere farther West to move, the political mentality
10 seems to find it necessary to extract from this continent
11 and ship exploited resources overseas.

12 Finally, I am concerned about the psychological
13 damage this project has already inflicted upon and continues
14 to inflict upon our community. Over the last decade and a
15 half, landowners and members of the community have
16 collectively spend thousands of hours of time working in
17 opposition to this project. We know that it is a detriment
18 to our livelihoods and environment. And frankly, people are
19 tired of having to stress these concerns to government
20 authorities and corporate entities. The preamble of the
21 Constitution of the United States of America does not leave
22 out the power of the people and our establishment of
23 justice, assurance of domestic tranquility, promotion of the
24 general welfare, and the security of the blessings of
25 liberty to ourselves and future generations.

1 In conclusion, I strongly and adamantly oppose
2 this project and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
3 should deny with prejudice the authorization and the
4 certificate of public convenience and necessity. Respect
5 creation. Sincerely, Summer Radon. Thank you for hearing
6 me.

7 MS. STOCKETT: Jasmine, J-a-s-m-i-n-e, and my
8 last name is Stockett, S-t-o-c-k-e-t-t. Okay, I have some
9 very serious concerns about the safety of the pipeline. And
10 my major concerns are the subduction event. I just found
11 out from someone out in the lobby that they are only going
12 to have 18 shutoff valves and that seems like not very many
13 for you know however long the pipeline is.

14 I have mixed feelings about the pipeline, but I
15 do know that progress needs to happen and people do need
16 jobs and things, but you know I have serious environmental
17 concerns -- the whales, the turtles, the fishing habitat,
18 you know that is going to be like a freeway of freighters
19 leaving that area. And I heard that they were going to do a
20 hundred acres of mitigation for the Coho salmon. A hundred
21 acres, that's nothing. That's miniature. That's tiny. It
22 should be a thousand, ten thousand. It should be something
23 much larger.

24 You know I need to see some very serious
25 whale/ship interactions because that is a migratory path for

1 many different kinds of whales -- thousands, literally, and
2 there's only four different kinds of sea turtles that go
3 around there, but they're very critically endangered too.
4 You know leather backs, others, so you know I need to see
5 something really proactive. Like say a whole bunch of whale
6 strikes start happening.

7 You know they have to figure out when the whales
8 come, their monthly migration up and down. Sometimes it's a
9 lot more. Whale strikes are happening. We have to slow
10 down. We have to slow down. We have to not do it during
11 that. I mean there has to be you know some very proactive
12 environmental regulations written into the laws because
13 corporations -- we're in a corrupted democracy now.

14 We're in a diminishing, dwindling democracy now.
15 Corporations and government frost each other's cake and
16 there is a lot of money behind this. They've been working
17 for 14 years. I don't want money to stand in the way of
18 beautiful Oregon.

19 And the other thing too is that we're going to
20 have a conflagration. If there's some kind of -- you know
21 catastrophe, lightning strike, you know an earthquake, it
22 cracks open, it starts a fire, that thing -- I mean you
23 don't know what it's been like around here, but the last
24 couple years we're talking serious fire issues, so some -- I
25 hate to say it, but if they have to build it, maybe they're

1 going to have to do some strip of fire you know of cutting
2 down some of the trees along the pipeline or something just
3 to make it safe because I'm telling you right now we're in a
4 different world now.

5 Climate change, there's a debris and detritus in
6 the forest now you know. So, if they don't -- you know I
7 don't have full confidence that the corporation is going to
8 build it with an eye to safety you know and I think -- and
9 they don't care about animals either. Let's just face it.
10 They don't care about wildlife. They don't care about the
11 fishery. They don't care. They want their money and they
12 don't care.

13 So, I get it, but I would prefer probably that
14 it's not built, but if it has to be built it's your job as
15 FERC individuals who work there to make sure it's safe. We
16 can't have all that wood and debris next to it. There's got
17 to be some pretty big swath.

18 They need to pay the people a correct amount
19 'cause they're trying to jack them too. And the other thing
20 is that you know we need to take into consideration
21 wildlife. We're in the six mass extinction. Whales are
22 getting hit. They're getting starved. The oceans are going
23 rotten. They are acidifying. This is our big our chance.
24 This will change the whole texture and way that Oregon
25 looks.

1 It's either going to be Oregon wild with fishing
2 and hunting and this and that or we're going to have this
3 giant thing. And I'm telling you now that they better do
4 the earthquake, not 8 to 10 earthquake better be built into
5 this thing too, which means -- and I don't know because I
6 was thinking about it.

7 I don't know if you know this, but once there's
8 a big subduction event all those processing plants, like the
9 one right here in Myrtle Creek that process all the gas and
10 oil or they take the different things and do whatever with
11 it, which is you know not actually the same as that; but
12 those things all spill and rupture. We need to figure out
13 some new age -- I don't care. I don't care if it's you know
14 a noodle. I don't care if it's whatever.

15 You've got to push them to do the maximum amount
16 of safety and you know make them prove to you -- you know
17 they're putting it on ads right now, oh, well, it can
18 withstand any event ever recorded. Well, 1700 was the last
19 monster, so that's a lie. Ever recorded, what'd you mean?
20 Do you mean just recently because it's not going to
21 withstand. Noting withstand a nine. Okay, a nine is like a
22 thousand times bigger.

23 I'm from California. I lived through them. A
24 seven was pretty bad. Then it's a hundred times, then it's
25 a thousand. So, we're talking logarithmic and I don't --

1 okay, I'll tell you the truth and I'll shut it down, but I'm
2 from California. I am cheating on California right now with
3 Oregon 'cause I've fallen in love with Oregon. So, the only
4 reason I'm doing this is because I care about the wilderness
5 and this is critical and it's your job -- fires, earthquake,
6 habitat, fixing -- you know offsetting what they do.

7 A hundred acres; a hundred acres that's nothing.
8 They're going to build this huge plant and they want to --
9 they're bragging on their ads that they're going to do a
10 hundred acres. I'd be ashamed. It should be ten thousand
11 acres. And they're going to make a lot of money. Don't kid
12 yourself. If they do this, they're going to make a fortune.
13 We're talking billions of dollars. If they get to build it,
14 they should take care of our Oregon, our animals, our
15 plants, our humans.

16 MS. HANSEN: My name is M. A. H-a-n-s-e-n.
17 Okay, I've been involved this for over 15 years. I own
18 three properties. It's never been proposed to go on any of
19 my properties. I just found from day one that it just
20 seemed to be so wrong in so many ways and in over 15 years
21 of really studying it and everything.

22 And I might say I have a degree in Planning and
23 Environmental Studies and I am an accountant. I have my own
24 accounting business since my twenties and I'm also an
25 international programmer and I've been all over the world,

1 so I've seen a lot of things that seems like I'm a pretty
2 good person to -- let's see, have an opinion of this that
3 probably is right.

4 And I'd like to kind of speak about some things
5 that I don't know that other people have spoken so much
6 about. Number one, I find that the imminent domain factor
7 of it is -- it greatly lowers the value of your property.
8 People don't want to be involved with anything that has a
9 threat of imminent domain, first of all, and it decreases
10 the ability to sell your property.

11 I know people who have been fighting this for 15
12 years because they're fighting for their properties and they
13 have not -- one big thing is they've not fixed their
14 property up at all in that time. And we've got a lot of
15 people -- and I have property in Myrtle Creek and Roseburg
16 and we've got a lot of people that are not fixing their
17 properties up.

18 This is an environmental impact. I mean that's
19 what an EIS is or EIR, but in California it's ERSR. What is
20 the environmental impact of this thing? People are not
21 fixing up their properties because they don't want to live
22 there if there's going to be a pipeline on it. They can't
23 sell it. Their kids don't want to be there, so why else do
24 people really keep their properties up.

25 I think that's something I've not heard anybody

1 else talk about, but I have been noticing junk all over the
2 place of properties that were just pristine before and the
3 same people own them. And they say, well, as long as I've
4 got this threat hanging over me -- this is 15 years of a
5 threat. I mean let us go. I mean I feel like a prisoner to
6 this because I travel to all of the meetings.

7 And as I say, it's never been proposed on my
8 properties, but it's been proposed in this world and it's
9 going to put America on the world market. We're going to be
10 paying for our own gas more than we're paying now, but plus
11 the fact is that we're not getting any of it, but yet, we're
12 going to be forced to pay that because they're going to be
13 selling it.

14 And as far as I know, they don't have any
15 contracts yet to sell this, so I really don't understand why
16 we're still fighting this thing because the first EIS, which
17 was totally illegal, the first thing you have to do is have
18 a need and the need has to be for the people it's going to
19 affect and the first ERS was written out and they said we'll
20 do the need later.

21 It's like, what, that's the first thing you do.
22 I mean I write EISs. And another thing I don't thing I
23 don't think I've heard people talk about -- I have witnessed
24 this. In the last 15 years, I've know several people who've
25 gotten extremely sick -- just sick. This is just something

1 that's a constant threat to their livelihood, to their
2 future, to their land that their grandfather and grandmother
3 worked on and their dad worked on and they were there and
4 they were going to raise their kids there.

5 I know of about four families where the kids
6 when they graduated they got the heck out of here when they
7 were -- they wanted to live on that land all their life and
8 it is like it's pulling families apart. You can't live
9 under this kind of stress and threat. You can't live under
10 it healthy. You just can't be healthy. And in their
11 elderly years -- I mean I don't know what I would do if I
12 thought that this pipeline was coming across my -- I have a
13 hundred acres and I have set this hundred acres up for me in
14 my elderly years.

15 That is where I'm going to make my stand and
16 that is where I want to be when they put me in the compost
17 pile. And it's like, well, God, how would I feel if I had
18 this threat of this pipeline.

19 And also, another thing, as I say, I'm an
20 accountant and also an international programmer, so I'm into
21 the numbers. So, the very first thing I did -- what they do
22 whenever they're going to bring a project to Oregon, they're
23 going to harp jobs. Do you know that I did the math on the
24 jobs? The jobs that are going to come out of this pipeline
25 are negative, so negative in number as to the ones -- and

1 I'm talking permanent jobs.

2 First of all, they said in the first three years
3 section of this that they were not going to hire Oregonians
4 to put this pipeline in because Oregonians don't know how to
5 build pipelines, quote -- that's a quote from them. And
6 then they were not going to hire Oregonians to build the
7 terminal because Oregonians don't know how to and that they
8 said that they probably would be employing about 69 -- and
9 I'm giving them more numbers, but that's what was in the
10 first EIS. That number was in the first EIS. That's how
11 many they -- and they couldn't prove that that would be
12 Oregonians that day.

13 I asked them out of a -- there was over a
14 hundred people in the room once and I made them get up and
15 stand -- the people from the project get up and stand on a
16 stage because they were always in their little tables and
17 just telling lies. So, I got them up there and I said how
18 many Oregonians that's today an Oregonian is going to have a
19 job on this pipeline when you are done building it because
20 you've already said you're not going to have Oregonians
21 build it and you're harping jobs here. How many Oregonians
22 are going to be working on that job?

23 And I said somebody who's an Oregonian today and
24 they all put their head down and one guy said six and
25 another guy said they might not be Oregonians. And I said,

1 okay, and how many in the terminal. Well, I don't know.
2 And I said, well, you put 69 in your ERS. Just to get going
3 here, let's just accept that. You think that's worth taking
4 away these permanent jobs that these people who own this
5 land for how many lands for how many years that you're
6 thinking of taking imminent domain from there is -- that's
7 what's called permanent jobs.

8 They have worked there all their lives, their
9 kids have, their grandfather -- that's a permanent job. And
10 over here you're going to have temporary jobs for these
11 people and actually you've already told us you're not even
12 going to have temporary jobs for them, so I want you right
13 now in front of all these hundred people to stop harping
14 jobs. And I said I'll tell you why you'd better. The
15 people in this room are packing. There were guns all over
16 that room.

17 I said we've warned you that there's places like
18 this that you're going to run up against and I said this is
19 one. You better make that promise now in front of these
20 people and they promised me they would stop harping jobs.
21 That was three years into this project and they stopped
22 until -- and I also -- I and others accused them back them
23 that they are going to export instead of import and we knew
24 that from day one because of the Ruby Pipeline. We just did
25 the math. That Ruby Pipeline would not be there if there

1 wasn't going to be exported and we said that from day one.

2 And 10 more years they lied to us about it was import.

3 They thought that they would get the land,
4 imminent domain, if they could say that there was a need for
5 the gas. We weren't getting any of the gas, so it wasn't a
6 need for us. And believe me, I could write many books about
7 it and I've written many books. I could write many, many
8 books about this project. Have you heard any of that?

9 Quite different. And I mean I haven't even started, so
10 anyhow, I can tell you some of the negative jobs -- the
11 saltwater fishing in Coos Bay is gone and they have admitted
12 that because as those ships come into harbor the security is
13 so big out there, it's so strong and you know why? Check it
14 out. Look at this one. Check this one out.

15 Having one of those LGN ships in your harbor is
16 the biggest terrorist threat you can have. There is an
17 airport -- a little airport that has these little planes
18 have to fly over those ships. One guy who thinks he's going
19 to be with a virgin and have -- can take that out. You know
20 what, 80 Hiroshima bones is the power in that ship. Why on
21 Earth would anybody approve -- you want to talk about
22 environmental impact, we would feel that right here. There
23 would be nothing, nothing left of Coos Bay.

24 And that's not the only thing. If a tsunami,
25 which we are about 500 years late on a tsunami here, when

1 that hits -- we don't say if -- when that hits and if one of
2 those ships are in the harbor everything is completely
3 melted for miles. Why on Earth would anybody approve that?
4 I don't care what kind of money is in it and I've proven, as
5 far as I'm concerned, there's no money in it. It's
6 negative. It's money for those people up there in Canada,
7 and my dad was a Canadian. I don't have anything against
8 Canadians, so I got Canadian blood, but it's just not right.

9 The freshwater fishing is going to go. I have
10 been volunteering for 13 years as a freshwater monitor for
11 the fish and if the water is right it's good for humans if
12 it's right for the fish. They're going to take water out of
13 one tributary, take it into the pipeline where they got all
14 kinds of toxic stuff in there and shoot that water into
15 another tributary. What's going to happen to the eggs and
16 the fish that were in this tributary? Now, they're over
17 there. They're toast. They're already toast because they
18 got sucked up and they're into this tributary now and
19 they're going to ruin that tributary.

20 You know this state makes a lot of money on
21 freshwater fishing. Timber is dead in this county. This
22 county makes a lot of money from freshwater fishing. Timber
23 is dead here. It's gone. I mean you just have to be from
24 here to know that. We got big trucks now that cut the
25 trees. The truck has a machine that cuts the trees, lays it

1 in the truck, it goes right pass the mill to go overseas.
2 The mill has a guy in there, if they did stop. They got
3 one guy they're going to give a job to. He does the work of
4 a hundred mill workers on a computer.

5 So, we need our tourism. We need our fishing
6 industry. We need our saltwater fishing industry. We need
7 our crab industry, our oysters. They're all goners. They
8 are goners. It's been proven they will be gone if they put
9 this thing out there in Coos Bay -- and lobsters. They're
10 all out there and they're all gone. So, that's big, big,
11 big minus.

12 And do you know that if -- that our forest
13 fighters are not taught to fight gas fires? If we get this
14 pipeline going, and it's only going to be three feet deep --
15 you know the top of it is three feet. Have you ever seen
16 the machinery that runs around up in those hills? If that
17 pipeline is hit, we've got -- you think we have the worst
18 fires now. Now, we're going to have forest fires that they
19 have to know how to fight gas fires, okay.

20 We are going to have to spend the money
21 ourselves to teach our firefighters to fight gas fires.
22 That's a big expense to us and you think we got forest fires
23 now. I mean we just live in that fear constantly of forest
24 fires here, constantly. Boy, are we going to have forest
25 fires when that pipeline goes and it will go. It will go.

1 History has shown that pipeline will go. If you want to
2 talk about environmental impact report and environmental
3 impacts, we've got environmental impacts up the yin yang
4 here that we could talk about forever.

5 MR. VANDER VELDEN: Richard Vander Velden,
6 V-a-n-d-e-r space V-e-l-d-e-n. Hello, my name is Richard
7 Vander Velden. A year and a half ago, I was one of the
8 first people in the county to come out and said no to Jordan
9 Cove Pipeline. And the reason ^^^^ there's different
10 reasons that I said no and there are few reasons that I say
11 yes to it, but my overall is still no.

12 First of all, Douglas County is the number one
13 county in the entire United States for quality of water. We
14 are a watershed county and it's kind of what makes us us,
15 even though, yes, it's rural and even though we're heading
16 into some financial difficulties, the watershed is really
17 important.

18 Now, Jordan Cove plans on going under, through
19 over 400 different -- I don't want to say watersheds, but
20 water obstacles. And they're telling us that, oh, nothing
21 will go wrong. Nothing will go wrong. I was an engineer
22 for 30 years. Don't tell an engineer nothing can go wrong.
23 That's why we always have backup plans because something
24 usually always goes wrong. So, protecting our waterways is
25 one of the big ones for me.

1 And the fracking -- fracking is probably the
2 most destructive thing on the planet for waterways.
3 Granted, it's over in Klamath Falls and I want to wish that
4 on there when their fish start dying and the kids start
5 dying from the poisons that will come up from fracking. And
6 it's not if, it is when. Fracking is dangerous.

7 Now, most of the 229 miles is going through BLM
8 land. Now, anybody who grew up in the woods like me around
9 Douglas County here now the woods actually do repair
10 themselves, so other than dynamiting through the shale rock
11 to lay in the pipe, that's not going to heal real quick if
12 ever at all. That's neither here nor there. Most of that
13 is out of sight. Most of that could happen from an
14 earthquake.

15 So, here's the other things that I said no for.
16 The first one is the most important is, still is, still was,
17 is the imminent domain, okay. Now, I talked to the reps
18 with Jordan Cove and they acted like nobody had ever
19 mentioned going and leasing the property instead of using
20 imminent domain or coming up with some other solution, other
21 than a Canadian company using imminent domain on American
22 citizen. They said they would look into it. Well, next
23 time I talked to them a month or so later nothing happened.
24 Couple months later nothing happened. So, they're not
25 interested in not doing imminent domain, to my looking.

1 I know it's not going to hurt a lot of people,
2 probably less than the 70 that are directly impacted, even
3 though the pipeline is going to go through hundreds of
4 people's property. I mean, sure, it's 100-foot wide and
5 then it cuts back down to 50-foot. I would, considering the
6 fact that Douglas County is going to receive about five
7 million dollars in tax money every year for 19 years was a
8 huge plus, an enormous plus. Douglas County, financially,
9 is really hurting. Most all of southern Oregon is really
10 hurting, so it's a big boon to us, but we can't let the boon
11 stop us.

12 The last one, their ads, please, people, we're
13 not all gullible bumpkins when you sit there and the first
14 thing that comes out is saying, oh, it's a pipe. We don't
15 pump liquid, therefore, it can't leak. Please, whether it's
16 gas or whether it's liquid, it's still a leak if that pipe
17 cracks.

18 Now, gas is just going to -- liquid is just
19 going to flow there, locally. Yes, it's going to be bad in
20 the water. It's going to be bad for the soil, possible
21 fire. But this is gas, not liquid; therefore, it's going to
22 flow to the lowest area. And if the wind doesn't blow it
23 away, the first spark that goes along, boom, and we're
24 talking boom. It's going to kill all the animals, all who
25 come in there they're going to suffocate. So, don't treat

1 us like bumpkins and tell us that, oh, we're totally safe
2 because we're not liquid. It just makes us mad that you
3 know they treat us with -- I don't know second-hand thought.
4 I mean as long as they get their money, I guess they're
5 okay.

6 No, I am not going to scream, rant, and rave if
7 it does pass through. I'm going to feel bad for the
8 families. I'm going to feel real -- even worse if any of
9 the waterways get damaged. That's a lot of waterways to do
10 it.

11 The County needs it, but the jobs are there.
12 That was another big lie. Oh, yeah, we're going to give you
13 jobs. We're going to give you jobs. A maximum of 30
14 percent from local industry, if the local industry has the
15 manpower needed to do the job. If not, manpower will be
16 brought in from outside. This is Douglas County. We can't
17 even find mill right. We can't even find a welder to work
18 in the mills anymore. There's so few of us around. So,
19 there's going to be basically nil, nobody available to work
20 on this pipeline from the County. So, they keep throwing
21 that in our face and that's another bad one.

22 They need to start owning up and being more
23 honest with us, if they want this thing to pass. I mean
24 it's a potential for a train wreck and it's also got the
25 potential for a possible savior for the County. So, I'll

1 let you decide which way you want to go. Thank you.

2 MS. PHILLIPS: My name is Diane Phillips,
3 D-i-a-n-e P-h-i-l-l-i-p-s. My address is P.O. Box 179,
4 Azalea, Oregon, A-z-a-l-e-a, 97410. And I'm here as a
5 private citizen, even though I have a uniform on.

6 So, I'd like to comment on the Draft and --
7 first of all, I've been involved in this since 2005, so it's
8 getting very -- it's very disappointing that I'm here again
9 because I think has been dealt with for years and so to see
10 this project back again, and without a pipeline company
11 because Williams is no longer involved, really has me
12 concerned.

13 I'd like to talk first about the public need. I
14 read ^^^ just now I was able to pull up because I have not
15 seen the Draft. I'm not online, so unfortunately, we did
16 not get either a written copy or a CD Rom, which would've
17 been really helpful, at least in our libraries, somewhere in
18 our communities or to certain people who have requested
19 them. And for that reason, it's been very difficult for me,
20 but I will try to do that and send written comments later.

21 But I did just get a chance to look at the very
22 beginning of the Draft that talked about public need and I
23 was astounded that they really didn't have any good reasons,
24 other than they wanted to sell the gas overseas to you know
25 foreign markets from either Canada or the United States.

1 And that doesn't seem to me to be the requirement of the
2 Natural Gas Act, which means that there needs to be a public
3 benefit or a public need.

4 And I have looked at all the different negative
5 aspects to the environment and landowners, et cetera, and to
6 me the costs are much larger to the public trust than they
7 are of the potential public need, which I see none stated in
8 the Draft.

9 I've heard it mentioned that the actual benefit
10 -- and this is just by verbal because I didn't see it in the
11 Draft -- was that it would provide jobs and that justifies
12 the public need. I believe that they have not talked about,
13 at all, the jobs that -- they did an economic study, I
14 believe, because I read about it in the paper from Eco
15 Northwest and in there they claimed there would be about
16 1600 plus jobs for one year.

17 This is much lower than has ever been mentioned
18 before. I've heard two, three, four years for extended many
19 more jobs, so that was interesting. Also, I heard it was
20 about 200 and some permanent jobs between the pipeline and
21 the terminal. Well, I believe they've failed to take into
22 account automation and this is coming now. It's coming very
23 quickly. We actually have no idea. Our technology is
24 changing so fast how rapidly that's going to change, but
25 it's been talked about. It's pretty much known, so

1 automation and mechanization will surely cut that number of
2 jobs and so it's really hard to predict.

3 Also, this market for liquefied natural gas
4 overseas is a very volatile market. It changes constantly.
5 I'm wondering how long the company once -- if they did get
6 approval, would sit on the project before they actually
7 build it. Do they have 20 years to wait to build it or is
8 it less time because the market will constantly change and
9 that is also very risky to Oregonians when you're expecting
10 them to take this big hit to their environment and so on.

11 One of my other points I'd like to mention is
12 that the NEPA process is not being followed correctly. The
13 NEPA policy is not being followed as it was written by FERC.
14 Ever since they took control of the siting of liquefied
15 natural gas terminals, since natural gas or I think it was
16 the Energy Act of 2005 or 2006, FERC took over implementing
17 the NEPA process and it is not being used as it was written.

18 One of the things that I believe is different is
19 the fact that they have considered some differing
20 alternatives for the pipeline and they've considered the
21 no-alternative, but you know what about putting it in
22 Canada? I don't see that in there as one of their
23 alternatives. Also, you know different routes to me are
24 not alternatives.

25 Also, Williams Pipeline Company, who is no

1 longer in this project, I understand, already owns an
2 easement down I-5 and through Medford. They also own an
3 easement into Malin. Why isn't that route being considered
4 and I think they should consider that.

5 Now, I want to talk about global warming. I
6 don't believe the effects of global warming are being
7 addressed with a significant enough impact in the Statement.
8 This spring, in April, we had a couple days where we had
9 temperatures over 100 degrees or very close to 100 degrees
10 and that did major impact to the plants. We're seeing our
11 fields are getting half the yield that they did the year
12 before.

13 I've lost a couple trees on my land. There's a
14 flower in the pipeline route called the *Calochortus coxii*.
15 We went up there two weeks ago and the flowers on one side
16 were burned from that day. They came up and it was just too
17 warm. The other ones they have yellow in the interior and
18 they were very pale, so they were not as normal. So, the
19 impacts of global warming we've already had worldwide
20 temperature increase of 1 degree Fahrenheit and this is
21 occurring much faster than we ever expected and I think
22 it's going to be really hard to predict some of those
23 effects. And so, therefore, the mitigation that they're
24 proposing is just totally inadequate. And so that's my
25 comment there.

1 And I wanted to mention again the Calochortus
2 coxii, which grows only in Myrtle Creek in a specific area
3 near Bilger Creek and it grows in serpentine-type soils at
4 1500 feet and there's only three places in the world that
5 grows around Myrtle Creek. There's only one of those places
6 that grows on public land and that is where the pipeline is
7 proposed to go through. I have seen nothing in the Draft,
8 although I have not seen it yet, but I tried to get some
9 information and I didn't, that this plant cannot be
10 propagated. At least, it has never been successfully been
11 propagated before. It cannot be moved. There is no other
12 place in the world that this plant would survive and
13 therefore there is not good mitigation for the impacts here.
14 That is all I have today, but I will submit written
15 comments.

16 MS. GIPSON: My name is Elizabeth,
17 E-l-i-z-a-b-e-t-h; Gipson, G-i-p-s-o-n. So, I oppose. I
18 don't think we need this pipeline to go in. It would be no
19 good for our waterways. It's bad news all around. Our
20 salmon are sacred. Our lamprey -- our Northwest lamprey are
21 sacred. I'm a Coquille Creek member and I don't speak on
22 behalf the entire Tribe. It's very neutral. But I can tell
23 you most of them are against it.

24 The other thing that it's more personal -- well,
25 not really personal, but you know I think about my children.

1 I grew up in this area and just the thought of us playing in
2 the rivers and we have these contaminates that -- these
3 toxins, the chemicals that just float up without you even
4 knowing and causing so much damage, not just to the
5 vegetation and salmon, but our children, and this is not
6 good for our future.

7 It saddens me to think that 229 miles we have
8 ancestors that lay to rest, not in a cemetery and for them
9 to be possibly dug up and tossed aside breaks my heart.
10 Gosh, there's so much to say and I can't think of it.

11 But all and all, you know Oregon's been mostly a
12 clean state and I'd like to keep it that way and I think
13 Oregon stands for that. You know the thoughts of the Bay
14 area that's a beautiful area and so many depend on that area
15 and for them to dredge it and dig it up and ruin the
16 vegetation and everything that come along with that.

17 And the tsunami, you know it's a tsunami area
18 and earthquakes and you know it's going to be very dangerous
19 and damaging to the people. It's going to kill many. It's
20 no good. Yeah, it's hard to talk without getting emotional.
21 I just know it's just no good. It's not good for our fish.
22 You know a lot of our people depend on seasonally fishing
23 and if the fish go we go. And it's not so much me and you.
24 It's our children and our grandchildren and the future.

25 So, you know, as it is, there's so much that we

1 have to deal with today. Why put more in the way of damage?
2 Why do that? And the whole job business it'll bring jobs
3 very temporarily, but I feel like Jordan Cove is lying and
4 there's not good in it. There may be good for some of those
5 people, but not for the rest of the community and it's not
6 benefitting Oregon whatsoever. It's not benefitting U.S.A.

7 You know they talk about how it's going to just
8 bring in so much money and I don't believe that. It's all
9 temporary and these people that think that it's not they're
10 going to one day put their hands up and say now what. I
11 thought this was supposed to be you know for a long time and
12 I don't believe it. And there's a lot of false advertising
13 and that breaks my heart because sadly there are people that
14 don't know and don't realize what's going on and so -- but I
15 do know, for the most part, you know those toxins and when
16 those pipelines break -- it's gonna break. It's if and
17 when. And when they put these pipelines in, they say they
18 check all the lines, but it's been known that they don't
19 check every line. They only check so many miles worth and
20 that's not fair.

21 And either way, it doesn't matter, they will
22 burst and they will cause damage. And Oregon, along with a
23 lot of the Northwest have to deal with so many fires as it
24 is. And I know some of those, sadly, are just mistaken
25 accidents, man-made. Why put a pipeline in there that can

1 cause such devastation and that's set up for failure for
2 Oregon. So, that's all I have to say.

3 MS. BAGLIETTO: Rocio, R-o-c-i-o; Baglietto,
4 B-a-g-l-i-e-t-t-o. Alright, I live at 2060 Springbrook Road
5 in Myrtle Creek. I've been informed that they're going to
6 have a pipeline go adjacent to my property a mile away.
7 Within my property, I have a spring. It's my only sole
8 water source. I don't know where the spring originates. I
9 don't know if the pipe -- cutting down trees, the easement
10 right is going to affect my water. I want know when -- the
11 compensation, what are we gaining by having the pipeline go
12 through our neck of the woods. The jobs that are going to
13 be created are they actually going to be hiring our people.
14 How will we know if the people in our community are really
15 being hired and if they're not bringing people from their
16 own neck of the woods into our neck of the woods?

17 Also, how long will these jobs last? Are they
18 just going to be like six months or you know are they going
19 to have people indefinitely taking care of the pipeline to
20 make sure it's safe. Also, with the safety concerns, are we
21 going to have any form of protocol? Are we going to be able
22 to view -- in case of an incident are we going to be able to
23 know what we are doing as a citizen and not rely on another
24 source, say the fire department or the police department
25 because where I'm at I don't hear the siren. In our

1 community, they have a local siren in Myrtle Creek that goes
2 off and everybody knows there's a problem. I don't get
3 that. We have one road going all the way up and it's
4 maintained by our own community, up and down our road.

5 And the other one is can we really afford to
6 sell our own natural resources at this point in time? You
7 know as I get older, I make less money and if I have to pay
8 more for energy how fair is it that our country is selling
9 our resources to another country? And that's it. Thank you
10 very, very much. Thank you for all your help.

11 MR. REED: Andrew Reed, A-n-d-r-e-w R-e-e-d,
12 and this is my statement. I'm a combat veteran, two tours
13 in Iraq, one in Afghanistan, and a resident of Douglas
14 County. I'm a property owner in rural Douglas County and
15 both the properties I own are along the pipeline route. The
16 pipeline does not go through either of them and it does
17 impact my neighbors and I have a couple of concerns.

18 Chiefly, being the impact -- the potential
19 impact on water quality. A lot of us in rural Douglas
20 County rely on our water source for irrigation, for animals,
21 for a lot of people's livelihoods. In my case, we use our
22 water to water our garden and to keep things from burning
23 down during the summer heat, but we also spend a lot of time
24 in the creek. So, it's a great place to go, so I'd be
25 worried if anything were to happen that would impact our

1 water quality and water availability for many, many people
2 just along the sections of creek that I have properties on.

3 I really don't understand the public need for
4 this project. If it was an import pipeline, you know that
5 might be a little bit different from national security or
6 strategic perspective, but it's not. I don't think that
7 it's right for property owners in Douglas County to kind of
8 give up their property rights, so to speak, through the use
9 of eminent domain to have this pipeline put through their
10 properties against their will. And that is also a concern
11 of mine, both from that perspective of feeling sovereign in
12 your own property. Something that you pay taxes on, that
13 you purchase, that you worked hard for. And also the
14 potential impacts from ecological concerns if there was some
15 sort of accident with the pipeline through construction or
16 whatever.

17 And then I also get frustrated because the idea
18 that my neighbors would not be able to really utilize their
19 property within the zone that they're putting the pipeline
20 through, whether it be -- to grow timber on. I understand
21 that they can raise livestock, but there's a lot more to
22 using someone's land or using your own land than just
23 raising livestock on that area.

24 That's about all that comes to my mind right
25 now, so that's my comments and hopefully they're heard.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. HAWS: My name is Cindy Haws, C-i-n-d-y
3 H-a-w-s. Alright, well, first of all, the Bureau of Land
4 Management's directive to create district designated
5 reserves for the pipeline is totally illegal. I know my
6 NEPA and that's total inappropriate, illegal, and public
7 land should not be given away to a foreign, private company.

8 Secondly, I oppose -- strongly oppose Jordan
9 Cove Project. And specifically, here are some of my
10 concerns. I have a background as a professional wildlife
11 biologist. I worked for the Umpqua National Forest, U.S.
12 Forest Service, so I know these areas very well where the
13 proposal; what they will impact. And I worked up to a
14 forest wildlife position, so I understand the impacts and I
15 find the analyses of those impacts completely inadequate and
16 the mitigation, not only unproven, but totally inadequate.
17 And due to direct/indirect and cumulative effect that
18 hasn't been adequately addressed and there's many species
19 that this will literally cause a trend toward listing, as
20 well as potential extinction.

21 We're literally at a point here -- definitely at
22 a point with salmon and the Northern spotted owl and all the
23 associated species -- lamprey, yellow-legged frogs. All
24 these species have hit a ceiling of impacts. We cannot
25 afford more impacts to these species. And I know what all

1 the impacts are in terms of habitat loss and fragmentation,
2 both terrestrial and aquatic. Our wetlands are hugely
3 impacted as well and we cannot afford to impact them
4 further.

5 The other part of this is that I'm a farmer and
6 I utilize the water that is going to be impacted for this.
7 And I know -- especially, there's a recent paper by Jones &
8 Perry, 2018. I'm well aware of the impacts to our water
9 quality and quantity that this project, as well as the
10 cumulative effects of other projects, will have and that I
11 will lose more of my access to water to grow my food, to
12 maintain my livelihood, and to have good, clean drinking
13 water. And I also know it's going to increase toxins, such
14 as the toxic algae because of the lower waters that we will
15 have in the summertime and it will have this huge impact on
16 the winter waters in terms of the peak flows it will cause,
17 which will continue to cause serious erosion and loss of
18 habitat for all those species.

19 So, the quantity and quality of water resources,
20 both direct and cumulative impacts will cause huge issues to
21 me, economically, as well as loss of quality of life and
22 livelihood. And we end up paying for these things. You
23 know people don't -- they forget that the small people end
24 up having to pay because all of a sudden there're
25 restrictions that we can't use our water any more, yadah,

1 yadah, yadah, because these bigger people come in and have
2 all these impacts upon us and then we get stuck holding the
3 bills and holding the mess afterwards.

4 And the last part of is that the economic
5 analysis doesn't address that. It doesn't address how all
6 of these impacts actually affect us in terms of the costs
7 that are not accounted for after the project's implemented
8 because there's always these external costs that --
9 especially, from the loss of environmental function that we
10 then end up having to pay for, one way or another, or many
11 ways is usually the case.

12 We've already seen that with other industry-type
13 activities. This, again, is a huge adverse impact. It
14 cumulatively adds to that in a situation where we've hit a
15 ceiling. We literally can't afford any more. And doing
16 this kind of stuff would be irreversible and irretrievable.
17 Alright, thank you.

18 (Whereupon, the scoping meeting was concluded)

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

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

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

Name of Proceeding: Jordan Cove Energy Project

Docket No.: CP17-495-000/CP17-494-000

Place: Myrtle Creek, Oregon

Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2019

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

David Downey

Official Reporter