

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, L.P. Docket No. PF17-4-000
PACIFIC CONNECTOR GAS PIPELINE, L.P.

----- x
JORDAN COVE LNG TERMINAL
PACIFIC CONNECTOR PIPELINE

Sunset Middle School
245 South Cammann Street
Coos Bay, Oregon 97420
Tuesday, June 27, 2017

The public comment session, pursuant to notice, convened
at 4 p.m.

1 VERBAL COMMENT SESSION

2 MR. CLARKE: My name is John Clarke, C L A R K E.

3 I reside -- do you need that?

4 FERC: If you want to put it in, that's fine;

5 but--

6 MR. CLARKE: I've put it on my documents.

7 FERC: That's fine.

8 Whenever you're ready, I'll start the clock.

9 MR. CLARKE: Okay. Well, I guess we're ready.

10 Back in 2013 they did a plume study; Jordan Cove
11 energy project did a plume study; but because the project is
12 now changed, I would like very much that the FERC, as an
13 early part of their business, to have them redo the plume
14 study because of the airport; it's adjacent to the airport.
15 And the FAA recommends that a plume study be done. I
16 brought in a copy, and I'm submitting a copy of the old
17 plume study.

18 Now also, because the State Department of
19 Aviation requires that no steam, that it interferes with
20 visibility, be identified. And so I've brought some
21 pictures of some local mills; I live up, out of Roseburg and
22 there are some mills there. I brought three pictures; these
23 pictures were all taken within a week of each other; they
24 were all taken at noon; and the temperature was 40 degrees
25 on all of them. You can see the changes; how the steam

1 varies from day-to-day. On the first picture, you'll see --
2 which is labeled 2A -- you will see that the road is wet,
3 so there was a light drizzle. And you can see that
4 everything is obscured by the steam cloud.

5 Then on 2B, there's less steam, and so there's
6 less humidity; and then on 2C it shows very little steam.
7 And that all occurred in the course of one week. So steam
8 becomes an issue when you're at the Coast.

9 Now my Exhibit 3 is a plant in Dillard, which is
10 Roseburg Forest Products. They produce their own
11 electricity; it's a 30 megawatt plant, and I'm showing you
12 the plume out of that 30 megawatt plant. The new proposed
13 Jordan Cove facility will produce 60 megawatts of power,
14 twice this amount.

15 My fourth exhibit is the FAA-issued Notices of
16 Presumed Hazard for aircraft, because of the facility. And
17 that's never been resolved in all these years; doesn't
18 matter how much testimony we put in, it has never been
19 resolved. So there are four or five, five -- and what I
20 want to do is make sure that FERC recognizes the fact that
21 some of the mitigation may not be acceptable because of the
22 steam that is being generated from this facility. And I
23 would like FERC to have the Applicant identify all sources
24 of heat that are going to be discharged from that facility,
25 and incorporated into that plume study.

1 That's basically my comments. And I am
2 submitting these comments to the Secretary.

3 [Documents for the record]

4 > MR. REID: All right, my name is Charles A. Reid,
5 III. R E I D, the last name is spelled. I'm basically an
6 independent citizen. I do work as a little bit of an
7 adviser with the Citizens Against LNG, as well. I also have
8 filed a written report which includes various different
9 pieces of information, but this is to add to those comments,
10 if you will.

11 In the early stage just let me make one very
12 specific comment. I used to live over in Jackson County. I
13 feel it's very, very bad that they don't have a meeting of
14 this sort over there. There's a considerable amount of
15 comment there, and the nearest spot to do this instead of
16 having to come to a place like this is three and a half
17 hours away, or to Klamath County, or someplace else where
18 it's a long distance to go. And they do have a very vital
19 interest in doing that.

20 The second part that I have is that not only is
21 the period of time short, but Jordan Cove has managed to
22 scarf up library materials that are important to anybody who
23 is studying these issues. Some of them were things that
24 were supplied by FERC, not their supplies and actual
25 materials. And that's shorthanded all the libraries all

1 across the State of Oregon where they were supplied
2 previously. Based on that, I do think the legitimacy of
3 this operation is most critical at this time to extend the
4 time period for comment to 90 days and mandate that Jordan
5 Cove return the stuff that they've taken from the
6 libraries.

7 Having said that, I've tried, in addition to my
8 written comments, which I'll give you a copy of. The very
9 tail end of it I get into economic discussion. My
10 background before my retirement is in economic development
11 and I did a fair amount of that in different areas, worked
12 as a consultant for private industry as well as some areas
13 of government. So when I see things that are claimed to be
14 such gray areas, there's going to be high paying jobs,
15 there's going to be this or that, and I'm reading now from
16 the Ohio Legislative Assembly letter, which was written and
17 signed by a number of people that are in the Assembly and
18 the Senate.

19 And one of the things I'm most concerned about is
20 this, they can make claims but how validly are they
21 evaluating those claims? When they're saying that they
22 would have had more development for the lack of a source of
23 gas, I think it's imperative that the question then be
24 asked, go back a twenty years, where have we lost industry?
25 One thing you learn very quickly with the history of

1 economic development, usually it's a collaboration of
2 events, materials, or supplies that create a critical mass
3 in an area in order to develop an industry.

4 And the fact that they have very little here,
5 other than the claim that, 'Oh wow, this is going to be a
6 constrained lack of gas, that we're not going to be able to
7 grow,' I would doubt that very much; most of the types of
8 industries they have would have to be pretty large in order
9 to do that, and it's likely, that like a Roseburg, or some
10 of the areas that have been represented by these people,
11 would even have gotten -- and I have located and relocated
12 businesses before -- I can tell you right now that I had
13 looked at places in Oregon back in the late 80's and a lot
14 of the things that I would have disqualified that didn't
15 have anything to do with natural gas.

16 The tax issue. They talk in here about how much
17 it's going to be paid to the State, but what they don't tell
18 you is that the \$62 million that they are going to, so
19 called, give in lieu of taxes, is to circumvent the Oregon
20 State Education Fund. We have a little bit of a convoluted
21 way of doing it because we don't have sales tax and other
22 things that the state raises for its money, so it's
23 basically income tax. And the contributions of the portions
24 of the real estate tax which are for schools. The net
25 recipient of that has been Coos Bay for some period of

1 time.

2 Now, in order to advert having to return monies
3 to the state and not give it all back, they've taken out of
4 the hands of the citizens, the use of taxpayers' dollars and
5 made a charity fund that's going to go through different
6 little clubs of hand- appointed people. It's subverting
7 democracy and of all quality; poor citizenship at its best.

8

9 They talk about the Bay, but they don't tell
10 there's a \$400 million job just to get it ready for all the
11 tonnage that they're talking about they'd like to have
12 future monies for. Right now, there is no specific need for
13 that even to be done. My comments in here, to further go
14 to it, it talks about the fact they really do not have a
15 sure order, if one evaluates -- and I have been evaluating
16 the oil and gas industries since the 1970s -- I can tell you
17 right now, Asia is in turmoil over this commodity. Nobody
18 is making these long-term commitments.

19 Look at it thoroughly. Look at the ten year
20 plans, five year plans, different orders to utilities in
21 these different nations, because those orders are not there
22 firm.

23 [Documents for the record]

24 > MS. HUGHES: My name is Laura Hughes. L A U R A.
25 H U G H E S. My name is Laura Hughes and I'm a Coos County

1 resident for 20 years. I am the Laborers International
2 Union of North America pipeline consultant. Because of my
3 34 years' history of working in the industry which
4 represents 14,000 workers building and sustaining pipelines
5 across the United States and Canada, I was also a founding
6 member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers,
7 B31Q, operator qualifications committee whose charge is to
8 determine the qualification of workers performing sensitive
9 tasks that would affect the pipeline integrity during
10 construction.

11 I have personally witnessed major changes in the
12 process of pipeline coating and the installation of the
13 pipe, since the Pipeline Safety Act of 2001. The ensuing
14 regulations requiring specifications on the coating and
15 protection of the pipe has resulted in an immensely superior
16 product, safely lowered into the ground.

17 I have, through the years, personally worked as a
18 laborer many large projects of the magnitude of the Pacific
19 Connector pipeline and have in my capacity as an
20 international pipeline representative, the overseeing of the
21 training of our members to perform the operator
22 qualification tasks in an experienced and correct manner.
23 The pipeline system in the country is still by far the
24 safest way to transport gas and oil to the downstream
25 consumers.

1 The materials to build these pipelines have
2 oversight, from the mills that the pipes make, to the
3 inspectors that watch it being put into the ground according
4 to government regulations and client specifications, and
5 workers performing those tasks in a safe and qualified
6 manner. I believe that this project is a shot in the for
7 Coos County's beleaguered tax base and a boom for the middle
8 class jobs here. This LNG pipeline project is in the best
9 interest of Coos County, the State of Oregon, and finally
10 the United States of America. Until we can develop the most
11 sustainable alternative energy sources we are still reliant
12 on a safe method of moving our energy through these highly
13 regulated underground pipelines.

14 Thank you for your consideration.

15 [Documents for the record]

16 > MS. GAAB: My name is Dana Gaab. G A A B.
17 Affiliated with, I am a board member of Citizens Against LNG
18 and have been since the beginning, which was going on 13
19 years ago now. All right, so I'm ready for my comments.
20 All right, I'll sort of read this.

21 Actually there are scores of substantive reasons
22 to be opposed to the siting of Jordan Cove on Coos Bay's
23 North Spit and the 232 mile pipeline to carry the gas across
24 Southwestern Oregon to the proposed export facility. My
25 concerns addressed here will focus on public safety.

1 Specifically, the safety of anyone on the North
2 Spit at the time of an earthquake. These people would
3 include the workers at the Jordan Cove facility itself. The
4 workers at DB Western, I'll get a numbers on that in my
5 written comment. Workers at South Port Lumber Company.
6 I'll get a number on that. And recreational users. Also,
7 one other group to be concerned about would be the first
8 responders at the proposed in the past safety center,
9 training center, they would be in prior proposals that they
10 were there.

11 All right, the geological record indicates that
12 the Northwest Coast has entered the time frame for a major
13 rupture along the Cascadia Subduction zone. The event will
14 include liquefaction and result in tsunami. A small
15 likelihood exists that there would be many survivors, as a
16 dike road that leads to the North Spit would receive major
17 damage. First responders will be among the first
18 casualties.

19 All right, that's kind of my comment and I want
20 to, I'm looking for an answer to this. And I have a couple
21 other comments, this one is short.

22 Define 'should' and 'shall' as used in prior
23 Jordan Cove Energy and Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline
24 Project, EIS and EIS statements.

25 That said, I'm finished here. I do have a couple

1 other comments that I will submit in written form. Thank
2 you. It's really disappointing to me the format that's
3 being used by FERC here. I know this isn't a formal public
4 hearing, but in the past two spoken processes there has been
5 a more of a format of a public hearing where members of the
6 community got to hear the concerns of other members of the
7 community on this crucial issue.

8 > MR. HUGATS: My name is Larry Hugats. That's L A
9 R R Y. H U G A T S. My name is Larry Hugats, I'm a native
10 of Coos County. I've spent many years away from home and
11 family because there's so few good paying jobs here.

12 You see, I'm in pipeline labor, a construction
13 laborer for 28 years. I have chosen this blue collar
14 occupation because it works for a high-school educated man
15 and paid me a middle class income. It helps me feed my
16 family and pay taxes in this place that I love. When I
17 heard we might get a pipeline coming here, I was all excited
18 that I might be able to at last work at home.

19 I am upset to see so many people that are not
20 aware of the facts that rule my life when I build pipelines.
21 We are trained and experienced qualified workers that are
22 proud of their end result. A safe product. Well built
23 pipeline put into the ground that looks like we weren't even
24 there when we're finished. Inspectors are with every crew
25 watching the process to confirm I've done it right. We are

1 proud of our ability to build a superior product.

2 I wish in my heart to be able to spend more time
3 with my family while building a quality pipeline for my
4 community. A job I have seen done so well on all the
5 pipeline projects that I have worked on for 35 plus years of
6 construction. This community desperately needs good paying
7 jobs that would provide. Please help make it happen.

8 And I'd also want to see it because it's going to
9 help us on our shipping port, you know bringing up the
10 tonnage where we can help get more ships in here. For 55
11 years it was the largest wood-producing terminal in the
12 whole country, for a long time. It just helps to boost it
13 up for the jobs. And that's basically all I've got to say.

14

15 [Documents for the record]

16 > MS. SEGNER: My name is Beverly Segner. B E V E
17 R L Y. Segner, S as in Sam, E G, as in George, N as in
18 Nancy, E R. I'm a citizen of Coos County. And that's, I'm
19 representing myself.

20 First of all, I want to say that I'm very
21 concerned about the format of this meeting. I think that in
22 the past being able to hear other people's testimony has
23 informed me about various issues and to do with the project,
24 of which I was unaware and you can't do that behind closed
25 doors.

1 I also echo Governor Brown's request that the
2 scoping process be extended to 90 days due to the rural
3 nature of our area. Also, I think it's important that FERC
4 look into the fact that a Jordan Cove representative went to
5 the regional libraries and emptied the shelves of historical
6 materials related to the project. And we will be submitting
7 that in a written comment.

8 One area I am especially concerned about is
9 environmental justice, and the fact that in projects of this
10 nature certainly it's important that the federal agencies
11 identify and address those disproportionately impacted by
12 the effects of the project. So that's an important thing to
13 me, in that, for example, this area is medically a under-
14 served area for dental, mental health, and primary care. It
15 is a health practitioner shortage area in all those
16 categories. I think there needs to be a review of
17 recruiting practices, difficulties with people who leave the
18 area. Health professionals, why they come, why they leave,
19 as part of this because one of the things in physician
20 recruiting to rural areas is the abundant recreational and
21 leisure activities, and I have heard physicians testify
22 previously that getting people to come to this area when
23 there's a noxious facility present would be a very negative,
24 or difficult process.

25 Also, I want that there be a map in this

1 Environmental Impact Statement that totally demonstrates all
2 phases of the project for evaluation. There needs to be
3 differentiation between the various phases and at each
4 phase. Pre-construction, construction, operation, and then
5 when it's going into mothballs, how the community's going to
6 be protected whether there's a bond, whether there's an
7 insurance, whatever there is.

8 Also, Williams has a track record that's not so
9 great on the pipelines' corrosion and there needs to be a
10 special plan above and beyond what's required for oversight
11 of that.

12 Also, maps showing where pesticides and
13 herbicides are going to be used in perpetuity as part of the
14 project so that people are aware of their property and the
15 families who are going to be affected.

16 We need clear information on the consequences of
17 a spill, mitigation plans, and disaster preparedness. We're
18 in a tsunami, earthquake zone and also assessment of the
19 area where the pipeline's expected to go. We have a real
20 difficulty with appropriate trauma care, there's no hospital
21 in the region affected by the pipeline or the main facility
22 that has a trauma level. People have to be flown out of the
23 area to get high level trauma care. They can stabilize
24 people but they cannot treat them for trauma.

25 Also all alternatives, including not doing the

1 project, and the impact of that needs to be part of this
2 scoping. And that all categories in the environmental
3 report, water use and quality, fish and wildlife,
4 vegetation, culture resources, socioeconomic, geological
5 resources, soils, land use, recreation, aesthetics, and
6 noise quality alternatives reliability, safety, PCB
7 contamination, and LNG engineering and design details all
8 need to be assessed for all phases of a project of this
9 nature.

10 I really appreciate it and thank you for taking
11 down my testimony, and I will be submitting written
12 testimony.

13 > MR. MANGAN: L A R R Y. M A N G A N. Any other
14 information you want, basic, before I start talking?

15 FEREC: Do you have any affiliations or
16 organizations or..?

17 MR. MANGAN: No. I'm just a private landowner.
18 First of all, thanks for coming. Thanks for listening to
19 us. We own a small ranch on Haines Inlet and we've been
20 here 30 years. My wife is a native Oregonian and I'm a
21 veteran. and our ranch is on the proposed routing of the
22 pipe. It crosses our property for 1,400 feet. Two issues I
23 want to talk about today.

24 One is safety and one is eminent domain. First
25 of all I'd like to welcome you to the blast zone. We're in

1 the blast zone here where people, say for example, children
2 in the schoolyard of the Sunset Middle School would get
3 second degree burns if they hadn't gotten cover in 30
4 seconds or less after the explosion. We're lucky we're not
5 in zone 1. Zone 1 is instant cremation. It's vaporization.
6 It sounds like a science fiction movie but it's not.

7 As you are aware, we live on the Pacific Cascade
8 Fault and roughly every 250 years, there's been a major
9 earthquake. Up to 9.4. It's been documented for at least
10 the last 10,000 years. At least 50 of them fairly
11 regularly, and we're overdue right now. So, this scenario
12 of a explosion of an either LNG pipeline, ship, or facility
13 is not science fiction. We think there are other
14 alternatives better for example, up the Umpqua River. The
15 old pulp mill near Gardener would affect much fewer people.
16 It would require a lot of dredging in the Umpqua River
17 port, but there are probably four or five hundred people in
18 the three mile blast zone as opposed to 17,000 in the North
19 end Coos Bay. So, for safety reasons I'd like to see that
20 alternative looked at.

21 The second issue is private property rights. I
22 can't really tell you and you would never really understand
23 what it's like to be in the bulls-eye of a pipe like this.
24 When you get a hand delivered, Federal Express letter saying
25 that they want to come on our property, and ultimately if we

1 are against the pipeline eventually the property would be
2 taken under eminent domain. We would have no reason to ever
3 sell it out for money.

4 It's like a personal attack on us. A blow to the
5 gut. We've had both physical and emotional concerns over
6 this. Our life has changed since the four months from when
7 we received the initial letter that our ranch was in the
8 bulls-eye. And the reason I don't think you would really
9 ever understand that is until it happened to you. We didn't
10 understand it. There are a number of people, a number of
11 ranchers, a number of landowners that have been dealing with
12 this for 14 years now. It's just a triple jeopardy, double
13 jeopardy and this is a triple jeopardy from one of them
14 going under this emotional and physical assault on them.

15 I'd like, whether it's legal or not, it
16 apparently is legal for a foreign company which is not
17 providing any services to the locals to be able to condemn
18 property through eminent domain. But I would like, one
19 issue is that there was an executive order by President
20 George Bush back in June 23rd of 2006. The title of the
21 executive order is, Protecting the Property Rights of the
22 American People. And I believe that that executive order is
23 still in effect; it has not been canceled, and it should
24 definitely be looked at and related to how it affects this
25 particular project.

1 The final comment is there are approximately 150
2 permanent jobs that will come out of this. And ultimately,
3 it would be affecting 300 to 600 landowners, so is it really
4 worth it? Two to four landowners affected for every job
5 that would be created. Is that really fair to put these
6 poor people that have -- we've only been on it for five
7 months now. Some of these people have been under it for 12
8 years now.

9 Again. Final thing. Is it legal, I don't know.
10 I'm not a judge and I'm not a lawyer, but the real question,
11 is it right? Just because something is legal does not mean
12 that you have to do it. So, my question to the
13 Commissioners is, is this the right thing to do?

14 Thank you.

15 > MR. HAHM: My name is David Hahm, H A H M, as in
16 Mary. I am currently a resident of Woodland, Washington,
17 but I spent the first 30 years of my life in Eugene, Oregon,
18 neighboring the Coos County. Over those 30 years, I was
19 involved in many sports activities and recreation that
20 brought me out to Coos County and the Oregon Coast.

21 Over my lifetime I've seen the decline and demise
22 of business in this area, including the logging industry,
23 and it's been very sad for me to watch this. We have a
24 chance to see a \$10 billion project in our own back yard
25 bring income and jobs, thousands of jobs for the first four

1 years, and up to hundreds of jobs for years after that in
2 maintenance and operations of the facility. I think it
3 would be irresponsible of us to turn this opportunity down
4 and not take advantage of this gift that's looking us
5 straight in the eyes.

6 I do represent 20,000 craft workers throughout
7 the Pacific Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters, and
8 currently seated as the lead representative for the State of
9 Oregon for the Pacific Northwest Regional Council of
10 Carpenters. In the State of Oregon we have over 5,000 craft
11 workers. Those 5,000 craft workers are still depending on
12 infrastructure and energy projects for their livings.
13 Without projects like this proposed \$10 billion project,
14 they will be without food on the table for their children,
15 without roofs over their heads.

16 Again, I feel it would be irresponsible of us not
17 to accept this gift and build this project. Thank you.

18 > MR. WASHBURN: Paul M. Washburn. W A S H B U R
19 N. My wife and I reside at 61829 Old Wagon Road, Coos Bay,
20 Oregon. The Pacific Connector pipeline is proposed to cross
21 our property where the pipeline crosses Old Wagon Road. It
22 is my understanding that in order to approve this permit
23 that the FERC must consider any alternatives to the propose
24 route to determine if it or the alternative is the best
25 route.

1 Over ten years ago the property owners between
2 mile posts 11 and 22, which is now known as the Blue Ridge
3 Modified Alternative Route. The previous final EIS stated
4 the Blue Ridge route did not pose a significant
5 environmental advantage to the proposed route. Most of the
6 rationale contradicted the applicant's own findings. For
7 example, throughout the EIS Pacific Connector said ridge
8 lines were always preferable to going over what I would
9 describe as cross-country. I was frustrated by the
10 rejection on the grounds of 'no significant environmental
11 advantage.' Why does the alternative have to be
12 significantly more advantageous? If you factor in the
13 disruption to over 20 families and private landowners, I
14 would argue there would be an advantage to Blue Ridge.

15 In addition, their old findings concluded that
16 the route would cross ten times as many water bodies as the
17 Blue Ridge alternative. They even admitted the Blue Ridge
18 alternative was a perfectly viable and a buildable route.
19 They also included a totally useless piece of information to
20 justify ignoring the Blue Ridge alternative. They cited
21 letters in opposition to the Blue Ridge Alternative from
22 seven people whose properties would not be crossed by the
23 Blue Ridge route nor even be in their neighborhood. The
24 Pacific Connector even went so far as to list these people's
25 names in the EIS. Suggesting of my opinion that their

1 concerns were more valid than those of us who would
2 actually would be impacted by the proposed route.

3 On the other hand, here's how they described us.
4 Quote: "A group of landowners objected to the pipeline
5 route," unquote. There was no listing of the 20 plus names,
6 objections, or their reasons for doing so. This was
7 disingenuous at best. Making us anonymous helps to not put
8 a face on us and it minimalizes the points we made in both
9 verbal and written comments to the FERC. In my opinion, the
10 Blue Ridge alternative was never given a serious look.
11 However, I think it bears close reexamination, especially in
12 light of recent developments.

13 Last year a rather extensive logging operation
14 took place on Blue Ridge, it lasted for a couple of months.
15 The FERC, along with their partners needs to make a new and
16 comprehensive study on how this logging would change the
17 dynamics of Blue Ridge as a viable alternative. Thank you.

18

19 Do I have more time?

20 FERC: You do, actually. Yes.

21 MR. WASHBURN: I'd like to make an additional
22 comment that if the FERC goes ahead with this and buys into
23 this particular thing and they don't want to do Blue Ridge,
24 that of the 66 streams that are in our neighborhood, they'd
25 be required to do a year, at least, in advance, be required

1 to do water flow studies on each of the streams in a
2 seasonal type of a basis like January, May, August,
3 September, or something like that. Anyway, the bottom like
4 is establish a baseline of how much volume these creeks are
5 producing so that if anything happens later on, to a creek -
6 - in our case, it's a creek that feeds five families, both
7 recreationally and for their water source -- if anything
8 happens to that, that the applicant be made responsible for
9 doing something to mitigate it. That's it.

10 [Prepared statement for the record]

11 > MS. ARANDA: I guess you want my name: Aida, A I
12 D A Aranda, A R A N D A. I'm a member of Labor Local 737.

13

14 So at this point the project has been under
15 development and negotiation for a lot of years. And many of
16 the revisions to the construction plans and the
17 environmental impact standards in order to ensure a safe,
18 efficient economic development for Oregon's economy. The
19 environment impact statement you're working on is critical
20 to ensuring that a consistent set of environmentally
21 responsible standards are applied to this project. As you
22 work on this report you have a duty to be mindful of several
23 things.

24 First, adding to Oregon's existing natural gas
25 pipeline framework is the safest and cleanest solution to

1 the needs of the proposed terminal. Thousands of miles of
2 existing pipe transport natural gas throughout the state
3 every day and do not require the intensive truck or rail
4 fuel costs, nor incur the same spill dangers as highway
5 bound natural gas. The most viable option to meet the
6 massive quantity demands of the proposed terminal is the
7 pipeline. It is simply cleaner, safer, and more efficient.

8

9 Second. The construction of this project is to
10 my understanding all ready to be done under rigorous
11 environmental oversight as to ensure the construction does
12 not soil our natural areas or private property. Our workers
13 are some of the safest trained and will be able to do this
14 work safely and efficiently and within the environmental
15 regulations. Which brings me to my final point.

16 The necessity, and importance of this project to
17 both our members and Oregon's economy as a whole. The large
18 scale export of liquid natural gas is critical to rejection
19 of pollution through energy production globally.
20 Understanding this unique position Oregon is in to help the
21 global effort for a cleaner atmosphere will simultaneously
22 creating hundreds of family wage jobs is a huge opportunity
23 going forward. Our workers will be able to work relatively
24 close to home for years. And Oregon will be able to
25 generate revenue through transportation and export of a

1 cleaner burning energy source, which is of particular
2 importance since we face a \$1.4 billion budget deficit. The
3 importance of this project to our citizens and the state as
4 a whole cannot be overstated.

5 Thank you very much.

6 > MR. ROLLER: My name is Bruce Roller. R O L L E
7 R. I'm a field rep for Laborer's Local 737 out of Portland,
8 Oregon. I've been a Laborers Union member for the last 22
9 years. I've worked primarily in the Portland metro area,
10 down south as far as Eugene.

11 I feel this project would be very, very good for
12 the State of Oregon primarily for the fact that it's going
13 to provide outside money coming in and with the problems
14 that the State has been having trying to find money to pay
15 things. I think this would be a really good opportunity to
16 have that influx. Wonderful construction side, hitting a
17 bunch of trades, primarily heavy highways, some building
18 trade stuff. But in the long run it's building our
19 infrastructure and strengthening our backbone here in the
20 State of Oregon.

21 And that's, I'm in total support of the pipeline,
22 I think it's needed. And I'm in support the LNG facility
23 even though it's a privatized thing as most of it will be
24 going overseas probably to Japan; but in the long run that
25 keeps them from possibly building another nuclear plant to

1 replace Fukushima. There again, I am in full support of the
2 project, and I know we can do it safely and hopefully in the
3 budget.

4 That's it.

5 > MR. WESTERMAN: My name is Robert Westerman.
6 That's W E S T E R M A N. I'm business manager with the
7 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union
8 932. I'm here to speak on, in support of the Jordan Cove
9 Energy project.

10 The Jordan Cove Energy project is going to bring
11 much needed economic stimulus to the Coos County area. Our
12 area has been economically devastated over the past eight
13 years and the past 30 years since the timber industry has
14 gone by the by. We feel that the economic benefits of this
15 project are going to far outweigh any of the damage to the
16 environment that isn't mitigated or to the homeowners who
17 have loss of property through eminent domain.

18 I do have one request for the Commissioners, and
19 that is that they don't delay the regulatory process any
20 more than what's needed. Thank you.

21 > MR. SUTHERLAND: My name is John Sutherland, J O
22 H N, S U T H E R L A N D. I'm with the Oregon Laborers
23 Union. I'm just here to support the project. I think it
24 will create a lot of good jobs for a lot of good people.
25 That's all I have,

1 FERC: Are you sure, because you have plenty of
2 time.

3 MR. SUTHERLAND: That's all right.

4 > MR. JACKSON: I'm Gary Jackson. I am a Business
5 Representative for the International Laborers Union.
6 Laborers Local 747. I'm glad you folks were here tonight to
7 have this hearing.

8 I understand that the last permit Jordan Cove
9 applied for was denied primarily because the project could
10 show no economic value to the communities involved. This
11 project is projected to employ 150 to 200 people full-time
12 after completion. There is expected to be another 700 plus
13 spin off jobs. So there should be about 850 to 900 new jobs
14 created. I would think that this would be an economic
15 value.

16 Coos County is estimated to receive in taxes and
17 fees \$200 million per year for the next 25 years. Douglas
18 and Jackson Counties, \$5 million per county per year for the
19 next 25 years. And \$10 million per year for the next 25
20 years for Klamath County. I would think that this would be
21 considered an economic value as well. There's also the
22 provisions for taps in the line for different industries
23 along the route of the line. This is the potential for more
24 economic value. With a work force of 3,500 plus the weekly
25 payroll will be very large, adding to the local economies

1 and tax bases as well.

2 Another issue was the use of eminent domain.
3 This project is part of an infrastructure project concerning
4 the entire world, not just southern Oregon. If this project
5 route was for a paved highway, I don't feel there would be
6 near the opposition or the outcry over eminent domain.
7 However, it is for pipeline, which is still a highway. An
8 energy highway. This highway is transporting natural gas
9 that is going to be used by Asian countries to eliminate coal
10 fired plants that are emitting huge amounts of greenhouse
11 gases and carbon emissions.

12 According to recently issued EPA reports, these
13 emissions and gases have been reduced by 20 percent since
14 their last report. At that same time, production and use of
15 natural gas has increased 40 percent. I would think that
16 this would also be an ecological value as well. Not just
17 locally, but globally.

18 I would ask and urge the members of the FERC to
19 please issue the permits necessary to construct the LNG
20 terminal at Jordan Cove and the Pacific Connector pipeline.

21

22 [Document for the record]

23 > MR. GOERGEN: Todd G O E R G E N. I'm the co-
24 president for Boost Southern Oregon, a grassroots
25 organization comprised of businesses and individuals in

1 support of the Jordan Cove Energy Project and the Pacific
2 Connector Gas Pipeline. And I have a letter here I want to
3 submit for the record. Then also, I am here to testify as
4 an affected landowner.

5 My family owns the Box Car Hill campground on the
6 North Spit. The pipeline appears from the exhibits here to
7 be going through our campground. We are in support of the
8 project and we feel that the benefits of the project far
9 outweigh any inconvenience that we might incur as a result
10 of accommodating the right-of-way for the pipeline.

11 One of the things that is so important for our
12 area, being a lifelong resident, is the lack of family wage
13 jobs in the area. Those resulting from the decline in the
14 timber industry over the past 30 years. So the 3,500
15 construction jobs that will be created and the 250 permanent
16 jobs after the plant is operational will really generate a
17 lot of benefits for the area. And the community enhancement
18 plan that the project is going to support in cooperation and
19 agreement with the county, Coos County, the cities of Coos
20 Bay and North Bend, and the international court at Coos Bay,
21 will generate half a billion dollars in benefits to that
22 foundation in the way of fees in lieu of taxes that will
23 help support our ailing school system, our first responders
24 and all of the other county and local services that have
25 seen a severe decline as the result of the horrible economy

1 that we've experienced in rural Oregon. Since the Spotted
2 Owl and the Marble Marlet issues.

3 So, I guess the other thing I'd like to state is
4 that natural gas is a clean burning energy source. There's
5 a renowned doctor, Bjorn Lomborg, with the Copenhagen
6 consensus center that recently stated that based on clean
7 energy, wind and solar generates on 6/10ths of 1 percent of
8 our global energy at the present time. And in 25 years ago
9 it only comprised about 6 percent. So the gap of 94 percent
10 needs to be met, but natural gas will be a good way to
11 transition into technologies where we can depend on wind and
12 solar more without the harmful effects of hurting those that
13 are least able to afford, you know, power. So, that's one
14 thing.

15 And then the other benefit of course, is those
16 western Rocky communities that this pipeline would create an
17 access for their stranded resources to reach the port and be
18 exported to the global marketplace. Right now China and
19 India, and a number of countries are still ramping up coal-
20 fired plants and some are starting to shy away from nuclear;
21 and having a spot market where there's available natural gas
22 to serve some of these other international markets could
23 help clean up the environment rather than disallowing
24 natural gas exports, where we would end up inadvertently
25 supporting the coal industry, which I think would be more

1 detrimental to the environment.

2 In conclusion, I do urge that we don't delay the
3 review or the extend the comment period. This project has
4 been in the works in one form or another for over 12 years,
5 and the footprint of the project has actually declined in
6 size with the elimination of the South Dunes power plant;
7 and for the betterment of our country, to address our
8 balance of trade issues, the primary customer for this
9 project will be Japanese, and we have a 60 million dollar a
10 year trade deficit with that country. This project could go
11 a long ways towards addressing that issue, and also to
12 address the Chinese aggression in the South China sea. We
13 need to support our allies in the Pacific Rim region. You
14 know, Japan and others to help counter the aggressive action
15 that the Chinese are taking with the construction of
16 artificial islands, and militarizing those.

17 Thank you.

18 > MR. WILDER: Name is William Westlee Wilder. W I
19 L L I A M. W E S T L E E. W I L D E R. I'm not affiliated
20 with anybody right now. I've been local for a long time.
21 I've worked in unions. I've worked on forest products, so I
22 guess I have been affiliated with them; but as for this
23 whole situation, since I've been here, I'm 40 years old, and
24 the whole town seems to get worse and worse. Less jobs and
25 less jobs. I mean, when I went to high school here it was,

1 you could go to the mall, you could go sport shopping
2 baseball, whatever, do a lot of things. I left for the Army
3 in '96, came back, and it was just like, more businesses
4 were closing down. More jobs were closing down.

5 I had friends that were struggling with their
6 families trying to get jobs, and it's just the area's not
7 good for jobs right now unless you want to work at Walmart
8 or a fast food place. Or if you're lucky enough to get on
9 with Roseburg Forest Products or a company like that. It's
10 really a struggle for more of my friends, they tell me.
11 So, yeah, I'm all in favor for bringing LNG to our community
12 and I'm really hoping that it will increase our community
13 jobs and help a lot of families out. It's just that I feel
14 the need to help our community grow, instead of getting
15 smaller and smaller because like I said, you go to our mall
16 right now and it's not even a mall; it's a place to go get
17 cell phones, and Joann Fabric whatever.

18 We definitely need to change something, we need a
19 turnaround. We need jobs, that's the main thing I'm here
20 for. And that's really all I've got. That's pretty much
21 everything; like I said, jobs is the main focus. Like I
22 said, my friends, I just turned 40 and it was like, I
23 thought things would improve by now, but every year it seems
24 to be getting worse and worse.

25 I live directly across the street from here, from

1 Sunset right here and it's just like the area, Coos Bay,
2 Empire, just more people that come, seems like more of them
3 are retired, so they don't really care about the job
4 situation as much as the people growing up here and have
5 been here all of their lives, or struggling to get jobs or
6 have to leave the area to get a job to support their family.
7 But more people from California come to retire here, and a
8 lot of them I see are the protesters I'm assuming, because a
9 lot of them I've talked to, oh, they've come from California
10 or Washington or wherever, so they didn't really grow up
11 here so. It's jobs is the main thing I see. Just. We
12 need jobs. And that's it.

13 > MR. ANSEN: And that's E R I C, A N S E N. I
14 work for LIUNA. Laborers International Union of North
15 America. So, I'm here today just trying to spread the word
16 about how much the community does need this project. Living
17 wages, jobs, careers mainly for folks down here. Every
18 since the logging industry went south they haven't had much
19 down here for good paying jobs so I just think this could be
20 a great opportunity to get people back to work and back on
21 their feet in an already hurting community.

22 About all I got. That's all I have for now.
23 I'll be here the next couple days. I'll get more.

24 > MR. FENISON: My name is Chad Fenison. C H A D. F
25 E N I S O N. I'm affiliated with the Laborers International

1 of North America, 737. I'm really in support of this
2 project. I'm a pipeliner and I've been all across the
3 United States for the last seven years, traveled to
4 different states. I have a lot of experience with this and
5 I know that pipelines, if they are done correctly, can be a
6 really good project. Good for the area, really good for the
7 economy, and really good for the people that work on them.

8 I was a steward on several pipelines. I took
9 care of the laborers on those pipelines, and we always do
10 everything by the FERC rules. We did great jobs and we had
11 inspectors watching our every move so if we had any kind of
12 problems or violations, we had to fix them right there. So,
13 my personal opinion is it's really good work, I think it's
14 environmentally responsible and I really hope that this one
15 goes through. So, that's all I got.

16 FERC: You've got more time if have anything to
17 add.

18 MR. FENISON: I think it would be great for the
19 area. Living wage jobs in the area. You know, 50 percent of
20 all the guys that are going to work on this project and will
21 come from this area. You know, for every mile of pipeline,
22 there's one laborer that's going to do, like, at least, I
23 think, 160 miles or something like that. There's going to
24 be at least 160 laborers on it. Half of those laborers will
25 come from Oregon, and a bunch more will come from this area.

1 And I think it would really revitalize the area.

2 The other half will be guys from all over the
3 country and those guys travel; that's their living, that's
4 what they do, you know. Like for me, I travel all over the
5 United States and do all kinds of jobs, and I'm an
6 Oregonian. So, another pipeline here would be great for me,
7 because, you know, it would be nice to work close to home.
8 So, like I said before, responsible wage can-do stuff and if
9 you do it with the Union, you're going to have people who
10 care about doing a good job, that don't cut corners, that
11 want to make sure it's safe; and want to follow the rules
12 because that's what we do every day and that's what we get
13 paid to do. So, we're professionals.

14 If it's a nonunion company, there could be some
15 issues, I think, because they're not as big on the rules as
16 the union companies are, in my personal opinion. I've
17 worked for nonunion companies before, several times, and
18 they cut a lot more corners, so, you know. I'm hoping this
19 will go through, and you go Union, and we're looking forward
20 to it.

21 > MS. SANDERS: My name is Carol Sanders, S A N D E
22 R S. I live in Coos Bay. And issues which the Jordan Cove,
23 Pacific Connector, FERC EIS needs to address.

24 I think we need a very clear, concise statement
25 of the purpose and especially the need for this facility as

1 it is specified in the NEPA law. The previous Draft EIS of
2 the project, dated November 2014, the purpose was stated
3 which was produce and send gas to the foreign markets; but
4 the need was not addressed. We need to know, this EIS needs
5 to tell the public need for this project over and above the
6 implied motive, which is to benefit a foreign company.

7 This project also involves ethical and moral
8 implications, and even human suffering because by the threat
9 of using eminent domain to take land from American citizens
10 to benefit a foreign private company.

11 The analysis of the future market for this
12 product. The overseas market, in view of increased
13 competition from other countries in the LNG field needs to
14 be looked into. And the fact that the lack of binding
15 contracts was the reason, one of the reasons that the energy
16 project was rejected previously, the last time around. The
17 dangers of this facility to planes using the Southwest
18 Oregon regional airport, dangers from thermal flumes, and
19 possible air crashes involving this facility and the ships
20 serving it need to be investigated very carefully.

21 The ships carrying the LNG cargo will have a
22 significant environmental impact on the Bay, the water, and
23 the air pollution they produce; that needs to be part of the
24 EIS, those LNG tankers. The EIS needs to look into the
25 whole, the environmental impact on the Bay by looking into

1 the conditions now. What are the conditions now? And what
2 is the base state, base condition, and what will be impacts
3 of these. So, we need to have baselines established in this
4 EIS.

5 The impact of thousands of workers coming from
6 across Oregon and the West to our small town and adding to
7 the further deterioration of our roads, bridges, and
8 highways needs to be addressed. The increased danger from
9 wildfires, which the areas affected by the pipeline are
10 subject to needs to be gone into to the people who have that
11 pipeline going through their property. And then what
12 happens if a wildfire comes through there? There's already
13 fires burning all over now, wildfires.

14 The dredging of millions of cubic yards of
15 material from the bay in order to build the marine slipdocks
16 and lay the pipeline under the Bay, and to deepen the Bay to
17 accommodate those oil tankers is part of this plan for the
18 project. And the Bay in previous years, many years, has
19 been a dumping area for heavy metals and other hazardous
20 materials produced from the then-manufacturing, mining,
21 forestry, and other entities. These materials are embedded
22 in the sediment. Sediment of the bay. This needs to be
23 analyzed before any dredging takes place to determine the
24 exact nature of these hazards and their effects on the
25 waters of the Bay and the creatures who live in it when they

1 are released into the environment.

2 Also, I would hope that they add a scoping such
3 as this, more open, preferably, for Jackson County; and I
4 hope that they are going to increase the time from 30 days
5 to 90 days for our response to this, the call for comments.
6 That's it.

7 > MS. SLATE: My name is Anna Marie Slate. That's
8 A N N A M A R I E S L A T E. And I belong to a lot of
9 organizations but I'm not representing any of them today;
10 I'm representing myself.

11 So my concerns are many. LNG plants have not
12 always been safe, and there's been several blowups, leaving
13 many people injured and dead, so that concerns me,
14 especially where they're trying to put the plant, and the
15 traffic flow pattern, if something blew, the airport could
16 blow, the bridge could blow -- and the other thing is, a
17 concern for a plant being put in because we're in a
18 subduction zone and it could liquefy over there; and that
19 concerns me, if you have a situation of fire dancing on
20 water because of the gases and oils.

21 I would be concerned about people being able to
22 get medical care, they'd have to get to around our hospital.

23 If something happened, if something blew, they wouldn't be
24 able to get to the Bay Area hospital.

25 My other concern is they're not using any of our

1 fabrication plants here; they're floating everything, from
2 what I understand, over from Japan. That's what I was told.
3 They have three fabrication plants here that could be used
4 and should be used. My concern is that it's really not --
5 there's not going to be that many people hired from here to
6 run the plant. And they should be hired from here, if the
7 plant's going to be here.

8 I am also concerned that because of this plant
9 coming in, a lot of people are considering leaving. I'm one
10 of them. And we're unable, although we have got -- recently
11 they expended our hospital and stuff, and now we can't get
12 the doctors that we need to come in to fill those positions
13 that are needed there. They don't want to come in.

14 I'm concerned about the toxic situation we could
15 be in; what if one of the tankers runs aground, our Bay is
16 pretty challenging situations. I'm concerned about proper
17 medical care for our people and the specialists we're
18 looking for just won't come in because of what's going on;
19 it's one of the reasons.

20 I am homeless, and have been homeless off and on
21 for about the last two years because I was priced out of my
22 apartment, and the rents have gone up. This has just been
23 exacerbated in the last handful of years because of that. I
24 have a limited income, I'm on retirement, and I can't
25 promise to pay for something I can't afford. And even the

1 rooms, to try to get a room, it's like \$550, \$625 just for a
2 room. I'm not talking about a studio; a room with a shared
3 bathroom. And so I'm 63 and I'm out there -- because of
4 lack of housing, and in assisted housing here is a week
5 in/week out.

6 I'm 63, I have internal damage, and I can't get
7 off the ground. I shouldn't have to be living this way.
8 It's just not right.

9 I worry about the subduction zone where people
10 are living, like if something happened, Sunset Middle School
11 and Madison Elementary are in the Empire area -- if
12 something happened and something blew up while they were on
13 the channel. That's when the ships are going in and out, we
14 would lose those schools in fire, and what if our children
15 were in there.

16 So a whole lot of concerns, probably the same
17 concerns that others have spoken. The traffic pattern isn't
18 right, either, to put something in that area. I know that
19 they want to change things around; something's got to be
20 done.

21 So I'm here and I vote "No LNG" and I do that
22 with all respect. And to those around me. Don't toxify our
23 beautiful crystal bay.

24 Thank you.

25 > MS. TUCKEY: My name is Sasha Tuckey, S A S H A

1 T U C K E Y. And I'm here with 250.org, and I'm also here
2 with Smash Productions, and I'm also here for the people.

3 So what I basically have to say isn't much; other
4 than my confusion, which I'm sure -- this is confusion; I
5 don't understand what's going on, and I just would like to
6 know.

7 I don't know what much to say other than I just
8 see so many people that are hurt, I see a lot of people that
9 are confused, I see a lot of people that are scared, and I'm
10 worried about my future, I'm worried about my nephew's
11 future and I'm worried about everyone's future when things
12 like this happen. And it's not necessarily a pipeline that's
13 happening that I disagree with, I just disagree with the
14 order and the way it's going down.

15 That's all I have to say.

16 > MS. KELLEY: My name is Linda Kelley, K E L L E
17 Y. And affiliation, I'd say 350.org. My comments are a few
18 areas. First is safety. FERC must consider the public
19 safety risks of Jordan Cove, local, Northwest subduction
20 zone, a hundred years overdue for slippage. Current
21 research shows land slippage of 30 to 100 feet, cities and
22 counties throughout the Northwest are now focusing money and
23 expertise in preparation for this event. Jordan Cove is
24 currently sited on a spit of land extremely vulnerable to
25 earthquakes and tsunamis, and land liquefaction creating a

1 disaster hard to imagine.

2 Local disaster and emergency plans, training and
3 resources have not been realistically assessed, which will
4 put local residents at high risk. Second, 17 miles of the
5 proposed pipeline route would run under the location of the
6 2015 Scouts fire, running highly explosive pipeline through
7 fire-prone Western forest land. It's a recipe for disaster.

8 We know pipelines leak. Even small leaks would
9 prove disastrous in a forest fire. Shutoff valves 20 miles
10 apart would create a situation that would take out a whole
11 portion of the State, with fires so hot that recovery time
12 for the forest would be over 100 years. Danger to families
13 and landowners along the route is very high.

14 Second is jobs. FERC's report must carefully
15 assess the promised 100 to 150 jobs by the Jordan Cove
16 project in relation to the jobs lost in the oyster, fishing
17 industry and recreation industry in the area. These will be
18 very negatively affected if not destroyed by the dredging
19 and constant closing of the harbor due to tanker traffic.

20 Clean energy jobs are growing fast. I feel it is
21 actually cruel to cling to a past of dangerous and dirty
22 jobs having people think that it is their only option. We
23 need to move forward into the future; technologies are
24 changing quickly; safe, sustainable energy is absolutely
25 viable only if we choose that path.

1 Last and most crucial for me, and for all of us,
2 actually: We just cannot build any more fossil fuel
3 facilities. Whether we like it or not, unless we move away
4 from fossil fuels, the pendency and focus on creating safe
5 energy jobs will allow our children to live and work in a
6 safe climate. Clean energy jobs can easily employ and
7 support rural communities.

8 The world is moving away from fossil fuels; too
9 slowly, but they are. Carbon pricing is in place in many
10 places, and it is coming here. Money is moving; there is
11 divestment in fossil fuels, and investment in clean energy
12 is growing rapidly.

13 The imminent danger of climate change is
14 beginning to dawn on us, and pull us out of denial.
15 Projects like Jordan Cove will become stranded assets, if
16 they don't blow up first. And the financial burden of the
17 cleanup of the site will fall on the State of Oregon. The
18 Pentagon has issued a report citing climate change as the
19 number one threat to worldwide security. So we know that
20 there's a problem, even on that level.

21 The Jordan Cove project highlights basically a
22 desperate -- the desperation of a dying industry, willing to
23 put rural communities and forests and rivers, our children
24 and our children's children at risk.

25 We can do better and we must do better. We owe

1 it to future generations and the billions of years of
2 evolution that has created this incredible planet to protect
3 it, and not to make shortsighted decisions that will destroy
4 it.

5 If I have a few seconds more, I'd just like to
6 say I feel badly for people who feel like this is their only
7 way to have local sustainable jobs. My husband is high
8 voltage electrician; we know we need to recreate the grid in
9 this country, and move towards more electrical capacity that
10 is powered by wind and solar energy. It's possible; it's
11 absolutely feasible, and I think it's not a disservice for
12 us not to be respecting the people that need the jobs in
13 creating that future that will be sustainable.

14 > MS. HINE: Patricia Hine, P A T R I C I A H I N
15 E. I'm here with 350.Eugene. It is a grass roots climate
16 activist group trying to stop fossil fuels from being burned
17 so that our planet will stop warming.

18 I believe that the Federal Energy Regulatory
19 Commission should consider the cumulative impacts of this
20 project and those effects on climate change. We know that 97
21 percent of the world's scientists' research shows that the
22 safe upper limit of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is 300
23 parts per million. We are currently at 411 parts per
24 million and rising. When I was born in 1956, the parts per
25 million of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was 314, so we

1 are rising with no end in sight; that is why the glaciers
2 and the polar ice caps are melting.

3 2014 was the hottest year on record, followed by
4 2015; and now 2016, and we're on track to set another high
5 in 2017. This project pipes fracked gas from the Rocky
6 Mountain West, which leaks at every possible change of
7 hands, multiple points including extraction, transportation,
8 liquefaction and of course burning.

9 Methane, which is what natural gas is, is a
10 greater greenhouse gas in terms of warming than even carbon
11 dioxide. I don't know about you, but the North Pole is 50
12 degrees above average. I'm worried about that. Permafrost
13 and ice caps melting, and this project will make climate
14 change and warming worse. And we think FERC should consider
15 overall emission pollution in their proposal, to not
16 consider cumulative climate impacts is negligent.

17 And finally, I would prefer a format for this
18 hearing which is more traditional, where we are able to be
19 witness to both sides of the comments, so we can engage in a
20 more back-and-forth understanding and grove, to understand
21 one another's points of view; and this does not avail that
22 opportunity in an organized format. So please consider
23 going back to the regular format.

24 > MS. McCAFFREE: My name is Jody McCaffree. Jody
25 is J O D Y, McCaffree is M c C A F F R E E. I am actually a

1 volunteer executive director of the Citizens Against LNG.

2 I don't consider what's going on here, this
3 complete chaos a proper hearing process, and I do not think
4 this is proper. Scoping should be extended from 30 days to
5 90, I feel, because the resource reports are not
6 consistently available on line. We keep getting error
7 messages, and can't review them.

8 Jordan Cove took everything about their project
9 out of the libraries; we have nothing to look at. And
10 because our Oregon Governor asked you to extend the time --
11 I have that to give you today, some of that evidence. The
12 90 days would actually make a fair process, and we need
13 access to the resource reports in our local libraries.

14 Two, I'm requesting that there be a independent,
15 full federal investigation into what Jordan Cove is doing in
16 Coos County. One, Jordan Cove is not planning on paying
17 their fair share of tax; they need to pay the same rate as
18 anyone else in the County, and they're not going to be doing
19 that. The City of North Bend and Coos Bay have indemnified
20 them for any hazards that may occur with the facility; and
21 three, currently they're changing the codes and ordinances
22 in order to benefit their project, and those are being
23 changed and they're not in line with, making the local to be
24 not in line with federal and state regulations; and they're
25 putting citizens in the coastal zones at extreme risk just

1 so they can obtain their local permits.

2 Jordan Cove continue to process land use permits
3 for their old terminal design that FERC has denied. And I
4 do not believe that is fair; I have a brief due this Friday
5 that is conflicting with this process; and really, that
6 should not be going on. It actually is a clear violation of
7 the NEPA process, and FERC should be telling them they need
8 to withdraw those older permits.

9 FERC should not rely on Jordan Cove's reports to
10 do the EIS because they have not always been correct. And
11 I'll give you an example of some of the information they put
12 out that's not correct. They keep saying our area here, the
13 Coos Bay - North Bend area is completely desolate and in
14 dire straits and in need of jobs. But that just isn't the
15 case.

16 Please see the attached -- one of the articles
17 I'm going to turn in to you about our area that shows that
18 we are actually strong here, our unemployment rate, I'm
19 going to turn in a paper that shows that it's very similar
20 to the national rate. So it's not that we are desperate for
21 jobs. And we all know that these are not local jobs anyway,
22 because if they were local jobs they would not be building a
23 2100-person man camp.

24 Well, I will be submitting more stuff. I
25 actually would like to submit some of this paperwork I've

1 turned in that was here.

2 I would like to say that the EIS should contain a
3 section on the effect on the environment, which analyzes the
4 past, present and reasonable foreseeable action of the
5 proposed development; all negative impacts of the project
6 need to be fully addressed, including Jordan Cove's effect
7 on our already-compromised marina wildlife ecosystems. And
8 I have an article in here that I want to turn in to you that
9 shows where our local -- commercial fishing is actually
10 being stopped right now. And there's actually closure of
11 the recreational fishing.

12 My Exhibit 4 shows that we have high levels of
13 toxins in our Bay, and these need to be considered because
14 Jordan Cove will put more impacts on this, and I will be
15 submitting written testimony that details that further.

16 I also would like to say that this has been a 13-
17 year ordeal for us; having to come back and resubmit the
18 same testimony over and over again, and do all these other
19 processes including FERC, is not there. Jordan Cove further
20 denied the project based on the fact that Jordan Cove had to
21 prove that there was a market; and they have not done that.
22 So that should be done first before us citizens are made to
23 come back and do all these processes again. Done.

24 [Documents for the record]

25 > MS. HAMPTON: My name is Michele Hampton, M I C H

1 E L E, last name H A M P T O N. I live in North Bend,
2 Oregon. I'm a landowner, property owner I should say. I'm
3 a citizen, been here for 30 years. I am representing
4 myself, and I just wanted to make a point -- I have
5 submitted a letter, but I wanted to state that this is
6 important to our community. I know a lot of people from
7 outside the area believe it's important to them, but it has
8 a direct impact on our community, and I feel that should
9 have some weight, the communities the pipeline goes in as
10 well.

11 It will be a positive impact, not only for us but
12 for outside of our area, for the State, for the Nation, I
13 know a huge impact for Colorado, but it will be huge
14 international impact as well, in a positive way. I would
15 ask that FERC not delay decision making. This has been on
16 the table for many, many years and people have had multiple,
17 multiple chances to review the information, to understand
18 the scope of the project. The project is a smaller carbon
19 footprint now even though it was still a positive influence,
20 because it has taken away dependence on coal; or dependence
21 on coal lessened, dependence on nuclear energy; and that's a
22 positive for all of us.

23 And I would respectfully ask that the committee
24 take those seriously, take the areas' thoughts. I think it
25 was a pretty clear sign when major success 162, which most

1 people felt was a stand for against Jordan Cove went down 3
2 to 1. I think that leaves a pretty good message, and that
3 should be listened to.

4 > MR. WILLIAMS: I'm Frank Williams; F R A N K W
5 I L L I A M S. Lived here for 59 years, I am a retired
6 longshoreman, ILW Local 12 for 37 years. Traveled all up
7 and down the Coast. I also do TV shows; we film most all of
8 the shows that come here, talk public input.

9 I, for the life of me, cannot understand why they
10 have to spend \$300 million to do a permitting process, so I
11 am told. \$30 million. I haven't seen one pipe put in the
12 ground, and it's taken 14 years, it's been a kind of
13 ridiculous length of time for any type of permitting
14 process. I don't know why there isn't some kind of rule or
15 law about free trade or doing export to other countries that
16 need this product. I would be thinking Japan would be one
17 of them after they had that big disaster.

18 So I think there's probably a need out there for
19 it, although I know the dollar factor plays a big part of
20 what is going on. That is, will happen or will not happen,
21 I don't know; but it's been a real good run for the
22 regulatory agency; I mean, 14 years or better, it's just
23 plum ridiculous.

24 I get an e-mail from LNG of all the different
25 stages and countries where this is going in; and it seems to

1 me it would have been a lot faster, like down in Texas. I
2 know you will probably consider this much needed, because of
3 the situation in the economy, probably doesn't enter in it.
4 To me it's very important.

5 I am hoping Trump takes back some of that
6 \$300 million -- and takes it away from you; that's what I'm
7 hoping. I mean, you guys should be out shopping jobs just
8 like the rest of us. I don't have to shop for a job; I'm
9 retired. But I think it's a sad state of affairs that we
10 have a product; and I have a cousin in Colorado who dug a
11 gas well. Three years ago, they hit gas, and he says it was
12 destined for Coos Bay. That was three years ago.

13 Now, when are you going to quit kicking the can
14 down the road and let it go? And as far as I can remember,
15 in my recollection, that they had approved it for import and
16 now it's turned to export and it's going -- why does it
17 matter if it's going in or it's going out? It's going
18 through the same pipeline, and that's what you guys should
19 have been concerned about, is the pipeline. And probably
20 the economy don't care.

21 If you approved it one way, what would take that
22 many years to approve it to go the other way, it's
23 ridiculous. To me, I wish I was in the position, I know
24 what I'd do: I'd be firing people; I'd be laying off. Or I
25 would do away with some of the budget money that comes your

1 way, where you go back.

2 There has to be some kind of a good steward of --
3 I understand that. But you guys -- when you were formed as
4 a regulatory agency, I don't think you were formed to
5 regulate people out of business, but that's what it seems
6 like to people I know and I talk to, that you regulate
7 people out of business.

8 Anyway, I hope this is the last hurrah and it's
9 going to go on and you're going to start work pretty soon.
10 Thank you for your time.

11 One thing, we had a vote, and about 3 to 1 on the
12 vote we voted down the deal. The Coos County citizens
13 wanted this to happen. They showed that on the last vote.
14 That's the most important of everything I said.

15 > MR. SISNEROS: Daniel Sisneros. S I S N E R O S.
16 Affiliations, I work for a trucking company here in Coos
17 Bay, that we deliver all types of freight. Our terminal
18 here is one of the smallest in our company that we run from
19 Washington down to San Diego; and I've seen over the last
20 few years, I've been with them for seventeen years -- and
21 I've seen our freight levels drop and our employment
22 decrease, from eight people down to three; and I know that
23 Jordan Cove would be a big boost not only to the trucking
24 industry here locally, but to all -- from mom and pop stores
25 in town to plumbing and electrical, and all the different

1 supplies that are going to be necessary for Jordan Cove.

2 Obviously I'm for the project, but also want to
3 stay informed of the environmental impact and making sure
4 that things are done properly. I moved here when I was in
5 the fifth grade and went to a very small school called
6 Sumner Elementary, and my parents moved from Los Angeles;
7 and my father was a longshoreman. When we first moved here,
8 Coos Bay was one of the largest exporters of lumber for a
9 single port, and we saw from seven to eight ships a day come
10 down to maybe one or two ships a day; and the area has been
11 fairly depressed since then.

12 Since the foresight of the lumber industry not
13 retooling their mills to small lumber, to the fact that they
14 did not replant years ago, so we would sustain a larger
15 timber. So over the years the employment for lumber has
16 decreased, so Coos County needs some kind of a boost, and I
17 think that Jordan Cove would be the right direction to go
18 into.

19 That's all I have.

20 > MR. ROEHER: William Rohrer. R O H R E R.

21 I'm here speaking about environmental risks. We
22 live in a geological volatile coastal zone; there is an
23 earthquake subduction zone as well as a tsunami zone here.
24 We live in a time of global warming, we live in a time when
25 the use of fossil fuels need to be phased out and new,

1 sustainable technologies phased in.

2 Environmentally, constructing pipelines that
3 cross our state carrying oil, sand and fracked fossil fuel
4 into a geologically vulnerable area for the profit of a
5 foreign corporation is not sustainable or future-oriented
6 for our community.

7 If a seismic catastrophe should occur here, as I
8 believe it to be the Pembina Pipeline Corporation of Canada,
9 hopes to make huge profits on this project will not be held
10 liable for the tremendous amount of damage from possible
11 explosions or contamination to our community.

12 The need for Jordan Cove is based entirely on
13 demand for natural gas from customers in Asia. This project
14 is about a foreign corporation and investors making money at
15 our town's expense and security. Some people see this
16 project as an economic boon to our towns, but they are
17 trading short term economic activity and temporary jobs for
18 long term and unforeseen seismic and environmental risks
19 which will not be able to be mitigated; that we will have to
20 live with it for the rest of our lives.

21 Let us set our sights on the future, which is
22 unequivocally renewable resources. And I have a thing I
23 might add: I own 50 acres of property, and it's all timber.
24 If there's a fire and that timber burns, who is responsible?
25 Who is going to pay for that? Question mark.

1 [Pause]

2 [Whereupon, at 7:00 p.m., the public verbal
3 comment session concluded.]

4

5

6

7

8

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: Jordasn Cove LNG & Pacific
7 Connector Pipeline Projets

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 Docket No.: PF17-4-000

18 Place: Coos Bay, Oregon

19 Date: June 27, 2017

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

24

Dan Hawkins

25

Official Reporter

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 JORDAN COVE LNG and
3 PACIFIC CONNECTOR PIPELINE PROJECTS
4 DOCKET NO. PF17-4-000

5

6 SUNSET MIDDLE SCHOOL
7 245 SOUTH COMMANN STREET
8 COOS BAY, OREGON 97420

9

10 JUNE 27, 2017

11

12

13

14 DANIEL VOIGHTSBERGER - REPORTER

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 MR. BURNS: My name is John Burns. I'm the
3 Chief Executive Officer of the Oregon International Port of
4 Coos Bay. I'm here today to talk in favor of the Jordan
5 Cove Export LNG facility and the associated pipeline.

6 I've been working in my current position for
7 about 18 months and during that period of time I've gotten
8 to know the intricacies of this program, what impact it will
9 have on the State of Oregon, the global energy outlook, and
10 what it can do to bring both jobs and prosperity to this
11 area.

12 In the course of the time that I've been working
13 on this project in conjunction with Jordan Cove, I've really
14 come to understand that the folks who work at Jordan Cove
15 really have worked hard and smart to make sure that the way
16 that this plant is going to be designed and constructed will
17 have the utmost sensitive to the environment and to safety.
18 They have worked very diligently with the populous of Oregon
19 to make sure that everyone's concerns have been heard.

20 Where there are issues, they have tried to work
21 with the stakeholders to make sure that those issues have
22 been addressed to the best of their ability. They continue
23 to work very closely with both the local citizens, the local
24 government, the state government, and the federal government
25 to make sure that all appropriate regulatory constraints are

1 taken care of and addressed.

2 I am working and my port is working on a project
3 to deepen and widen the navigatable* channel here in Coos
4 Bay. To take it from its existing depth of 37 feet and to
5 take it to 45 feet, widen it from 300 feet to 450 feet.
6 Part of the reason for doing that would be the Jordan Cove
7 Plant and the associated marine traffic that will go there,
8 but there'll also be an added benefit of all of the other
9 shippers in the Port of Coos Bay that will be able to take
10 advantage of the deeper and wider channel. Those deeper and
11 wider channels mean bigger ships, mean more ships, mean
12 more opportunities. Again, that provides an outstanding
13 opportunity for enhanced employment here in the Coos Bay
14 area.

15 Coos Bay and southwest Oregon is a rural,
16 depressed area. It has been devastated since the 1980s when
17 the timber industry was dealt a severe blow by both some
18 environmental issues with the spotted owl and some just poor
19 land management issues. At that time, this area was real
20 rocked and most of the employment that was had here went by
21 the boards. This is an opportunity for a rebirth and I
22 think that Jordan Cover, again, works diligently to make
23 sure that they get done everything that should be done in
24 the best possible manner. Thank you.

25 MR. de VRIEND: My name is Wim de Vriend and I

1 live in Coos Bay. And before I forget, I brought a document
2 that I printed out, about 70 pages, and I gave it to one of
3 you who said they'd take of it. I think it was John
4 Pickanow (ph), yeah.

5 Right, there's some arguments for this project
6 and there are a lot more against, in my opinion. So I'll
7 just concentrate on the ones that are most important to me.
8 I've lived here for well of 40 years -- actually, it's
9 getting to be 45 and we've only in recent years become aware
10 of the extreme exposure that we have to it, to geologic
11 hazards, meaning an offshore great big earthquake of the
12 type that they had in Japan in 2011, followed by a Tsunami
13 within 15 minutes and I honestly don't see how this project
14 when it's operating could deal with that.

15 The plant would be in a Tsunami inundation zone.
16 And even if tanks survived the earthquake and the grounds
17 could very well settle there, still you're liable to have
18 leaks from the loading equipment and from all the other
19 gases that will be stored there. But possibly, even more
20 serious is the high likelihood that there'll be an LNG
21 carrier in the Bay and the transit time for those is
22 estimated at 90 minutes.

23 Now a big ship like that is fine in the ocean,
24 but in the Bay it won't be. There'll be Tsunami waves
25 rolling in and out for the better part of a day. Preceded

1 by that, a lot of the water will go out of the Bay, so it'll
2 probably grounded first and then it'll be tossed around.
3 And if you've seen any of the pictures of ships being tossed
4 ashore in Japan, it's pretty scary.

5 So the critical thing here is that the high
6 likelihood of this ship being damaged and you get an LNG
7 leak, which will turn into gas because of the heat of the
8 water, and that will turn into a pool fire. And to illustrate
9 that I could give you this, which is also in the document
10 that I've prepared, but it's a map of the area and it shows
11 the -- this is the navigation channel and the terminal
12 would be here. The location of this terminal violates just
13 about every recommendation of SIGTTO, which is an
14 international organization headquartered in England that
15 formulates safety recommendations for the industry.

16 And I'd go into that further, but I probably
17 don't have time for that. And the company maintains that it
18 will be a simple matter of controlling these tankers with
19 three tugboats and I think anybody who's seen these videos
20 from Japan would think that's ridiculous.

21 I'm not expecting you to nod in a sense here.
22 You're only recording. I know. The other part that is also
23 important to this area is that I realize that there are some
24 benefits, mostly of increased property tax revenues to
25 government agencies and some temporary jobs, but the actual

1 permanent effect on job is likely to be negative because due
2 to the presence of this you're going to have people moving
3 out of the area and avoiding it. And I don't say that
4 lightly, but I know people who have moved here because we
5 had the cleanest air in the country and still do, but these
6 tankers will each carry a 148,000 cubic meters of diesel
7 exhaust in their tanks, which is a fire-control measure.
8 Well, that'll all be vented into the atmosphere.

9 Between that and the plant itself, the liquid
10 (0:08:20.7)* equipment, that'll be one of the biggest
11 sources of air pollution in the state of Oregon, so that's
12 going to work against us, that, plus, the monopolization of
13 navigation there, which is going to drive fishermen away and
14 tourists as well.

15 So those are things that I'd like to address.
16 I'm sure other people will come up with a lot more.

17 MS. MOORE: Hi, my name is Janet Moore. I'm a
18 Coos Bay resident. I'm the produce manager of a
19 community-owned natural food co-op here, but I also have a
20 background in soil science. Myself and the people I talk to
21 every day in this community are very concerned about climate
22 and the environmental impacts and safety of the proposed
23 Jordan Cove LNG export facility. Like all estuaries, the
24 Coos estuary is an important and fragile natural place.
25 Estuaries are highly productive ecosystems providing goods

1 and services that economical and ecologically indispensable.
2 They're often called the nurseries of the sea because
3 they're vital nesting and feeding habitats for so many
4 aquatic plants and animals.

5 Compared to other organ estuaries, Coos Bay
6 contains a high degree of fine sediments, clays, and silks.
7 The impacts of turbidity from dredging due this project
8 have been grossly underestimated because the larger particle
9 size was assumed in past modeling than actually exists in
10 our Bay and this needs to be corrected, additionally,
11 modeling needs to account for the affects of tides on
12 turbidity during dredging. The Dungeness crab fishery is
13 the most valuable commercial fishery in Oregon, according to
14 the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

15 In one study, 45 to 85 percent of all Dungeness
16 crabs died during a single simulated dredging event. The
17 papers is by Chang and Levines. The ongoing dredging to
18 maintain the berth and shipping channels will continuously
19 disturb this ecosystem and significantly impact all aquatic
20 species reliant on a functioning estuary, including Coho
21 salmon, threatened green sturgeon, and threatened eulachon.

22 Mitigations that may take place elsewhere will
23 not make up for damage to our resources here. Turbidity
24 from dredging will be extremely harmful to the resource
25 productivity of commercial in need of oysters, as filter

1 feeders, oysters are very sensitive to turbidity.
2 Construction would impact to commercial oyster companies,
3 Clausen Oyster Company and Coos Bay Oyster Company.
4 Additionally, oysters are very sensitive to increased ocean
5 acidity caused by climate change.

6 Proper contaminate studies have not been
7 conducted to determine if dredging will stir up latent
8 pollution. Dredging would release harmful biocumulative
9 compounds from past industrial activities buried in tidal
10 sediments such as turbidital and heavy metals, PCBs, and
11 polyaromatic carbons into the water column and up the food
12 chain. And it's been well documented that there's been
13 dumping events in the past in our Bay, so we think
14 contaminate studies need to occur.

15 And fine organic matter readily disburses in
16 water also and is often bound with pesticides and other
17 harmful chemicals. A clam will readily bioaccumulative
18 toxic contaminates and so clams are tested worldwide to
19 detect contaminates in marine sediments, but sediments
20 testing for this project have not included the tissue
21 sampling of clams. Please read the past FERC motion from
22 the Clam Diggers Association of Oregon.

23 Even when sediments are uncontaminated,
24 turbidity damages fish gills, causing fatalities,
25 particularly in young fish and smothers important

1 (0:11:49.7)* plants such as eel grass that so many species
2 depend upon.

3 We're also concerned about the introduction of
4 evasive species and temperature increases from ship ballast
5 water. The Coos Estuary is a designated national estuarine
6 reserve set aside for protection, long-term research, water
7 quality monitoring, education, and coastal stewardship.
8 Damage to the Coos Estuary from the proposed project will be
9 significant for all the reasons mentioned and this is in
10 violation of the National Estuary Restoration Act of 2000.

11 Climate change can no longer be ignored. When
12 you account for all methane linkage associated with its
13 extraction, liquid natural gas is even more damaging to the
14 climate than burning coal. We need to focus on renewable,
15 locally produced energy, not building more polluting
16 infrastructures such as this. Additionally, this project
17 will require enormous water resources that could threaten
18 local water supplies. The boom bust cycle this community
19 will experience during the construction phase will have
20 some economic benefit, but there will be consequences as
21 well.

22 While working as a soil scientist for the
23 USDA/NRCA, twice was stationed in areas experiencing
24 fracking booms in Wyoming and North Dakota with large man
25 camps such as this project will entail. Not only did retail

1 prices or rental prices soar, hurting lower income people,
2 but so did crime in those areas, including illicit drugs,
3 prostitution, and sexual assaults. It was a pretty scary
4 atmosphere.

5 Imminent domain seizure should be used for
6 public benefit only. There is no public benefit from this,
7 except for a few permanent jobs that will result locally,
8 but that benefit is negated by the many sustainable
9 fisheries and recreation jobs that will be lost by this
10 unnecessary project as private boats will not have access to
11 the Bay while LNG tankers are in route and exporting LNG
12 will cause domestic prices to rise, which will cause job
13 loss as well.

14 Additionally, the Williams Pipeline Company has
15 an unacceptable record of safety. Please safeguard the
16 precious resources of our beautiful Bay and the Coos
17 Estuary.

18 MR. SANCHEZ: Hi, how are you. My name is Juan
19 Sanchez. I am a professional union carpenter. I support
20 the Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector Project and ask that
21 FERC evaluate the following issues as part of its
22 Environmental Impact Statement. The impact of Jordan Cove
23 approximately 10 billion capital investment in Oregon and
24 how its approximately 48 million in annual Oregon corporate
25 taxes and 62 million in annual local taxes in payments in

1 lieu of taxes will greatly benefit the state and southern
2 Oregon's economy and local governments.

3 I do want to tell anybody and everybody that's
4 involved with this project to please allow jobs to come to
5 this part of our state. It's hard that we struggle to put
6 food on the table our families. What's going to happen
7 today, tomorrow, next year, and the future for our kids if
8 we have no jobs.

9 That is really all I want to say and I thank you
10 for time, your consideration. And I would like to submit
11 these written comments on my behalf and I thank you for your
12 time.

13 MR. LESHLY: My name is Dick Leshly. I own
14 Yellow Cab Taxi in Coos Bay, Oregon. I bought the company
15 in 1986 and have been a self-employed business guy since
16 1986.

17 I want to speak to the economic benefits of this
18 project. So in 1986 when we moved here, the county was in a
19 depression. We got to a recession and then we went into a
20 depression and I think we're kind of climbing up into a
21 recession now. Our schools and our infrastructure are
22 broken and just the tax benefits from the project itself
23 would warrant approval, but take that away. This project is
24 absolutely -- it's safe. It's clean. It'll employ people.
25 And the most important thing that this project will do for

1 this county is give people hope. We have no hope now.
2 We're losing a restaurant. There's six or seven or eight or
3 nine people out of work, minimum wage, they don't know
4 where they're going to go.

5 My product has got to the point where we are now
6 -- people are turning our product away because they can't
7 afford to ride a taxicab. We do somewhere between 180 to
8 190,000 trips a year and that's decreasing because we're
9 priced out of the market because our drivers need to make
10 more than minimum wage to make a living. And so I just
11 don't see any end to it unless something breaks and this
12 project is the project that can break that wide open.

13 First of all, there's no public money going into
14 this project. It's all private money and it's clean and
15 it's safe and it's been looked at since 2004 or 2005. I'm
16 not really sure what else we can do and I would just like
17 FERC to move forward with this process as quickly as they
18 can because the information is there and give us some hope
19 in this community. And I'm really done. That's all I need
20 to say at this point in time, but I thank you for the
21 opportunity.

22 MR. SCIRE: My name is Joshua Scire. My last
23 name is spelled S-c-i-r-e. I'm with the Pacific Northwest
24 Regional Council of Carpenters. I am in support of the LNG
25 Project in terms of jobs. I believe that if this project is

1 going to happen it's should happen with well-trained
2 individuals that are you know the top-of-the-line workers.
3 I believe a project of this nature does have a lot of
4 potential for going wrong in a lot of different aspects and
5 so for it to not go union with professionally-trained
6 carpenter it would just leave it open for a disaster.

7 Also, I'm in support of it for what it could do
8 for the economy of Coos Bay, as well as the surrounding
9 communities. This is definitely an area that needs the
10 revenue from you know the permanent jobs it would create and
11 from the boost in the economy just from the LNG Project
12 itself. So that's all I got.

13 MR. NEMETH: My name is Knute Nemeth. First
14 name is spelled K-n-u-t-e, last name, N-e-m-e-t-h. I've
15 lived here in Coos Bay for over 35 years. I've been a
16 commercial fisherman and a merchant mariner with
17 (0:19:09.5)* Brothers Tugboat. I've hauled hundreds of
18 millions of gallons of petroleum between the refineries
19 here on the West Coast. I have concerns about the channel,
20 our jetties, and the entrance to Coos Bay.

21 At one time in 2008, there was an estimate for
22 800,000 million to \$1.2 billion to widen and deepen the
23 channel. I've not seen any figures brought out by anybody
24 because nobody's putting any figures out, the Corps of
25 Engineers or Jordan Cove or anybody about how we're going to

1 spend U.S. tax dollars on the dredging.

2 At this time we have a terrible north jetty in
3 disrepair, which I feel has cost six lives in the last three
4 years here because of no maintenance or no money for
5 maintenance. The Corps of Engineers has to go to Congress
6 to get money. Congress has not given us any here for our
7 channel dredging and maintenance operations and I think that
8 we shouldn't consider getting big ships in here until we can
9 address the channel deepening and widening project and to
10 understand the finances from the U.S. taxpayers that are
11 involved with this because Jordan Cove is paying for what's
12 inside their fence line

13 And they say they're paying for everything, but
14 they don't talk about all the public infrastructure that
15 supports this project and I really think that needs to be
16 looked into and those figures need to be made available to
17 the public so we can understand our participation and our
18 buy-in on this project here. Proponents have painted a
19 really good picture of this as being positive the whole way,
20 but they have lots of holes in their story and have left a
21 lot of things out that we need to bring up.

22 I've dredge Coos Bay twice. I've been fishing
23 out of here since 1982. I'm vice president of the
24 Charleston Fishermen Memorial Project. I'm president of the
25 Charleston Community Enhancement Corporation and I'm a

1 Charleston Booster, so anything that affects Charleston is
2 within my area of expertise, I would say. I think this may
3 inconvenience commercial fishermen when they go to sea with
4 the transit time of the vessels and I think this might have
5 a big impact on our recreational fisherman getting run off
6 the water. And I would like FERC to look at that because
7 that does affect us here. Twenty-six percent of our economy
8 is tourist based. Fifteen percent is transfer economy,
9 which is people that have retired and moved to our area and
10 they come here for the clean air, clean water, and our
11 recreation and so I do have concerns about air quality and
12 water quality on this one. And I have concerns about public
13 safety and I would mostly like for the American people to --
14 for us to understand what these outside costs are that
15 Jordan Cove is not specifying.

16 MR. TROTTER: I'm Jennifer Trotter,
17 J-e-n-n-i-f-e-r, T-r-o-t-t-e-r and I'd like to give a
18 comment about why I oppose the LNG Pipeline and the refinery
19 associated with it.

20 I'd like to state that this isn't a public
21 commentary because this is private; therefore, this isn't a
22 public hearing or commentary. But for a private commentary,
23 I'd like to say that methane is 84 times the rate of carbon
24 dioxide as far as a greenhouse gas emitter, so I don't think
25 that that's something that we should be allowing in our

1 atmosphere. And all pipelines leak, they do, and I
2 disapprove of that.

3 The pipeline isn't going to bring a substantial
4 amount of jobs to the community and those jobs that it does
5 bring will be mostly temporary until the pipeline is built
6 and then those jobs will go away. The jobs that are filled
7 at the refinery after it's finished are going to be
8 high-level jobs, so chances are those people aren't going to
9 be from the community 'cause they're not trained to work
10 those jobs, so that's really not helping the community
11 either.

12 The leak in California, which spewed an
13 estimated 100,000 pounds of methane into the air each hour,
14 was not immediately reported by the company. They did
15 acknowledge it in 2015. An environmental advocates also the
16 canyon in Los Angeles saw an ordinary natural facility with
17 pipes poking out of the ground that looked just fine, but
18 they couldn't see that there was a huge leak. They did
19 acknowledge the leak in 2016. Months later they reported
20 that it was fixed, but it took them months to fix and so all
21 that methane that just spilled and no one reported it until
22 way later.

23 California has the money to fight for
24 environmental justice, but as far as especially southern
25 Oregon doesn't have any money at all. We don't have the

1 money to fund environmental watchdogs to make sure that the
2 company's doing what they say they're going to do because
3 they all say they're going to do things, but then they
4 don't. We've all worked for companies that don't follow the
5 rules. It happens.

6 We need to be leading the future, not following
7 the past. Pipelines are old energy. They're not going to
8 help us in the future. We need renewable energy. There's
9 so much tidal wind that we could use here. We could be a
10 leader in the community. The power created from those kind
11 of facilities would generate more than enough for this
12 community and they could sell back to the power grid, which
13 would improve the area and make it more of a tourist
14 attraction, whereas a refinery is ugly and no one wants to
15 see that.

16 And when the mega-thrust earthquake happens,
17 which is overdue, that refinery is going to explode and as
18 much damage as the earthquake is going to do the explosion
19 is going be just the cherry on top. We don't need that.
20 There's no good reason to do this. This isn't our product.
21 We're not making money off of it. We're not using the
22 product. We're not selling the product. Why is it here?
23 Why would we want such a horrible, destructive substance
24 coming through our country for no reason, no profit? We're
25 taking Americans land away from them without their consent

1 for Canada's profit. That is not right. It is not
2 American. I do not agree or cooperate with that at all.

3 MS. LLOYD: Okay, my name's Janis Lloyd. It's
4 spelled J-a-n-i-s L-l-o-yd.

5 First, I just want to say I am so disappointed
6 in this if you want to call it a public meeting. A few
7 suggestions, it should've been in an environment where
8 people have seating. Also, at least have a microphone to
9 call the numbers or a bullhorn. I worked 35 years for the
10 Forest Service and I've dealt with the environmental
11 process. Yeah, this just makes me sick, to tell you the
12 truth.

13 I'm deeply concerned about the safety, public
14 health, environmental, climate pollution, and environmental
15 impacts of the Jordan Cove LNG Terminal and Pacific
16 Connector Pipeline Projects. The projects will harm
17 Oregonians, our environment, and our climate. They are
18 inconsistent with the public interest. Additionally, I'm
19 concerned that FERC's public engagement process will hamper
20 the public's ability to provide comment and learn about the
21 terminal and pipeline.

22 Because of strong interest and region-wide
23 impacts of this project, I urge FERC to expand the scoping
24 process to provide additional time and space for the public
25 to weigh in. To facilitate effective public input, FERC

1 should schedule scoping hearing in Jackson County. It makes
2 no sense to exclude Jackson County from scoping meeting. I
3 think this is by design. Consider scheduling a hearing in
4 northern Oregon as well; extend the scoping period from 30
5 to 90 days because of the complexity of the project and the
6 hundreds of pages of reports that is submitted by Jordan
7 Cove and the Pacific Connector.

8 At public meeting, people should be allowed,
9 again, to testify in front of the group. I also urge FERC
10 to consider these issues as it develops its NEPA analysis.
11 FERC's EIS should contain a section on affected environment
12 in which analyzes the past, present, and reasonably
13 foreseeable future action of the proposed development. All
14 negative impacts of the project need to be fully addressed,
15 including Jordan Cove's affect on our already compromised
16 marine and wildlife systems. Also, recreation use should be
17 a significant issue in this document.

18 FERC must consider alternatives to the project
19 as a whole. FERC must consider alternative designs to avoid
20 potential impacts from the project, spell out specific
21 mitigation measures and plans that are relied upon to draw
22 conclusions about the impacts of the project. They should
23 weigh heavily the negative impacts on private landowners of
24 the Pacific Connector which would harm private property
25 rights through the use of imminent domain, of which I

1 believe there is close to 600 and maybe you have 300 that
2 have agreed to go along with this god-awful project.

3 FERC should address the full impacts of the
4 project on water quality for each stream and wetland
5 impacted. It should require Pacific Connector to rely on
6 up-to-date and site-specific information to evaluate the
7 impacts of the proposal. They should consider the direct,
8 indirect, and cumulative impacts to fish and wildlife that
9 will be impacted by the proposed LNG terminal and pipeline,
10 including threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead, and
11 wildlife.

12 I also believe that this project could be a
13 target for enemy fire on the case of war. That should be
14 addressed. FERC Must consider the climate changing
15 pollution that would be generated by all aspects of this
16 project and this includes the direct, indirect, and
17 cumulative impact of frack and conventional gas production,
18 transport, liquefaction, and end use.

19 FERC must undertake a detailed analysis of the
20 public safety risk associated with the proposed terminal and
21 pipeline. In past reviews, FERC has failed to address fire
22 risks and emergency responses along the pipeline route.
23 They must take a realistic look at a worse case LNG spill
24 and fire near the terminal where it is also near the airport
25 and the indation* zone for a Tsunami.

1 FERC should require Jordan Cove to comply with
2 the Society of International Gas Tanker and Terminal
3 Operator Guidelines for safe site selection and design for
4 LNG ports and jetties. Also, there should be a bond.
5 That's a part of this process.

6 Let's see, to wrap it up, I also do not believe
7 that the Veresen CEO should part of Trump's cabinet being on
8 the infrastructure. I think that's it.

9 MR. HARMS: Hello, my name is Jeff Harms,
10 spelling is J-e-f-f H-a-r-m-s. I'm here to make a comment
11 on behalf of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters in support
12 of the LNG facility.

13 The UBC, United Brotherhood of Carpenters,
14 wholeheartedly supports the proposed LNG export facility.
15 This project will bring hundreds of carpenters work for the
16 next four to five years. Work which provides living wages,
17 good benefits, good working conditions, high safety
18 standards, and opportunities for our young adults through
19 our apprenticeship programs.

20 No matter the trade, a young man or woman could
21 possibly work their entire four-year apprenticeship on this
22 project alone, earn a living wage, have full health coverage
23 for their entire company, and vested into a pension program
24 before the project is over. They come out of that on the
25 other side as a journeyman/carpenter and a good career in

1 front of them.

2 This project is good for this community. It's
3 good for this state. It's good for economies looking for
4 cleaner alternatives to coal, oil, and nuclear. Thank you.

5 MR. MOORE: Gary Moore with Oregon Southern
6 Idaho District Council of Laborers, Gary, G-a-r-y
7 M-o-o-r-e.

8 The construction of the LNG terminal at Jordan
9 Cove and the accompanying pipeline are critical job creators
10 and economic bones for the State of Oregon and provide a
11 safe means of transport a cleaner energy source overseas,
12 understanding that the people of Coos Bay decided earlier
13 this year that they do not want to ban this project. It is
14 important that we ensure the mode of transportation of the
15 natural gas is aligned with the enormous export needs.

16 The proposed pipeline will be built by some of
17 the best trained construction workers in the world and with
18 strong oversight from an environmental inspector. Already
19 the planning has undergone dozens of changes in order to
20 work with local communities and in an effort to best
21 accommodate our natural areas.

22 We believe these ongoing conversations are
23 allowing this project to be planned and built in reasonable
24 and eco-friendly manner. Aside from the strong oversight
25 and negotiations that are going into the construction of

1 this terminal and pipeline, the fact is that the pipeline is
2 a cleaner, safer alternative to transport natural gas via
3 trains and trucks massively reducing operating hours of
4 these vehicles which directly translate into fossil fuel
5 emissions is a factor that should be considered as you
6 develop the Environmental Impact Statement.

7 Finally, I would be remiss if I didn't address
8 the jobs that will be created by this project. There will
9 be hundreds of in-state, family-wage jobs available for
10 members of multiple construction trades over the next
11 several years. This means less travel time, more time at
12 home, and a promise of gainful employment for hardworking
13 Oregonians.

14 After the completion of this project, it will
15 also create stable operations and maintenance jobs for both
16 terminal at Coos Bay and the pipeline itself. These
17 economic incentives must be considered as you address the
18 necessity of this project. Thank you.

19 MR. FOXWORTHY: My name is Adam Foxworthy,
20 A-d-a-m F-o-x-w-o-r-t-h-y, with IBW Local 932 in Coos Bay,
21 Oregon. I'm here to support the Jordan Cove Project. It's
22 a much needed economic development in our tiny community
23 that's starting to kind of go the wrong way. We're
24 experiencing an increase in crime and you know desperation
25 in this area because of the lack of job and I think that

1 this project would benefit our community that way, so as
2 long as it meets the requirements of the Federal Energy
3 Regulatory Committee (sic), I think that it should be
4 approved.

5 MR. GARCIA: My name is Luis Roger Garcia,
6 L-u-i-s R-o-g-e-r G-a-r-i-c-a. I work for the Pacific
7 Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters representing 20,000
8 members of our Council. And basically, in a nutshell, I
9 want this project to go forward due basically to one reason.
10 It's going to make a lot of man hours and woman hours.
11 We've got sisters in the Brotherhood. We have five
12 different trades that are going to make a lot of hours, not
13 just hours for my trade, but for other trades too.

14 And after that, it's going to be good for the
15 people who live here in Coos Bay that's going to be working
16 at the plant and taking care of it. That's basically it.

17 MR. ERNSTSEN: My name is Alan Ernstsen,
18 E-r-n-s-t-s-e-n. I'm a citizen and I never know when I'm
19 speaking clearly because I've got denture problems, anyway,
20 here we go.

21 I was just thinking that as this project goes
22 forth and they dredge the Bay there'll be impacts to both
23 the wildlife and undersea wildlife, of course, and the whole
24 of that part of their creation. I think that lamprey,
25 seals, all the creatures that live down there are going to

1 be impacted by this and I would think that remediation, if
2 there's trouble, which there will be, ought to be part of
3 the planning in scoping.

4 I think that as the pipelines come marching
5 through the forest there'll be impacts that need to be
6 addressed too, cultural implications, anthropological
7 degradation, whatever it is, even so much as what the local
8 Tribes hope to see happen themselves a certain respect for
9 their positions. They've had it pretty tough over the
10 years. They just keep getting nailed every time and I
11 think that that's got to stop.

12 The third and last impact that the coming and
13 goings of the various large boats and effort to build will
14 have on the local fisheries and fishing people they too have
15 kind of a rough time of it and those impacts just have to be
16 looked at, codified, addressed, worked around. Even let
17 them benefit. You know maybe a new plan will come forward
18 that a project that just says, okay, they need assistance in
19 their own way beyond the pipeline companies' assistance and
20 that sort of stuff. Anyway, thank you.

21 MR. JENSEN: My name is Matthew Jensen,
22 M-a-t-t-h-e-w J-e-n-s-e-n. I'm the president and business
23 representative for Laborers Local 737 here in the State of
24 Oregon. I support the Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector
25 Project and ask that FERC evaluate the following issues as

1 part of its Environmental Impact Statement.

2 The impact to Jordan Cove's approximate \$10
3 billion capital investment in Oregon and how it's
4 approximately 48 million in annual Oregon corporate taxes
5 and 62 million in annual local taxes and payments in lieu of
6 taxes will benefit the state and southern Oregon's economy
7 and local governments. The economic ripple benefits of
8 construction workers and the public benefit analysis
9 considering their income will contribute directly or
10 indirectly to state and local payroll taxes, increase
11 spending at local businesses, increase spending with local
12 construction vendors, job training, increased local
13 charitable contributions, increase tourism, and more.

14 This project will create 3500 construction jobs
15 for two to four years and those workers will be earning an
16 average of \$80,000 a year, plus benefits. More than double
17 the average wage of southern Oregon counties.

18 The limited impact, if any, to streams and
19 rivers since more than half the bodies of water that will be
20 crossed are intermittent and dry when they will be crossed,
21 the use of modern construction methods such as horizontal
22 directional drilling which go well below the bed and banks
23 of rivers will also help avoid impacts. This project will
24 be built by highly skilled and qualified union trades people
25 with years of experience safely building industrial

1 facilities, including natural gas pipelines, such as the
2 Ruby Pipeline, which was completed in 2011.

3 The importance of Jordan Cove in reducing
4 greenhouse gas emissions since it will displaced new
5 coal-fired power plants in Asia, just like natural gas
6 displaced coal here in the United States. The reduction of
7 greenhouse emissions is a global issue and this project will
8 help reduce those emissions by providing a new source of
9 cleaner natural gas to countries that have limited energy
10 resources of their own.

11 The benefits of increased natural gas supplied
12 to southern Oregon by the Pacific Connector gas pipeline
13 will allow for increased supply of natural gas to Douglas,
14 Jackson, and Klamath counties and will provide opportunities
15 for local distribution companies to provide gas service to
16 communities that currently do not have it. This will lead
17 to even more business investment in southern Oregon and even
18 more good paying jobs.

19 Jordan Cove and the Pacific Connector will
20 provide great economic benefit to southern Oregon and the
21 United States by providing the only U.S. West Coast outlet
22 for North American natural gas to Asia. This will improve
23 our trade relationships with Asian countries and provide
24 needed cleaner energy to important U.S. allies, such as
25 Japan, which has already contracted for half of this

1 project's capacity. Thank you for your time and
2 consideration.

3 MR. CAMPBELL: Kody Campbell, K-o-d-y
4 C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l. I'm for this project because it would give
5 me a job for the next three to four years. I'd be able to
6 work in the area and support my family. I've got two kids
7 and a wife, sole income. It'd really mean a lot to me to be
8 able to watch my kids grow up and work in the area that I
9 grew up in.

10 MR. JENSEN: Hi, I'm Jon Jensen, J-o-n
11 J-e-n-s-e-n. I work for IBW Local 48 in Portland, Oregon.
12 We represent about 4500 electrical workers in the region.
13 My comments today on the Environmental Impact Statement I
14 would say I would ask to keep the scope to the realistic and
15 the actual. I understand there are a lot of greater
16 concerns and there's a push to look at those, but you know I
17 think you really have to consider international energy
18 stability and stuff, so that's pretty deep waters.

19 They're also you know they're looking on the
20 state on carbon offsets and other ways that can kind of
21 mitigate some of these issues. So for the real issues of
22 the project, I feel like this is a very well engineered and
23 vetted process. If it's not, you know please make
24 recommendations on adjustments, but please consider the real
25 valid scope of the project.

1 And as far as community input, I would ask you
2 to look at the recent ballot measure hearing in Coos County
3 that was -- the local population here overwhelming
4 demonstrated that they're in support of the project, so
5 thanks for your time.

6 MR. MCGILLIVRAY: My name is Jeff McGillivray,
7 J-e-f-f M-c-G-i-l-l-i-v-r-a-y. I'm with UA Local 290,
8 Plumbers and Steamfitters and so I just wanted to speak in
9 support of this project, not only for the jobs it'll bring
10 the construction industry, but also in this very school
11 we're sitting in here not you could look in the lobby there
12 and half the ceiling tiles are stained from roof leaks and
13 the economic advantages it'll bring to the community
14 outweigh any inconvenience of construction.

15 I feel the project, through the project labor
16 agreements that have already been set forth with the Curry,
17 Douglas Building Trades Council ensures the work will be
18 done at the highest standards and that's really about all I
19 got.

20 MR. GRITZ: My name is Griff Gritz, G-r-i-f-f
21 G-r-i-t-z. So I'm a union rep with Laborers of the
22 International Union of North America and we obviously
23 strongly support the project and I've been chasing the
24 project for about what, 10, 12 years from the beginning down
25 here. Being the rep for this area for a long time, you know

1 we have a lot of members down here that have been without
2 work and obviously this economy down here has been
3 struggling for a lot of years and a project like this of
4 this nature brings you know good, middle class jobs and with
5 benefits and it's just a great opportunity for this local
6 area and the three or four counties down here that have been
7 struggling for the last 10 years.

8 I, myself, starting out working on a pipeline,
9 the TransCanada line all the way through basically from
10 Merlin all the way to Stanfield in 1992 or '93 and back then
11 it was a great job. I mean you know they're safe. They
12 clear the right-of-ways and all that good stuff and you
13 don't even know it's there, other than there's no trees and
14 stuff like that. So they put everything back
15 environmentally perfect as best we can, you know.

16 And just with the numbers of these people that
17 reap the benefits of a job like this we want this job to
18 move forward and this process to move forward. We've been
19 through for 12 years now. We've been through the steps and
20 we need to move this thing on and get people back to work.
21 So that's really all I have to say.

22 MR. ROHDE: My name is Rich Rohde, R-i-c-h
23 R-o-h-d-e. I've lived in Jackson County for 32 years. Part
24 of my background is that I just retired as a family advocate
25 with Southern Oregon Headstart and I've also been a

1 community organizer around healthcare and have been, in the
2 past, part of the Public Health Advisory Committee in
3 Jackson County. We helped it at one point and so my
4 comments really in relation to the FERC scoping relate to
5 social determinates of health and children. So those are
6 the two things I'd like to comment on today.

7 I was looking at basically the headings that
8 you've listed as the things that are going to be part of the
9 scoping for the FERC study and one of the things that I
10 would like to add to that is the notion of social
11 determinates of health. It's become such an important part
12 of our understanding of public health and the health of our
13 communities that when we look at our climate as a long-term
14 determinate, and this project will affect the climate,
15 there is so much now being studied and looked at in terms of
16 what long-term climate change means to the health of our
17 people.

18 In the list here, you have cumulative impacts.
19 I'm not sure what that was, but I'm hoping that means it's
20 looking in the broadest way the impacts. And if we consider
21 climate and we consider public safety, then to me those
22 relate very directly to how climate and health are going to
23 be affected by the project, particularly, over the long
24 term. And I say this coming from working with young
25 children in Headstart.

1 We've spent so much time getting our families
2 and children to be able to have good quality healthcare and
3 that was part of my job was to ensure that you could see how
4 wonderful that made families thrive. And I'm really
5 concerned that a program could come through in our state
6 that would affect the quality of life for those children
7 down the way. And I'm concerned that if we're not looking
8 at the climate and if we're not looking at how that relates
9 to the health of all of us, but clearly our children then I
10 think we've really made a mistake.

11 MR. MARICE: Hello, my name is Matt Marice. I'm
12 with Laborers International Union of North America, Local
13 737 based out of Portland, Oregon, but we cover the entire
14 state of Oregon and I just want to speak to our membership
15 and how important this job would be for our members in
16 southern and eastern Oregon.

17 Last time I was in, I spoke with a member who
18 said that he would love to be on this job. Not that he
19 would need to be on this job, but him and his family need to
20 be on this job and they've just been struggling the last few
21 years and he could really use the job. And no construction
22 job creates the amount of man hours and number of jobs like
23 a pipeline does for our membership. So that's all I got.
24 Thanks.

25 MS. SANGER: So my name is Mary Sanger,

1 S-a-n-g-e-r, and I'm from the Eureka area in California.
2 And I a member of a group called 350.org. It's an
3 international organization of climate activism. And the
4 Jordan Cove Project is important to me because it affects
5 global climate change.

6 First of all, it brings fracked oil from Canada
7 and Colorado. Fracking is one of the dirtiest ways of
8 producing gas, so it has a known impact on the amount of CO2
9 in the atmosphere and leading to global climate change,
10 which is a concern for all of us.

11 Another concern that I have, though, is I don't
12 understand why a Canadian company bringing in Canadian
13 fracked gas is going to be exercising eminent in the U.S.
14 That doesn't make any sense to me. I think that that's
15 really wrong. Also, LNG has an impact on geopolitics in the
16 entire world. It is the basis of the war in Syria right
17 now. It's the basis of what's going on with Cutter and the
18 Gulf States. It's a worldwide battle over who's going to
19 control these resources.

20 And at this time what we need to be doing is
21 using our talents and our money building an infrastructure
22 that is not going to use fossil fuels, so that's why this is
23 such a critical time now right now that we're not taking
24 more gas and oil out of the ground and be burning them as
25 fuel. We should be focusing on the next fuel source, which

1 is going to be solar and wind and small geothermal and
2 things like that. And it's going to take decades for those
3 to come on line and we need to be putting our focus there,
4 not on something that's going to contaminate our atmosphere
5 and cause wars. Thank you very much.

6 MS. BOWMAN: My name is Lori Bowman. I'm with
7 the Laborers Union of North America, Local 737, and I am
8 here representing the workers. And I am here representing
9 the workers that couldn't be here because they're already
10 working or with their families.

11 So this project will not only initially be
12 adding hundreds of family-wage construction jobs, but also
13 maintenance and operation jobs following its completion.
14 Our 2500 members are ready and wanting to be put to work on
15 this project and both allow them work security for several
16 years and will help boost our coastal economy around the
17 terminal itself. With the utilization of our numbers, this
18 energy project will be built safely and efficiently by some
19 of the best trained construction workers in the world.

20 Jordan Cove Energy Project has been under
21 discussion for years now and should not be delayed further.
22 The stakeholders have been working on this project
23 tirelessly and as of earlier this year with the vote of
24 measure 6-162 members of the community have spoken up saying
25 they want to be allowed to have these kinds of projects in

1 the area.

2 The benefits to Oregon's economy are tremendous
3 as are the long-term environmental goals it serves
4 internationally. The ability to produce, store, and export
5 LNG to Asia is crucial to global environmental fixes.
6 First, much of the air pollution created in East Asia comes
7 directly back across the Pacific western U.S. A larger
8 scale export of natural gas will help move their energy
9 production in a clearer direction and as a state that boast
10 environmental progress it our duty to ensure we do all we
11 can to help international effort to combat climate change.

12 Second, the pipeline is a phenomenal method of
13 transit considering the alternatives. Transporting natural
14 gas via train or truck not only uses more fossil fuels, but
15 relies on riskier modes of transportation more prone to
16 dangerous accidents and spills. The pipeline it provides us
17 with safer and less greenhouse gas, heavy mode of moving
18 this product. On behalf of (0:58:02.9)* I strongly urge you
19 to take these environmental factors into consideration in
20 your creation of an Environmental Impact Statement. Thanks.

21 MR. NEWELL: Alright, my name is Chris,
22 C-h-r-i-s, N-e-w-e-l-l. I'm from Portland, Oregon. I
23 represent PDX Water Protectors. I've traveled down here to
24 put it on the record that as a state, Oregon, is opposed to
25 this for the most part. I went out and I looked at the site

1 today. I can't understand how someone would want to put an
2 LNG terminal in the middle of all the critical habitat. I
3 saw eagles. I saw great blue herons. I saw shore birds. I
4 can't see putting an LNG terminal there. It would destroy
5 too much.

6 And as far as jobs, I don't see it benefiting
7 the state in the long term. 250 local jobs isn't going to
8 make a difference in the economy here.

9 I think that's about all I have to say. I
10 appreciate the time.

11 MR. MCGEE: My name is Debra, D-e-b-r-a, McGee,
12 M-c-G-e-e. I'm deeply concerned about this project for many
13 reasons. Today I will comment specifically about impacts on
14 landowners. I have lived and farmed on the same land for 30
15 years. For a private property owner, a 100-foot clear cut
16 is a significant loss.

17 First of all, it is a loss of land use for the
18 owner, as they are no longer able to use that part of their
19 property. Another loss is privacy. The pipeline company
20 will be on the land any time they wish monitoring and
21 maintaining the pipe and clear cut. People buy land in the
22 country partly for privacy and having strangers on your
23 property is a violation of privacy rights. Another loss is
24 property value. Land with a dangerous infrastructure is
25 worth less. In fact, many buyers are not even willing to

1 consider buying land.

2 Another huge loss is the sense of safety and
3 security. A 36-inch pressurize pipe of highly explosive gas
4 buried underground is dangerous. Many pipelines leak and
5 sometime it is not known the pipeline is leaking. Sometimes
6 it is difficult to find the leak and sometimes leaks cause
7 explosions and people die or are injured.

8 Eminent domain should only occur for public
9 citizen mutual benefit. This project will require eminent
10 domain for private profits of a foreign corporation.
11 Oregonians get the risk and destruction and the corporations
12 get the profits. This use of eminent domain is wrong and no
13 amount of money from the corporations can mitigate the
14 losses. FERC should only put the pipe through the land
15 where the landowners are willing to allow it.

16 While my property is not on the proposed route,
17 I will be adversely affected and my children and my
18 grandchildren will be adversely affected because this
19 project will increase carbon pollution and add to making our
20 only home hotter and eventually unlivable. And that is my
21 testimony.

22 MR. KENYON: Hello, my name is Patrick Kenyon,
23 P-a-t-r-i-c-k K-e-n-y-o-n. I'm a live-long resident of
24 Coos County. I've worked in fishing and logging and
25 tugboats and more recently line work. I've helped build

1 power line construction. The comments I have I mean we need
2 the jobs. We just do. You know nobody's looking at the
3 (1:01:58.5)* or other jobs. They're primarily looking at
4 one thing at a time, which sometimes that's the best to do
5 is one at a time, but sometimes we have to look at bigger
6 pictures, you know, to see what's going to sustain more
7 people.

8 But the concern I have, basically, is in March
9 -- February or March of 2016 the first liquid natural gas
10 barge left Louisiana headed for European markets.
11 Unfortunately, the market dropped down to a low two dollars,
12 like \$1.97 per cubic foot, so they had to reroute that barge
13 over to Japan and try to sell it there because it cost them
14 \$5.05 per cubic foot to put that on that barge to be
15 shipped.

16 The reason I understand, from reading the
17 research about what FERC's rulings were, is that they told
18 LNG last year no to this because the eminent domain
19 requirements were not met and that it has to have a viable
20 customer. A viable customer is somebody who can actually
21 make a profit consistently and not just be operating at a
22 loss and then expect somebody to bail you out because that
23 wouldn't work, so there is that part of the equation.

24 The other part of the equation is the Canadian
25 and most all of the UK because I've worked in the UK and

1 Russia and Antarctic and many countries, but they subsidize
2 their businesses to be able to have a better opportunity. I
3 mean you can get lumber here from New Zealand cheaper than
4 you can here and we were at one time was the largest lumber
5 shipping port in the world. Okay, their government
6 subsidizes them. It helps them, right?

7 Well, if you look at -- well, here's a copy of
8 the Wall Street Journal from March of this year. There's a
9 huge glut of natural gas in the middle of America. I mean
10 would that -- by us giving Veresen or whoever owns it now
11 them the right to be able to come in here to have subsidies
12 to -- you know in addition to the subsidies that their own
13 government provides for them, wouldn't that give them an
14 unfair advantage over American market producers of natural
15 gas? So I mean those are the concerns that I, as a
16 citizen, would have. I mean I'm not opposed to having
17 liquid natural gas. I mean we need it. You know I still
18 kind of wonder what happened to the one in 1995 and '96. We
19 put a 1-foot gas line in here and pretty much we don't
20 really know what's happened with that, you know.

21 Somebody out there told me that it was bought up
22 by LNG (1:04:20.5)* bought it from our city commissioners.
23 I do not know if that's true or not, but I mean why couldn't
24 that same pipeline still be used today I mean for putting in
25 the gas that's already there. You know instead of creating

1 a new eminent domain property take and all that other stuff
2 why wouldn't we just use that line. It's a 1-foot line.
3 And like said, I put the first million two volts
4 underground up in Seattle and the biggest line they put in
5 was a 6-inch line of gas. It's because it's community
6 trenched. You know they put it all in the same ditch.
7 That's all the bigger they ever put and those are major
8 metropolises.

9 So I know a 1-foot line is already here. What's
10 the advantage of a 36-incher. So thank you guys for helping
11 and I appreciate you guys that's working this, and John,
12 thank you for the time.

13 MS. RANKER: My name is Natalie Ranker,
14 R-a-n-k-e-r. I live at 414 Simmons Avenue, North Bent. And
15 actually, before I start, I would like to say that I'm not
16 in favor of the way you're breaking things up because I
17 think we all can gain from hearing other people's opinions.
18 And in honesty, it feels like you're trying to separate us
19 to diminish the impact. Don't know if it's true, but anyway
20 that's just my feelings. Thank you.

21 One of the main considerations for the EIS for
22 Jordan Cove should be safety. The local airport requires
23 planes to take off and land over the facility. Coastal
24 winds, rain, and fog make landing precarious at any time.
25 Add to that the thermal plumbs coming from the facility,

1 which have never been adequately addressed, other than to
2 say they won't affect air traffic and take offs and landings
3 will be much more dangerous. And for all intents and
4 purposes there is a bomb at the other end of the runway in
5 the facility.

6 Jordan Cove will be in a subduction earthquake
7 Tsunami zone. Sand dunes are not the place to build a plant
8 where millions of cubic gallons of LNG are being stored no
9 matter how much you want to compact it. Experts from OSU
10 and elsewhere have determined that there is at least a 50
11 percent probability that a subduction earthquake will occur
12 within the lifetime of the plant. They predict that the
13 quake will greatly damage or destroy much of the facility,
14 including the holding tanks.

15 There are thousands of residents who live within
16 blast zone who will be killed or badly burned. To dismiss
17 this as pie in the sky, as Jordan Cove has, is to show no
18 respect for human life. The tankers that traverse the
19 channel as well will also cause the loss of thousands of
20 lives living within a one-mile inland from where an accident
21 may occur in the channel. I feel that Jordan Cove is
22 playing with lives thinking only of their profits.

23 There are many other impacts to local residents
24 and businesses. The directing for the facility and the
25 channel will seriously harm, if not destroy, the local

1 oyster industry. This industry alone employs 300 people and
2 these people will lose their jobs and may not be among the
3 50 or so lucky people who will get permanent security,
4 grounds keeping, or cleaning jobs with low wages at Jordan
5 Cove. Oysters are a very up and growing industry here and
6 that will be a bit hit.

7 The dredge silk will also affect other by-valves
8 and crabs, which are very important to the local economy.
9 Fisherman will also be greatly affected because the tanker
10 movement will create closures at the entrance to the harbor
11 for several hours, coming and going, and that will create
12 havoc in the Port of Charleston.

13 Tourism will also be greatly affected. This
14 area was just starting to become a well-known tourist
15 attraction. Coos Bay was written up in the February issue
16 of Sunset Magazine as a wonderful costal area to visit.
17 Without recreational fishing, clamming and crabbing, many
18 will just go elsewhere. Tourism would provide a greater
19 resource and more employment than Jordan Cove ever will and
20 we should be able to develop it freely.

21 Also, the pipeline will create many problems for
22 landowners from here to Klamath Falls. A Canadian company
23 should have no right to use and abuse someone's property if
24 they provide no benefit to the area. Property values will
25 fall drastically and land use will be limited, not to

1 mention the potential dangers of explosion and fire in
2 hard-to-access areas.

3 When I attended the Jordan Cove Open House
4 several months ago, I asked the presenter why they chose
5 Coos Bay. He told me that this was the shortest route to
6 Japan for tankers. I told him, no, that Vancouver was. He
7 then admitted this, but then he stated, but Vancouver would
8 never allow this facility to be built. Washington and
9 California agree.

10 Jordan Cove should not have the right to defile
11 our coastline, disrupt our local industries, and endanger
12 our lives because no one else will have them. I also feel
13 that it would be really important to talk with the people
14 around the Medford area and Jackson Counties. The pipeline
15 is going right under the Rogue River and it's going to
16 affect them drastically, especially, if there are spills,
17 and pipelines always have spills. So I think it's a
18 disservice not to include them in the scoping. And I thank
19 you all very much. Thank you for coming. I appreciate that.

20 MS. COPPOCK: Hello, my name is Anita,
21 A-n-i-t-a, middle initial "J," last name Coppock, spelled
22 C-o-p-p-o-c-k. My address is 830 25th Street, in digits,
23 North Bend, Oregon 97459. My phone number is area code
24 541-756-2975.

25 I have several categories of what I'm reading.

1 The first one is proponents for the program. They think it
2 will create jobs, but only a very few permanent jobs will
3 continue after it's built. And it seems to me that everyone
4 is in denial about possible devastation due to any material
5 or human failure.

6 Opponents, believe that -- and I am one of them
7 -- it is a dangerous carrier in our water. It's flammable,
8 not suitable for any nature dangers, example, earthquakes,
9 Tsunamis, subterranean is a very deep thing, but it's laced
10 with hidden objects. We've had over 200 shipwrecks along
11 this coast because of the hidden rocks underneath.

12 The Port is very deep, but it's very short for
13 the turnaround and could cause the liquid load of LNG to
14 shift when the ship turns and move and unbalance and spill
15 into our Bay. That's a very big fear and history shows
16 there have been over 200, as I said, shipwrecks in our Bay.

17 Future outcomes, if this program is approved,
18 the schools and the churches, the homes, the stores are all
19 at risk. First of all, Coos Bay schools are too close to
20 the dangerous outcomes because they're located in Coos Bay.
21 They have very few -- the churches and schools in Coos Bay
22 and North Bend are Tsunami safe places to go. I was a
23 volunteer in our drill a few years back and the subduction
24 zone brought in over a thousand people to the one school
25 down there. And I was at a church up in North Bend and we

1 had maps of subduction zones and all of that.

2 It's unknown and unpredictable what damage will
3 happen to our homes. It will close and damage stores if
4 there's a disaster and employees and owners are unable to
5 work because of the air pollution that's caused by the ships
6 and rampant long-lasting danger to health and traffic. With
7 that many people --they believe about 2100, I think. The
8 number of temporary workers to build the pipeline will
9 increase our traffic. We have five-minute rush hours --
10 rush minutes. Five rush minutes and when the traffic comes,
11 it's going to be unbearable. We'll feel like we're in Los
12 Angeles, I think.

13 There's an alternative option I would like to
14 promote here. The deepest water port is this one in the
15 entire coastal area down here and because it is deep water
16 it could accommodate smaller cruise ships to come in here
17 and it would allow more revenue for the community because
18 I've been a cruise ship-goer and rider and I shopped in all
19 the stores when we pull up to them. And we could build
20 business here with that if they could come and it would
21 allow much more revenue and keep us not having to deal with
22 an LNG project that really has lost its value since we're
23 doing a lot of solar and everything that that industry is
24 already losing money being LNG is not needed a much with the
25 solar and wind-powered places. So this is just my opinion

1 and I thank you for listening to it.

2 MS. KNITTLE: My name is Christa Knittle,
3 spelled C-h-r-i-s-t-a, Knittle spelled K-n-i-t-t-l-e, and I
4 live in Eugene, Oregon. I'm opposed to the Pacific
5 Connector Gas Pipeline and the Jordan Cove Energy Project
6 because I feel they are harmful to the human community and
7 our environment. The pipelines leak and explode and my
8 understanding is the company has a history of pipeline
9 accidents. And it's just too harmful to the 400 streams
10 and rivers that the pipeline will go through. And I also
11 feel the terminal is harmful because it's in a Tsunami zone
12 and it will be harmful to the fish and the water.

13 And I think eminent domain for private corporate
14 profit is not justified. And I think that the fossil fuel
15 industry is a dying industry and our country needs to
16 promote renewable energy and the solutions are out there.
17 Our governments need to fund renewable energy and compete
18 with the rest of the world, which is turning to renewables.
19 And even China is developing solar energy and weaning
20 themselves off of coal, so I've heard the argument that LNG
21 is what the people in China need, but really they're moving
22 to solar as well. They don't need LNG.

23 One solution I've heard of that I think is very
24 exciting is that Norway -- there's a Norwegian company
25 that's developing a solar-powered cargo ship that will --

1 it'll be launched next year. They're testing it and I think
2 it's an example of the exciting things that are happening in
3 the new renewable energy economy that our country needs to
4 support and our government needs to subsidize because we can
5 do international trade and the City of Coos Bay can maintain
6 their proud tradition as an international port and they can
7 be a thriving example in the new economy that's clean and
8 safe and not harmful to our environment, not causing climate
9 change. So solutions exist and we just need to publicize
10 them, promote them, and not believe that the only
11 possibility is fossil fuels.

12 Also, and that company in Norway is called Yara
13 Birkeland, Y-a-r-a B-i-r-k-e-l-a-n-d, and I think they
14 deserve special attention because ocean-going vessels
15 contribute tremendous pollution and we now have the
16 technology. We don't have to keep polluting our oceans. So
17 we should follow the lead of countries that are coming up
18 with clean solutions because the future generations deserve
19 a clean planet and we have the ability to do this. We just
20 need the critical mass of people to speak up and push our
21 leaders to do the right thing.

22 And like I said, we should give at least half
23 the subsidies to renewable energies that we give to the
24 fossil fuel industry. I also understand that when the
25 terminal will be built there'll be a large temporary

1 workforce and that'll put a lot of stress on social services
2 in the community. So thank you.

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Hi, name is J.C. Williams. It's
4 the initial "J," initial "C," Williams, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s.
5 And I'm a local person. I live right in the blast zone for
6 this project. One of the very first things that I'm worried
7 about is evacuation. I want that well addressed in the EIS
8 because it won't even take an earthquake and a Tsunami to
9 create some sort of disaster scenario. This has happened
10 recently in Washington State with an LNG facility where they
11 had a tank breach and they had to evacuate people, so I'm
12 very concerned about that. I want to make sure they have a
13 really good evacuation plan and that they provide you know a
14 place for us to go.

15 And also you know the worst part of that is that
16 Highway 101 is our lifeline here, so because this facility
17 is really close to Highway 101, I'm concerned at some stages
18 if they have to do an evacuation they have to actually close
19 off an evacuation route you know, so all these things have
20 to be addressed.

21 Obviously, the other thing that I'm sure you've
22 heard lots about today is air quality. And we have a local
23 doctor that's testified in the past that this project will
24 definitely make his asthma and allergy patients worse. He's
25 given lots of testimony about that and I'll let him do that,

1 but I want it addressed in the EIS that it will probably
2 make seniors and kids sicker that already have breathing
3 problems.

4 Air is an interesting thing about this project
5 because I think everybody thinks that air is infinite and
6 it's not. When you go to space and you look back on the
7 planet there's a thing called air glow and it's this
8 beautiful kind of aurora looking thing that encompasses the
9 Earth, but what it tells you is that it's finite. And you
10 only have to go five miles up and you can't breath, so you
11 know what we put into the air is really super important and
12 I want to make sure that they have all the facts and
13 figures on that down to a "T," and to include the ships, the
14 particulate and the pollution that will come off the ships.

15 In the past, they were hesitant to put in the
16 record and I think that if you're going to talk about how a
17 project affects the environment you have to talk about how
18 it affects the environment in every way possible and the
19 ships definitely are a pollution source.

20 One of the things that's interesting about our
21 area as well is that the wind comes blowing across the spit
22 and it blows right into town, so all that particulate and
23 all the air pollution that will come off the plant this is
24 especially in the summer. You can almost set your watch by
25 it. Like at 1:00 in the afternoon here it comes. It's the

1 summer wind and it's that wind -- it's the same cold,
2 northwest -- you know they're nor'westers. They just come
3 blowing into town and it's going to blow all that pollution
4 into town.

5 Water usage, this really shocked me when they
6 did the previous EIS. This facility is going to use a
7 million gallons of water a day. And last year was the first
8 time -- I've lived here 22 years and last year was the first
9 time that we actually had a drought. It was declared a
10 drought disaster in our county and not only in our county,
11 it was in counties all up and down Oregon. It was all over
12 Washington. It was all over California. So I want to know
13 more specifics in the EIS about the water usage involved
14 with the building of the facility and also after the
15 facility is in place. The other thing with water, of
16 course, is that the pipeline is going to go under 400
17 different water resources and I want that addressed in the
18 EIS as best possible.

19 The next thing on my list is earthquakes. And
20 what can you say about this? I just don't think this is a
21 proper place to put a gas facility, so you know they've had
22 -- anyway, one of the issues with the earthquake is that
23 there's 100-foot hill where they're going to remove that
24 hill and I want that addressed too because I think they
25 either have to have an evacuation tower for the crew that's

1 out there. I want the crew to survive the earthquake if we
2 have it and they're going to remove that hill and I want to
3 hear more about that as far as the environment goes. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. SKINNER: For the record, my name is Rick --
6 Richard Skinner, S-k-i-n-n-e-r, 1069 Canyon Drive, Coos Bay,
7 Oregon. I'm a lifetime resident of Coos Bay, Coos County,
8 born in North Bend, raised my family in Coos Bay and I'm
9 definitely a supporter of the Jordan Cove Energy Project. I
10 really feel like it has a lot of public benefit. Being a
11 lifetime resident of the Bay Area, I really feel that you
12 know jobs are important. It's going to bring 250 permanent
13 jobs. Just the construction jobs itself, which I'm a
14 construction worker and have been my entire 40 years in
15 Coos Bay with 3500 construction jobs, has definitely some
16 public benefit to it.

17 The Port of Coos Bay you know has a channel
18 dredging project that is very important to the vitalization
19 of the Port of Coos Bay and what we envision it to be and
20 the 7.8 metric tons of cargo that Jordan Cove will be
21 bringing through the project definitely helps with the
22 maintenance and preservation of the channel, the channel
23 deepening project and you know the repairs that really need
24 to be done to our north jetty.

25 Jordan Cove has an agreement with the partners

1 of the Enterprise Zone, which is the Port of Coos Bay and
2 the City of North Bend, the City of Coos Bay, and Coos
3 County and currently the project sits in an Enterprise Zone
4 which means they don't have to pay any property taxes, but
5 they've agreed to pay a community (1:25:53.7)* fee in lieu
6 of property taxes, 50 percent of that half a billion dollars
7 will definitely benefit our schools and our children. It
8 will be given out to nine different school districts all
9 within Coos County and another school district in Reedsport
10 seems how they kind of fit in the area of the project. A
11 half a billion dollars isn't anything to sneeze at and you
12 know definitely public benefit for that.

13 Jordan Cove will build an LNG fire training
14 facility and partner with SWOCC, our local community college
15 here, to train people in the firefighting duties if an LNG
16 fire did happen. Currently, Texas Tech is the closest
17 university doing anything on LNG fires right now.
18 Definitely a public benefit to our community and everything
19 to do that. You know Jordan Cove's been a great partner
20 with our community for the last 13 years trying to get this
21 project off the ground and does a lot for the community in a
22 way of community grants, give away hundreds of thousands of
23 dollars each year, twice a year that really helps our
24 community. I think it gives us an alternatively cleaner
25 fuel to burn.

1 You know all of the communities that the
2 transmission line will go through all have a benefit from
3 taping that line and coming up with that extra resource that
4 we all need as an alternative in fuels. You know they have
5 all their contracts in place with the local gas carriers
6 through Vista and Northwest Natural Gas.

7 The one thing that I'd really like to bring up
8 is the fact that in our November election there was actually
9 a ballot measure that came out that would've stopped the
10 flow of LNG and other gases through Coos County and that
11 ballot measure was defeated by 76 percent of the people, so
12 there's definitely some people here that you know don't want
13 to see the facility built, but 76 percent of county does
14 want this built. So I think that really means a lot to the
15 community. You know we have some partners in Colorado that
16 would really like to sell the access natural gas and stuff
17 that they have in Colorado. I've met personally with a lot
18 of port commissioners and stuff out of Colorado and their
19 community is similar to ours and would really like to be
20 able to sell the excess gas that they don't have a market
21 for right now, so it really brings a lot to everybody, I
22 think. Thank you very much.

23 MR. RORRER: I'm for Jordan Cove for many
24 reasons. One is the environmentalists they're going to do a
25 lot for this town and this town needs it. We've had nothing

1 since the logging industry died and it's time for a change.
2 And there are people that have kids. There's nothing for
3 them to do when they get out of school. It's just going to
4 be a good thing for this community and it's the only thing
5 we have going for us and hopefully it does go.

6 I don't know what else to say, but I'm 100
7 percent for it. It's going to boost the economy here. It's
8 going to do everything. It's going to help us a lot and
9 they're giving money to -- it's going to help the Police,
10 the Fire Department, the schools, everything, and the City
11 of Coos Bay and North Bend it's going to help them. And the
12 biggest thing is we need employment in Coos Bay. That's all
13 I have to say. My name is Larry Roller, L-a-r-r-y, Rorrer,
14 R-o-r-r-e-r. Thank you.

15 MS. ROHRER: Hi, my name is Maryanne Rorrer,
16 R-o-h-r-e-r. I live on Haines Inlet. I've been a resident
17 of the same house for 38 years. My problem -- or not my
18 problem, but my question to FERC is who -- we have
19 merchantable timber on our property. We've been saving that
20 for our retirement. If there is a leak or some kind of an
21 explosion or accident with this pipeline, I would like to
22 know who is going to be responsible for reimbursing us for
23 our timber and I would like to know that for all the people
24 who have timberlands and houses and who is going to be
25 responsible to replace this. Is there going to be some kind

1 of a bond that's going to be posted for all of this? This
2 is a big concern of mine.

3 You know Veresen has been bought by the Pembina
4 Pipeline Corporation of Canada, a petroleum and natural gas
5 pipeline operator who now wants to take over Veresen where
6 they left off and we need to realize that this project is a
7 foreign Canadian corporation outside investors making
8 profits at the expense of private Oregon property owners.
9 Our properties and homes will be devalued and our lands will
10 vulnerable to all kinds of environmental risks, which cannot
11 be mitigated. And I want to say that. How do you mitigate
12 somebody when your house burns down or any other kind of --
13 the pollution problems that will be there.

14 You know Veresen had failed to easements with
15 more 630 landowners who live along the proposed 232
16 pipeline. It was clear then and it is still clear now that
17 property owners and homeowners don't want our land
18 endangered. We don't want our land devalued. We don't want
19 to suffer loss of revenue to our homes, our businesses, our
20 timber, our farms, or our oyster harvesting. We do not
21 believe that eminent domain should be used for us to lose
22 our rights to our freedom to own our land for the profit of
23 a private and foreign corporation. FERC must make certain
24 that these applicants bear the brunt of the destruction of
25 landowners properties should a catastrophic explosion or

1 leak ravage our properties.

2 FERC denied Veresen and its pipeline
3 collaborators from realizing their profit-making schemes in
4 2016 and now I urge that FERC stay with that ruling and say
5 no to this project. No, I don't want the right to keep my
6 property secure and safe taken away for the profit of the
7 private corporate owners and investors who have little
8 investment in keeping our properties safe and
9 environmentally sound.

10 And I do want FERC -- it's very important to us
11 if an accident happened who is going to reimburse landowners
12 or other people who have suffered problems from this? This
13 is a long-term project which will be with us for many, many
14 years. It is a short-term for jobs. People will come in,
15 in mass, build this thing and they'll leave and it's a boom
16 and bust type of scenario. We don't need this for our
17 property. We need renewable energies that will secure our
18 future not only in this county and our state, but for the
19 world.

20 Anyway, that's what I have to say and I would
21 hope that FERC would please look into this matter and deny
22 this terrible project.

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: Jordasn Cove LNG & Pacific
7 Connector Pipeline Projets

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 Docket No.: PF17-4-000

18 Place: Coos Bay, Oregon

19 Date: June 27, 2017

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

24 Daniel Voightsberger

25 Official Reporter

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
2 JORDAN COVE LNG and
3 PACIFIC CONNECTOR PIPELINE PROJECTS
4 DOCKET NO. PF17-4-000

5

6 SUNSET MIDDLE SCHOOL
7 245 SOUTH COMMANN STREET
8 COOS BAY, OREGON 97420

9

10 JUNE 27, 2017

11

12

13

14

15 BRUCE MORGAN - REPORTER

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MS. WEIRUP: My name is Linda Weirup,
2 W-e-i-r-u-p, and I live at 410 Holloway Muse, Coos Bay,
3 Oregon and I've lived here three year now.

4 Okay, when this first came up as an issue, I
5 filed my comments with FERC online formally and then it was
6 denied and I was very pleased. At that time, there had been
7 a leak at an LNG plant in northeastern Oregon I think by
8 Hermiston -- I'm not sure of the town. And they had to
9 evacuate two to four miles for a few days because of this
10 vapor cloud that could ignite and it was dangerous for
11 people.

12 Okay, I live, as the crow flies, not very far
13 from where the plant would be. I'm pretty near the airport,
14 maybe three-quarters of a mile or a mile from the airport.
15 I don't see why we want to do this for a foreign company. A
16 lot of people are against eminent domain. Mostly, I'm
17 against it because of the area. I wouldn't want to be
18 sickened by a leak.

19 The Bay itself is so good for shipping logs, for
20 shipping chips. We get huge ships from all over the world
21 here. It's also recreation. The sand dunes are a high
22 recreation thing as well as the beaches, fishing, and I
23 can't see -- I hope that it's denied and I hope because
24 President Trump is in now that it won't be approved just
25 because of him. It was denied before and I cannot see the

1 benefit of doing this for a foreign company.

2 As far as contributing to jobs, it would create
3 a lot of jobs, initially, but a lot of those people who work
4 on the setup initially would be in from out of the area.

5 And even the local ones, once it is setup, it would not
6 maintain that much hiring for our area. I think we can do
7 better with our own natural resources. Coos Bay and U.S.
8 businesses than we can with a foreign company like Veresen
9 or whoever might've taken it over. It seems like I read
10 something about that. And that's my comments.

11 MR. ADAMS: Clarence Adams, 2039 Ireland Road.
12 I am an affected landowner and president of Landowners
13 United.

14 I will read what I have. It's just simpler that
15 way. The LNG ships need to be included in the EIS because
16 they are a part of the project. Without Jordan Cove, they
17 would not be here. Included in the ship issues should be
18 the following: the social/economic impacts to local economy
19 when all of the traffic in the Bay is stopped for the one
20 and a half hours it takes to move a tanker in and out.
21 Veresen's estimation of 181 ships per hour is not good
22 enough for information. We need those sizes of tankers
23 expected, how long it takes to fill a tanker, and how many
24 times and duration the Bay would be closed to other boat
25 traffic per day.

1 Veresen needs to report on the types of ships
2 expected and if they will be fit under the FAA's 167-foot
3 height restriction. The affect tankers will have on the
4 North Bend airport traffic pattern needs to be studied and
5 the cost of delaying flights and/or landings because of the
6 tankers passes right in front of the main runway. Also, the
7 long-term effects on the Hermiston Marsh due to the LNG
8 transport ships and the two to three supporting tugs running
9 24 hours a day while at berth.

10 In my estimation, a tanker at berth will have
11 little as 7 to 13 feet from keel to bottom of the berth,
12 depending upon how low the tide is. A better explanation is
13 needed detailing what will happen after a subduction zone
14 mega-quake when the water recedes out of the Bay preceding a
15 Tsunami. How will the tanker be affected by the Tsunami
16 after being grounded on its side? Will the on board LNG
17 tanks survive in tact and what will be the affect in the
18 outcome if the tank compromise? Need to explain the worse
19 case scenario.

20 Veresen also needs to complete a survey of
21 possible sources for secondary explosions as part of the
22 public safety portion of the EIS. If the LNG facilities
23 were to explode, the North Bend Airport is about a half a
24 mile across the Bay from Jordan Cove and the prime example
25 with multiple areas of aviation fuel that can ignite at any

1 one time. These secondary explosions will have a multiplier
2 effect on the original explosions.

3 Also, I put a pitch in for a 90-day comment
4 period, as normal, not the 30. And you folks really
5 discriminated against Jackson County by not having a meeting
6 down there. It's really unfair not having a scoping meeting
7 down there. I think that's probably about it. Thank you.

8 MR. MILLER: My name is Charles B. Miller.
9 Charles in the usual way, Miller, M-i-l-l-e-r, and my main
10 affiliation is I'm emeritus professor of Oceanography at
11 Oregon State University. My written testimony I'm going to
12 turn in rather than read all of it.

13 It remarks that I have a letter to FERC, which
14 is three pages, that has the same content in more detail and
15 my written testimony here that I've just given over makes
16 three basic points. One is that FERC must insist that the
17 Environmental Impact Statement for the renewed (0:06:19.1)*
18 proposal include an honest assessment of the risks from the
19 anticipated next mega-thrust earthquake to the LNG terminal,
20 and there's some details which you can read later.

21 Second, FERC must insist that realistic
22 evaluation of Tsunami damage to the LNG terminal, to the
23 Coos Bay communities and to the availability of first
24 responders be included in a new EIS. For example, the
25 bridge is going to come down in that earthquake and first

1 responders will not be able to go in either direction.
2 Reasonable care for the safety of citizens in the region
3 dictates against building any such facility.

4 Oregon needs FERC to recognize that and to
5 refuse certification of public convenience and necessity.
6 An honest EIS would make that conclusion inevitable. FERC
7 owes North Bend and Coos Bay and all of southwest Oregon
8 that honest EIS. The contents of (0:07:23.4) report so far
9 are dishonest in both respects. They misrepresent
10 earthquake potential and they misrepresent what Tsunamis are
11 like. Thank you.

12 MR. DILLEY: I'm Jan Dilley. That's J-a-n and
13 Dilly is D-i-l-l-e-y. I live in North Bend, Oregon and
14 address 1223 Windsor Avenue. Thank you for this scoping
15 session.

16 From the second paragraph of your notice, I
17 quote, "The Commission will use this EIS in its
18 decision-making process to determine whether Jordan Cove LNG
19 terminal is in the public interest and the Pacific Connector
20 Pipeline is in public convenience and necessity," a mighty
21 fine objective, emphasizing public interest, convenience,
22 and necessity. I hope they will do a better job than they
23 did in approving the import terminal for Jordan Cove.

24 Contrary to attention to public concerns, the
25 EIS was filled with damage to and disregard for the public

1 and a map showing the blast zone, including the airport,
2 mall, and homes of some 17,000 people. How do lives matter
3 in your public concern? In fact, you have chosen to meet at
4 a secondary school that is in the 32 zone, not as bad as a
5 complete wipeout a few blocks down the street.

6 If that isn't bad enough, our own U.S.
7 Geological Survey reported an over abundance of gas, which
8 precluded the need for our entire country, never mind the
9 State of Oregon, to seize property by eminent domain. Yet,
10 FERC approved the destruction of one of the finest places to
11 live per sunset October 2007, sunset.com best in west and
12 National Geographic, January 18, 2016, as submitted to you,
13 only to send gas to California, who closed their own ports
14 before FERC existed.

15 With a threat facing the Ninth Circuit Court,
16 Jordan Cove withdrew the import facility and reapplied for
17 an export facility with FERC's help maintaining much of
18 Jordan Cove's input, but completely eliminated all public
19 input. But we, the public, labored to reenter all our
20 comments and more to defeat the second Jordan Cove Project.
21 However, with FERC's "without prejudice" clause in the
22 rejection of Jordan Cove Number 2 we are faced with Jordan
23 Cove Number 3.

24 This is now a mandate on FERC's performance as a
25 regulator as its name indicates and not a facilitator as

1 performance indicates. Thank you.

2 MS. CALDWELL: My name is Caren Caldwell,
3 C-a-r-e-n, C-a-l-d-w-e-l-l. My first concern is about the
4 public nature of this event. I don't consider this to be a
5 public meeting. I don't consider this to be public input
6 because there are no reporters here and the general public
7 is not allowed in. I would like to know where and when
8 we'll be able to access the comments that people make for
9 the public record.

10 The comment I want to share with the committee,
11 with whoever -- whatever you call yourselves -- is the
12 concern I have about the climate. I think it's only in
13 recent years that we have a population that's become aware
14 of how serious climate change is and what's going on. We
15 know that fossil fuels, including liquefied natural gas,
16 even when it's you know less than carbon is still a huge
17 global-warming substance and it's accumulating faster and
18 faster in the atmosphere. Even as we try to lower our
19 emissions, it's still accumulating. There may be other
20 features in our environment, carbon sinks that are not as
21 effective as they once were in previous generations.

22 So the fact that you want to pipe liquefied
23 natural gas through a portion of the country as well as
24 shipping it overseas demands that we look at the strong
25 environmental impacts in regards to climate of doing that

1 project and as well as the effect on, in our area, fire
2 danger. If there are safety features that have not been
3 considered yet in each of the places where the gas is going
4 to be piped over ground, then that needs to be dealt with in
5 a strong and thorough way because as climate dries out our
6 landscape fire is more dangerous and of course you know
7 we're dealing with a fuel here.

8 Environment around animals how it affects them,
9 this particular project will produce more greenhouse gases
10 than any other project in Oregon. We need to step up and do
11 our part as human beings for the globe for the next
12 generation. And so we need to look at how much is actually
13 going to be emitted through greenhouse gas emissions through
14 the whole history of the project, not just you know when
15 it's going through the pipes, but when it's dug out, when
16 it's fracked, when it's shipped, when it's compressed, when
17 it's loaded onto ships, when it's sent overseas, when it's
18 burned someplace else. All of those are places where the
19 emissions are going to escape. That's what I got.

20 MS. JACKSON: Rowena Jackson, R-o-w-e-n-a
21 J-a-c-k-s-o-n. I'm a member of the Klamath Tribes, enrolled
22 Klamath Tribal member, Modoc, Navaho, and Paiute and
23 Umatilla. So we're here to talk about what kind of issues
24 we have with FERC. And just walking in the door, my first
25 thing that I disagree with is how this is set up. I think

1 everybody should be able to speak in front of each other so
2 everybody can hear each other and what their comments are.
3 You know I don't feel like this is fair to the community,
4 the Tribal members. The whole thing is a big issue in
5 itself. It's really unfair.

6 And one of the things that I'm really concerned
7 about as a Tribal member you know where the pipeline is
8 supposedly going to be laid out from Klamath Falls area to
9 Coos Bay we have a lot of sacred sites, burial sites, and
10 you know we have an old village in that area and it's -- the
11 whole thing is showing disrespect to our ancestors and
12 that's why I wear this shirt here today. No LNG, protect
13 cultural sites, and water, you know.

14 The whole company is not respecting our
15 ancestors and you know we're the people of the land and you
16 know, yeah, there's new landowners you know. That was taken
17 from us too. The whole thing is unfair on top of unfair and
18 you know layers of unfairness and so I totally disagree with
19 the pipeline coming out here. You know this 32nd placard
20 you know that's not fair. You know the court reporting you
21 know I agree with that being recorded, but it should be
22 recorded in front of everybody so we can hear each other.
23 It's kind of like being separated in jail and being you know
24 20 questioned for something you didn't do wrong you know.

25 And yeah, the whole thing is a big issue in

1 itself and you know a lot of people are going to suffer, not
2 right away, but eventually you know and I don't think this
3 organization is not looking out for the people's best
4 interest, only in their pockets and what they can gain with
5 dollar signs. It's not fair. And you know I understand
6 people want to make a living, but you know when you put
7 other people's lives at stake it's not worth it.

8 Regardless, just like gambling, you know. You're going to
9 gamble people's lives, next generations you know and the
10 hazards you know it's all just a big mess you know.

11 And this isn't the only pipeline. Everybody has
12 a pipeline in their backyard, so I hope that this doesn't go
13 through and that there's a different way that they can do
14 things like not do it at all you know. So yeah, no means no
15 you know. No LNG. And I'm looking out for people's next
16 generations I don't even know you know. I mean your kids,
17 your kids' kids you know. So I'm very disheartened about
18 the whole thing and I just want to say you know I hope
19 everybody opens their eyes and their heart, not just their
20 mind. Thank you.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Juan Rodriguez, J-u-a-n
22 R-o-d-r-i-g-u-e-z. I'm here representing the Pacific
23 Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters today. I am in
24 support of this project being built because of the carpenter
25 hours that will be put into this job for a prolonged period

1 of time in a region where we don't get many jobs this big.

2 I think it'll be good for local economy. It'll
3 boost it. It will help workers who live here. There will
4 be sustainable jobs here and you know this is American made.
5 This is money that we're building here -- you know making
6 here and making Oregon better with this and our economy.

7 MR. DEL REAO: My name is Daniel Del Reao and
8 the spelling on that is D-a-n-i-e-l D-e-l space R-e-a-o. I
9 work for the Pacific Northwest Regional Council of
10 Carpenters, so that's who I am affiliated with and I'm
11 speaking in favor of the project. Mainly, because with my
12 background in construction, I feel that bringing jobs into
13 this area would be beneficial for the economy, everyone
14 locally. Not so much even for the construction workers,
15 but also just everyone in general.

16 Previously, I used to work for Anderson
17 Construction as a foreman for their Special Projects
18 Division and one of the main things that I used to do was I
19 was doing a lot of their bank work, so decommissioning
20 projects that weren't being used for Bank of America,
21 Merrill Lynch, AmeriTrust, stuff like that. And it's
22 honestly sad. You know there is a couple of times where I'd
23 go out to just different places, but the ones that stood out
24 to me mostly were like coastal towns.

25 I did a decom in Crescent City, California for

1 Bank of America there as well as Aberdeen, Oregon or
2 Washington -- excuse me. And both of those were actually
3 sad where previously back in the eighties or before then
4 they were nice bustling, nice towns. You know coastal towns
5 and stuff and then the mill started like not working out
6 there and people were starting to leave the area and stuff
7 and it was sad. I actually happened to be part of the
8 people that would go close down like a branch for like a
9 bank or something. And it just seemed like the people in
10 the town it was just that was the one thing I notice.
11 Myself being younger, is that the towns that they'd send me
12 to, to do that kind of work, were just dead you know.

13 And I feel that Coos Bay is kind of in the same
14 sort of situation where it's just over the years it's been
15 slowly declining as far as population and the work that goes
16 on here, the people that live here. Everyone just moves out
17 because there's really no work for that infrastructure or
18 anything like that, so I think bringing in a project like
19 this, as long as it's done carefully and with minimal impact
20 to the environment I believe would be a strong thing to
21 bring into the economy. That way we can hopefully not see
22 this go the way of other coastal towns or small towns that
23 ultimately end up dissolving and withering away with time
24 because there's just nothing there for people. And that is
25 my statement.

1 MS. MANGAN: My name is Sylvia Mangan,
2 S-y-l-v-i-a, Mangan, M-a-n-g-a-n. The first thing I'd like
3 to state is we all thought this was a public meeting and
4 that is something that we really would like to see happen in
5 the community.

6 Now I know this is a scoping session and it's
7 mainly to talk about issues, but we're hoping that when you
8 get more into the further depths and the phases there will
9 be more public meetings where we can hear everybody's
10 comments.

11 The big thing I'm here for is to discuss eminent
12 domain. My understanding of what eminent domain should be
13 would be for a public project, such as a railway or a bridge
14 or something that's really going to serve the public good,
15 but this is serving a foreign country. And we are on the
16 pipeline route and we have a very wonderful ranch and we're
17 extremely bothered by this. That some of our property could
18 be taken for this for a foreign country that will not
19 benefit our community whatsoever.

20 And the other big thing is safety. Our house is
21 500 feet from the pipeline and we've done a lot of research
22 and we know the dangers of this project and we want to be
23 removed from the route. And we've been told different
24 stories that perhaps we will be off the route, but we've
25 seen no publication or anything made public. But I'm

1 speaking for all of the other homeowners as well. Eminent
2 domain should not be something that is used for this
3 project, a foreign country coming in and taking people's
4 hard-earned land.

5 Safety, the environment, my husband is a
6 wildlife biologist and has worked many, many years with the
7 wildlife and the fisheries in the area. We moved to this
8 area 30 years ago and have moved here because of the coast
9 and because of the pristine environment that exists here and
10 we believe this would be a very damaging project for this
11 community and would like to see something that is much more
12 health conscious and balanced and sustainable for the
13 community. I guess that's mainly it.

14 MR. LLOYD: My name is Nolan Lloyd, N-o-l-a-n
15 L-l-o-y-d. I'm here today to provide some comments on the
16 liquefied natural gas proposal that FERC is entertaining.

17 First off, I've done NEPA for the federal
18 government and this is the funniest public comment session
19 I've ever run across. Normally, a public comment session is
20 done in public so that people can hear what other people are
21 saying.

22 The primary issue -- I think you're going to
23 hear some of the other ones that I've got, so I'm going to
24 hit the main one that I think hasn't been touched on. And I
25 believe that the NEPA document should include a detailed

1 economic analysis of the affects of the plant coming into
2 this community, the community of North Bend to Coos Bay, and
3 it needs to include the numbers of people that not only come
4 in to do the job -- to do the buildup and then actually work
5 on the project you know once it's in -- it's actually
6 liquefying natural gas, but we need to understand the
7 numbers of people that will leave and the economic affect
8 that that will have on the area, also the affect on tourism
9 for the area. Tourism is huge in this county and I believe
10 that -- I believe it'll have a negative affect, but I think
11 it needs to be analyzed anyway. That's the main thing.

12 One of the canned one that I ended up with that
13 somebody was handing out having been in this process myself
14 and finding that bonds were a rehabilitation of projects
15 never cover the costs. I think you guys need to come up
16 with some method of providing a large enough bond to cover
17 rehab for this thing after the 20-year lifetime of the
18 project or whatever it is. You know an analysis that I have
19 seen shows that LNG probably won't even be in demand in
20 another seven years, so we need to figure out how to
21 dismantle this mess once it's brought in. And I think I'll
22 just leave it with that.

23 MR. WHITNEY: Alan Whitney, A-l-a-n
24 W-h-i-t-n-e-y. I'm not representing any groups at this
25 time. Basically, I have several questions. I'm not really

1 for or against the thing. I'm just not sure about several
2 things. Number one was the -- originally, it was designed
3 to have a workforce in the area of the Simpson Heights and
4 that's not on this final -- this paper that they sent. It
5 seems to have been moved over, but I've seen people over
6 there doing some lining and I don't know if it's with them
7 or not.

8 Number two, as far as the use of the Jordan Cove
9 Project, you know the FERC it says here that FERC's mission
10 is to enable or you ensure reliable, efficient, sustainable
11 energy for consumers and this has nothing to do with
12 consumers. I understand that this energy going through here
13 won't have any effect or benefit to the local area, which is
14 somewhat not very good for us having to do this, so I'm
15 wondering about the project in that regard.

16 The other one I'm not too thrilled about sending
17 our energy to foreign countries, particularly, when we've
18 been through somewhat of an energy crisis at home. We ought
19 to be preserving, especially, since it's coming at somewhat
20 of an environmental problem.

21 Another question I have is you're running the
22 36-inch pipeline through a seismic area and I don't know how
23 that's protected in a seismic area if you're shifting and
24 it's only 3-feet -- at best 3-feet down below the surface of
25 the ground and/or versus terrorist activity in this day and

1 age how it's protected. Basically, those are my questions.
2 I don't really have -- I'm not for or against the thing. I
3 just want to make sure that all the "T's" are crossed and
4 the "I's" dotted, environmentally and for personal people
5 who have their lands being violated on this. So that's it.

6 MR. MURIELLO: My name is Samuel Muriello,
7 spelled S-a-m-u-e-l and then Muriello is M-u-r-i-e-l-l-o.
8 I'm from Cascade Locks, Oregon and I'm in favor of the
9 project.

10 I live on a coastal town in a way because I'm
11 port town right off the Columbia River. In my opinion it's
12 a dinosaur town and a project of this magnitude coming to an
13 area that resembles my town would be crucial for the
14 economy, for the people that live in it. There's no
15 replenishment of younger people coming into this town. If
16 anything, they're being born here and leaving because
17 there's nothing here.

18 It would bring construction trades back into the
19 fold in this area. It would help out the businesses. It
20 would help out schools. I'm totally in favor of it because
21 it would also be built union and the people building the
22 project would have very standard wages. They would have
23 benefits for themselves and their kids, which you can't ask
24 for much more and it would also train the future. It would
25 entice the Coos Bay natives to stick around for the future.

1 So that's why I'm in favor of the project and that's it.

2 MR. MESSERLE: My name is Ken Messerle, K-e-n
3 M-e-s-s-e-r-l-e. I'm representing myself, but I've lived
4 here my whole life. I was ranching with my brothers, who
5 are on the property line, but I have no ownership in those
6 properties any more.

7 I've served on the legislature, served on
8 several state boards and commissions and then I lobbied. I
9 actually lobbied for Williams Pipeline when they were first
10 trying to establish this project, so I've had -- and then I
11 also sponsored a bill when I was in the legislature to bring
12 the county gas line in, so I've had a lot of experience and
13 done a lot of research on gas lines and safety and those
14 kinds of things.

15 I just wanted to say that this is extremely
16 important to the community and the state and the whole
17 region, extremely important to the Port of Coos Bay, and the
18 other things that will feed off of this, such as more
19 shipping and enhance the railroad and just the whole
20 community.

21 Our community has been suffering here for
22 probably 20 years, even more than that when the timber
23 industry started falling off and there is so much potential
24 here, but we just can't seem to get our feet on the ground
25 and get moving. We have a very high drug problem, a huge

1 homeless problem. Our schools are suffering. You know when
2 I compare it to -- I've got grandchildren that are going to
3 schools in the Portland area and stuff and there's just no
4 comparison to what they offer those kids and the education
5 they get compared to what we're struggling with down here.

6 As I said, I think this is important for the
7 whole community and the whole region. I know Medford area
8 is very interested in getting this port going and what this
9 will benefit them. One thing that I don't hear mentioned
10 very much is that this area is really lacking energy. The
11 gas line, the county gas line that's 12 inches that has come
12 in that's an allotment that Weyerhaeuser was not using in
13 Eugene and so it can be interrupted and we've had business,
14 such as Nucor try to come in here and when they realized
15 that there was not an unlimited supply of energy they just
16 had to walk away. I mean they couldn't afford to put up the
17 plants without assuring that they had the energy.

18 The other thing is I doubt if we'll ever see
19 power lines come in any more, so I think it's important that
20 we have the access of enough natural gas here that if we
21 have cogent if anything in the future develops, but I think
22 this is an important project for the whole region. I've
23 done a lot of studying and I've been to presentations on the
24 safety of the gas and I think there's just a lot of very bad
25 information out there in the public that just people don't

1 realize how really safe this is, particularly, with the new
2 standards that they're building the pipelines and those
3 kinds of things. But we're certainly in need of a boost to
4 our economy.

5 Like I said, I was born and raised here. When I
6 was in high school and stuff, this was a booming community
7 and we were the largest lumber port in the world at that
8 time. And the whole community here is just struggling
9 repeatedly, so I'm very much in favor of it and I think the
10 company, what I've worked with, Jordan Cove are excellent
11 people and try to do things above and fair beyond what is
12 required and so I'm very hopeful that the project move
13 forward. I think that's probably all I have to say.

14 MR. JANSEN: My name is Steve Jansen,
15 J-a-n-s-e-n. I'm the Coos County assessor. I've been
16 reviewing the property values associated with the original
17 12-inch Coos County pipeline that was put in over a decade
18 ago and I'm midway in my analysis right now. I've looked at
19 all the properties that are within one mile in any
20 direction from the existing pipeline that are not in city
21 limits and I'm comparing how their market values have stood
22 up compared to market values of all the properties outside
23 of that one-mile buffer on either side. So it's a two-mile
24 wide band all the way through the county roughly the same
25 transit as the proposed Pacific Connector line.

1 So far, I've analyzed six properties that have
2 sold more than once, so it's either twice or three times and
3 one that had actually sold four times in the last five
4 years, 2010 'til 2016, actually six years. And once I
5 finished that analysis, then I'll go back and take 2016 also
6 and then all the years prior to 2010.

7 So far, I've found no difference at all in the
8 market. There's actually out of the six I've looked at five
9 of them have gone up, a couple of them significantly, and I
10 don't know why. I just know that the market value the
11 second and the third time around has gone up and one of them
12 has decreased marginally. And again, I don't know if that's
13 because structures were taken off or what the reason, but if
14 the other properties track the same any change in market
15 value attributed to the pipeline is background noise. I
16 don't see any difference at all.

17 After I've finished, then I'll go back out and
18 do a two-mile wide swath and what I'm looking at is only
19 residential bare land and residential improved land. So
20 far, I think it's about 3700 properties I'm looking at.
21 Because within city limits it's a little bit more volatile
22 and depend on other things. I'm leaving out anything that's
23 within an established city limit, so rural property is rural
24 property and the new proposed pipeline is all rural. It
25 doesn't go through any cities, so that's just what I wanted

1 to put out there on the record.

2 MR. DOVER: My name is Dennis Dover, D-e-n-n-i-s
3 D-o-v-e-r and I'm here in support of the Jordan Cove Natural
4 Gas Export Terminal.

5 This is going to bring a tremendous economic
6 impact to southern Oregon. I've been in construction since
7 right out of high school. I'm the business rep for the
8 Sheet Metal Workers Local 16 and it's going to promote a
9 living wage for the people that are down here during the
10 construction process and then after that the economic
11 benefits to the communities along the pipeline and the
12 public, in general, is way going to outweigh a little bit of
13 the people that are totally against the pipeline.

14 I understand the eminent domain thing is a big
15 issue, but you've got to weigh the greater need of the more
16 than the individual and that's why you can't yell fire in a
17 movie theater because it outweighs. So you've got to have
18 that balance and for that reason I'm in support of that and
19 if it has to come to eminent domain on a couple of the
20 people that are holding out for the pipeline I think it
21 outweighs that because of the more benefit to the public
22 that's going to have on the economic impact in these areas
23 and thank you for considering my testimony.

24 MR. OHMIE: My name is Rick Ohmie, R-i-c-k
25 O-h-m-i-e. I'm a business agent with Laborers Union of

1 Oregon. I'm here in support of the LNG process down here.
2 I think that this process is obviously taken long enough
3 already and kept you know good wage jobs out of the area.
4 They just had a vote here where they were trying to prevent
5 this project from happening, which was voted down
6 overwhelming by 75 percent. If that doesn't tell you the
7 will of the people in the area here, I don't know what it
8 does. But I am in support of the good wage jobs that'll be
9 created during the construction process and the good wage
10 jobs that'll be after the project is complete with people
11 working here.

12 The community here needs the jobs. The timber
13 industry has almost destroyed southern Oregon and I'd just
14 like to see this progress at a lot faster rate than it has
15 progressed. I see no reason to hold up this project any
16 further.

17 MR. RICKER: My name is Mitch Ricker, M-i-t-c-h
18 R-i-c-k-e-r. I work for Laborers Local 1737 out of
19 Portland. We represent a lot of members in this area. We
20 really support this Jordan Cove Pipeline and facility for
21 the boost in the economy down here and getting our members
22 back to work and we really want to see this through, and the
23 amount of jobs that it's going to create after the fact,
24 even after all the pipeline and everything's done.

25 MS. RIGG: My name is Teresa Anne Rigg,

1 T-e-r-e-s-a A-n-n-e R-i-g-g. I've been in North Bend
2 since 1951 or Coos Bay, so I guess my affiliation is just
3 personal concern. I'm a raising granny, but I don't think
4 that counts.

5 Well, actually having been here this long, we've
6 seen a lot of history of companies come in, make promises,
7 and leave and leave us a big mess. My immediate concern is,
8 first, the emergency factors. We had a situation only maybe
9 last year or the year before where McCullough Bridge was hit
10 and everything had to go through Roseburg, then weather
11 prevented that and the stores were empty and there was
12 nothing. We're doing all this Tsunami planning and I don't
13 think adding into the mix the possibility of an accident
14 with either a ship or the plant in the proximity of the
15 bridge all of the responders, including the Coast Guard, the
16 Fire Department, the airport, and closing the channel is a
17 particularly bright idea to operate on.

18 I think that there are a lot of people that have
19 good reason to fear this operation because -- and I'm not
20 going to go into the geographical. I'm sure you've heard
21 about the Tsunamis and all that. We know it's there. We
22 know about the storms. I do have a concern that they were
23 -- about using Pacific Power to cool it. I have been in a
24 situation here -- I think it was '96, '95/'96 where our
25 power was out for two and a half weeks.

1 Any extended use of what they -- they have not
2 proven to me that they can keep this plant cooled under
3 those circumstances without help from Pacific Power. My
4 main concern is the pollution that comes from it. Unlike
5 what people think, this is not a pollution-free area. I
6 developed a lot of problems growing on the hill. Well, you
7 can look up what was there in the past before me and since.

8 I have been told by the doctor -- Dr. Joseph
9 Morgan, who has also testified -- that I need to move out of
10 Coos Bay proper to avoid "life-threatening episodes" of
11 which I'm just coming out of one now. So if I seem a little
12 unfocused, there's things in here that are bothering me. So
13 we already have a pollution level. While people compare gas
14 as being cleaner to coal and other substances that have a
15 high particulate pollution level, what this plant would put
16 out cannot fall to the ground and be swept up or cleaned.

17 I also have concerns about what is happening to
18 older people and is already happening. I have a friend
19 that, for instance -- I have more than one actually who has
20 been priced out of the housing market, had Section 8, lost
21 her house because in an anticipation of the boom -- and
22 again, that's kind of like the prop and the cane. I don't
23 mean that word literally. They are speculating, putting
24 buildings up for sale anticipating housing costs to go way
25 up and acting on it now.

1 People who are on a reduced income -- and I've
2 been here almost all my life. I have been here since 1951
3 actually. When you have a retirement that is based on two
4 dollars an hour you can't compete. As it is now, we can't
5 hold our ground. And I have my own home. People who don't
6 are in a real bind. I know there's so many reasons, but I
7 personally had a daughter-in-law that was involved or close
8 to an explosion near -- I think it was Bellingham where the
9 Navy base is -- I get them confused in Washington where
10 there was a pipeline explosion there.

11 We know that they happen all over. And the
12 sheer scope, size of this pipe combined with our total
13 inability to get people in and out of here are at complete
14 odds. Okay, I will go with what we got. I can write the
15 rest and I'm sure you're hearing other comments over and
16 over. So personally, I would not be able to live here any
17 more because of the increase in pollution. I'm a canary,
18 okay. I have chemical sensitivities, but I'm finding more
19 and more people and young people who are now going to the
20 doctor with the same allergies and the same food allergies
21 and the same chemical and contact allergies. This is not a
22 world we need to create. And economically, we can't benefit
23 from this gas. We can't invest in the company. Their whole
24 plan is for shipping it to a country that can already buy it
25 cheaper from Russia.

1 This is a loss/loss situation. It should not
2 involve eminent domain. It should not involve coming
3 through us at all. When they came the first day they said
4 if you don't want us here, we're leaving. Fifteen years
5 later, it's still here and an awful lot of people at the
6 first meeting said actually we want you to leave. It's an
7 inappropriate place, an inappropriate product, and a
8 dinosaur. Thank you.

9 MR. COLES: Okay, my name is Kevin Coles,
10 K-e-v-i-n C-o-l-e-s. Okay, basically, I think LNG -- is
11 that what it's called, liquid natural gas, should stay in
12 the ground. It's time to come out of ground has passed.
13 It's time to divest from the use of petroleum products. It
14 will take time, so it's best to start now. It's like have
15 bad brakes. You have to start braking early to avoid a
16 serious crash. That's it.

17 MS. HEYL: My name is Linda Heyl, L-i-n-d-a
18 H-e-y-l.

19 FERC's public interest determination in the EIS
20 must consider how JCEP would impact the educational work of
21 the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology, the OIMB, located in
22 Charleston, Oregon, across from the proposed construction
23 site on Coos Bay. The University of Oregon has been
24 teaching and conducting research in marine biology on the
25 southern Oregon coast since 1924. Undergraduate and

1 graduate students, including my son, as well as visiting
2 professionals live, study, and work at this permanent
3 year-round facility for education and research about coastal
4 and deep water habitats.

5 The campus includes classrooms, state-of-the-art
6 lab facilities, a small fleet of ships and boats, and
7 housing and dining facilities for students and researchers.
8 How would changes in the shipping channel, the construction
9 of the plant, and the operation of the export facility
10 affect this work and the health and safety of the staff,
11 students, and visitors to the campus?

12 Two, the south slew of the Coos Bay estuary is
13 one of 29 coastal sites in the National Estuarine Research
14 Reserve System Network designated to protect and study
15 estuarine system. Established in 1974 through The Coastal
16 Zone Management Act, the reserve represents a partnership
17 program between NOAA and the Oregon Department of State
18 Lands. Estuaries provide unique habitats for hundreds of
19 species and serve as irreplaceable breeding grounds and
20 brood environments for juveniles. The EIS must consult with
21 NOAA and other relevant agencies to assess the potential
22 negative impacts on this stewardship, research, training,
23 and education with which these agencies and sites are
24 charged.

25 Three, the EIS must thoroughly address the

1 possible consequences from an earthquake and resulting
2 Tsunami occurring on the offshore Cascadia Subduction Zone.
3 Such an event could cause catastrophic damage and harm to
4 the surrounding communities during both the construction and
5 the operation phases of the JCEP. The EIS must consider the
6 possibility of multiple system failures, similar to what
7 happened in Fukushima, Japan.

8 Four, the EIS must address the possible negative
9 impacts consequent to the expansion of shipping required for
10 the JCEP. This would include impacts related to, one,
11 deepening and maintenance by dredging of the shipping
12 channel; two, water quality affects from sediment; three,
13 increased ship traffic; four, the movements, such as
14 propellers and wakes, et cetera, of the larger sized LNG
15 transport ships, the potential for leaks or spills from the
16 engines of the ships as well as from the LNG cargo,
17 introduction of evasive marine species from ballast water
18 and impacts on local endangered species.

19 Five, FERC must carefully and fairly consider
20 whether there is a true need for the JCEP in terms of U.S.
21 energy security and in terms of the people of Oregon. JCEP
22 describes the project as supply side market driven, not
23 driven by end user energy needs. In the JCEP general
24 overview document, the statement of focus and need is a very
25 brief paragraph that describes the purpose of the project to

1 export LNG, but makes no attempt to articulate a need. In
2 contrast, the section about the U.S. market supply is two
3 and half pages in length.

4 Quoting the report on page one, "The project is
5 a market-driven response to virgining and abundant gas
6 supplies, giving those supplies an efficient and
7 cost-effective output. The project is also a market-driven
8 response to the growth of international and particularly
9 Asian natural gas markets." The gas is being fracked, so
10 the only need is to find or create a market, in this case, a
11 foreign rather than a domestic market. The mere
12 availability and production of natural gas in Colorado,
13 North Dakota, and Canada does not constitute a need to
14 export that gas through Oregon.

15 FERC must carefully and fairly consider JCEP's
16 claim that supplying LNG to Asian markets will help
17 ameliorate carbon emissions by supplanting coal use. There
18 is no guarantee of this. The use of LNG may be added to the
19 use of coal and other fossil fuels. The global energy
20 market must shift rapidly away from fossil fuel and this
21 may, as likely, delay the transition to non-fossil fuels
22 sources of energy. I'll stop there.

23 MS. MACOMSON: My name is Susan Macomson and
24 that's S-u-s-a-n M-a-c-o-m-s-o-n. I am here today to ask
25 you to look into taking eminent domain for a corporation for

1 private business, taking land from farmers. And I am for
2 Colorado originally and I watched the fracking industry do
3 this and it was brutal to those farmers. Not only do they
4 take away the land, but they destroy the roads and those
5 farmers are who are the tax base and it was very disruptive
6 and these pipelines are the same thing. You destroy the
7 land of these farmers and you allow these corporations to
8 trash the roads and the farmers have to pay for that with
9 their tax base, so it's a huge impact on our rural
10 communities.

11 And you know the second thing is these pipelines
12 leak. You know I think this is a gas pipeline, but they
13 leak, as we know from California. And we know that the
14 North Dakota Pipeline continually leaks everywhere, wherever
15 that company is, it leaks. And we keep letting it happen
16 and it's time for the government to say, look, if you're
17 going to do this stuff it's going to work or we're going to
18 shut you down and that hasn't been happening and that's the
19 job of the federal government to make sure that companies do
20 what they're -- you know what they're supposed to do and
21 doesn't seem to be in the interest.

22 You know the second thing is is in Coos Bay, in
23 particular, we're expected to have a large earthquake and
24 this whole area is in the impact zone. And you know that
25 impact zone would go well up the pipeline. You know

1 probably across a good chunk of the state. And you know the
2 way business has been treated it's hands off and so you know
3 if we have the big one it's going to be a disaster for this
4 community.

5 So again, you know we allow big corporations to
6 dictate what they want. They get free tax breaks and the
7 people of this state end up paying for it. The people of
8 this community will die for it. And you know the federal
9 government has a responsibility. Corporations are not who
10 rules this country. It's we, the people, and it would do
11 well for our government to understand that and remember it
12 and go back to the roots of the constitution you know that
13 to put us first.

14 Lately, we haven't been put first and I think
15 it's up to you guys to make sure that we get put first back
16 where we belong. And that's all I have to say.

17 MS. MURPHY: My name is Jean Murphy,
18 M-u-r-p-h-y. This is the third time I've come to Coos Bay
19 to attend a FERC hearing about the proposed LNG pipeline and
20 terminal. I feel like a hapless villager trying to drive a
21 spike through the heart of an evil creature who will not
22 die. The prospect of a pipeline carrying a volatile,
23 flammable liquid through hundreds of miles of forest, under
24 streams, through a bay and to a 14-story tank built on sand
25 dunes in a Tsunami zone is terrifying. What are they

1 thinking?

2 MS. BRUNELL-MINEAU: I'm Helen Brunell-Mineau.
3 That's H-e-l-e-n B-r-u-n-e-l-l, Mineau is M-i-n-e-a-u. My
4 affiliation is public citizen, resident of the county. I
5 own property in Coos Bay, the county, and in North Bend. I
6 am definitely pro the LNG program. I am absolutely
7 disgusted with the people sitting outside with me.

8 I want to point out a couple things. I'm one of
9 those beneficiaries of -- they made us an offer. The
10 Williams Pipeline people made us an offer. We accepted the
11 offer. We've been paid. So to be up front about it, I'm
12 happy as all get-out because we got our money and we're
13 moving onto the next -- just waiting for construction to
14 start. And we've been told it may or may not go through
15 our property, but the money's still there and it's already
16 been cashed and we don't have to return it. So that's kind
17 of my bias to that statement, but I also want to remind
18 everybody that this is a -- besides the fact that we
19 desperately need the money in the community, it's a
20 right-of-way these people are asking for.

21 So if you have electricity that goes to your
22 house, if you have a telephone or cable those all come to
23 our house. If you live in the city limits, you've got water
24 and sewer. Those are all on public right-of-ways. That's
25 what these people are asking for. They're not buying the

1 people's land and I'm tired of hearing, well, they're not
2 paying me a fair price. They paid us a very fair price for
3 it. We got offered money every time they even made a
4 proposal to us they gave us an offer of \$750 to go talk to
5 an attorney if we wanted to.

6 I took the very first notebook over I got to my
7 attorney. My attorney read it in about an hour and a half.
8 He said I'm not charging you a dime for this. He said this
9 is a very reasonable thing, very fair, want you to take care
10 of that. It would be a smart thing to do. My sister who
11 lives in Billings, Montana her neighbor happens to work in
12 the natural gas industry in Montana. He looked at it and
13 said, well, that's more than we pay here. So she was happy
14 about that.

15 Like I said, the offers were fair and
16 reasonable. They explained everything all the way through.
17 Like I said, I'm probably more annoyed with the people that
18 come from out-of-state, out of the county. I mean I talked
19 to a lady from across the city out there, four or five from
20 Eugene, all complaining, and I'm going but this community
21 desperately needs the money. They need the infrastructure.
22 We need jobs. We need all of it. And that's probably my
23 biggest thing. And as I've said before, and I said it back
24 in the early seventies -- early eighties when we worked on
25 consolidation, the biggest thing we export in our community

1 is our children. We don't have -- the young people don't
2 stay in our community any more because they don't have jobs
3 to stay here for and that's the biggest thing that I see --
4 I mean I see this project as positive for the community,
5 positive for the economy, would benefit everybody.

6 MR. OTTERBY: My name is Lon Otterby, spelled
7 L-o-n O-t-t-e-r-b-y. Again, my name is Lon Otterby. I am
8 the chair of the Many Rivers Group of the Sierra Club,
9 Oregon Sierra Club representing over 3,000 Sierra Club
10 members and supporters in Coos, Douglas, and Lane Counties.

11 We have studied the Pacific Connector Pipeline
12 for several years now and the Jordan Cove Terminal and it's
13 a disaster for Oregon on all counts, as it would be a
14 disaster for our neighbors to the north in Washington and
15 the Province of British Columbia had they not rejected the
16 same proposal.

17 The myth spread across country that this PCP and
18 the LNG terminal at Jordan Cove will create hundreds of
19 long-term paying up to \$90,000 per year is just not true.
20 There are an extremely limited number of customers for this
21 product. The price for LNG is extremely limited and the few
22 jobs that are available are mostly temporary jobs for
23 out-of-state employees.

24 Two weeks ago I was walking near the beginning
25 of the proposed PCP route south of Klamath Falls where the

1 PCP crosses the Lost River and the migratory bird marshes
2 there. Here I found the rare white-faced Ibis and several
3 other migratory birds right in the middle of the path of
4 this pipeline, which is like a freeway going through our
5 state.

6 I followed the route west and north across the
7 Klamath River to Spencer Creek to the Rogue River, north
8 across the south fork of the Umpqua River and on to the two
9 forks of Myrtle Creek up here off I-5, then west to
10 (1:03:30.2)* Creek and the south fork of the Coquille River
11 just south of town here, northwest two more forks of the
12 Coquille River and across the south fork of the Coos River
13 and finally, across Coos Bay and Jordan Cove. All of these
14 fish-bearing streams, rivers, creeks, and bays, over a
15 hundred in all, will be in the path of the pipeline that
16 might not fail, but will fail that poison fish and aquatic
17 habitat. This will happen.

18 It has always happened where there are pipelines
19 and for what? This is all for a short-term profit of a few
20 investors in a foreign corporation. We will see our good
21 recreation jobs diminish. We will see our small businesses
22 harmed and go out of business and our climate will continue
23 to rise for the gain of the few and the loss of Oregonians.

24 Please reject this 223-plus pipeline and a
25 freeway of destruction through our forests, our jobs, and

1 our homes. Thank you.

2 MS. SMITH: My name is Mende Smith, M-e-n-d-e
3 S-m-i-t-h, and I am representing the National Green Party
4 and the Green Party in Pacific Greens in Oregon. I live in
5 Eugene and we were asked to come and to give our opinion of
6 the pipeline and to basically just express our concern for
7 the pipeline project.

8 I am a Washington-born native. I experienced a
9 lot of the changes in the coastline up there growing up as a
10 kid, watching when they were just talking about how some day
11 the Alaska cruise ships were going to come down and what
12 that was going to do to the industry and how wonderful it
13 was going to be. And I don't know if you're familiar with
14 how bad it's been and how now the big, enormous boats can
15 just literally park like right there at Elliot Bay and it's
16 just become one big tonnage problem after another.

17 And I guess where I'm going with this is it's
18 one thing to say, oh, we're doing this for this community.
19 This is a benefit for this community. This is going to
20 bring jobs. It's going to bring you know whatever. It's
21 going to bring prosperity for a little while when we talk
22 about sustainability. This is not a sustainable project.
23 It is not a sustainable industry. Fossil fuels are a thing
24 of the past. Veresen is a foreign company and eminent
25 domain is taking the land from the people.

1 All of those things wrapped up that it's become
2 such a big issue that all of these things have to be in line
3 to make it happen. What happens when there is a pipeline
4 leak? Who is that going to affect? It's going to affect
5 everyone in Oregon and everyone in the country, everyone in
6 the planet. These things are not just little, tiny, you
7 know microcosms, these industries. The decisions that are
8 being made affect all of us and opening the dialogue to
9 people in communities that are improvised and live in
10 institutional poverty many of them don't have the skills
11 they need, barely have gone to educational means anything
12 and when someone comes along and says we're going to give
13 your son a job all of a sudden it's a good idea.

14 And like I was saying, it's just not
15 sustainable. A guy that's going to work for 19 months or 4
16 years for a project is not going to benefit this community
17 for very long. And when he's done, he's going to be out of
18 here and the people that live here and the people that work
19 here and the people that do care to stay here for the rest
20 of their lives are going to be affected by that decision
21 that that guy who happened to make that pipeline if it was
22 not surveyed properly or if it was like the one lady we met
23 with -- one of the lady's from the property line she was
24 explaining when they brought the survey guy out he was like
25 this is supposed to be a big, flat area. What is this over

1 here? And she said it's not flat unless you're looking at
2 it from space.

3 You know they walked him and he saw, oh wow,
4 we're actually probably not going to be able to use this
5 area and then it happened again and then it happened again
6 and then it happened again. It's not a good idea to take --
7 I mean I've always been a keep it in the ground type person,
8 but letting Canada run a pipeline through this country to
9 send product to another country I can't even believe we're
10 having the conversation. You know I mean it just doesn't
11 make sense. It's not sustainable. It's not a good idea.

12 And you know Donald Trump might've pulled us out
13 of the Paris Agreement, but we're all still pretty serious
14 about the Paris Agreement and we don't know what the future
15 holds. I have three kids myself. I've got a 24-year-old.
16 I have a 20-year-old and a 17-year-old. What kind of Earth
17 are we going to leave them if we don't do the responsible
18 thing. I suck if I don't do the responsible thing as their
19 mom. So I'm just really -- I mean I'm glad that you guys
20 are doing the hearings. I think that's wonderful. I think
21 it gave a lot of people they feel like they're being heard
22 and that's very, very important because look what we just
23 went through in Standing Rock. Indigenous people constantly
24 saying that they haven't been supported and that they have
25 agreements that are dead and treaties that are dead and gone

1 and there are so many nimbus that have already made this
2 thing not happen in their neighborhoods. Now we're looking
3 at an improvised area in Oregon. We have 400 rivers. We
4 have 234 miles of pipeline. That's what we're talking
5 about.

6 So realistically, if you guys could just figure
7 out a way to put it -- maybe go above just up into the sky
8 somewhere. I think it wants to stay in the ground
9 personally, so anyway I'm really glad that you guys came
10 down, though. I really am. And there's a lot of people
11 that are interested from the northern part of the state.

12 MS. WARNER: My name is Alice Warner. I'm a
13 public interest attorney and a teacher. My family lives in
14 Newport within a mile of the peak shaver LNG tank in
15 Newport, Oregon. I drove down here today, it's about 100
16 miles, to comment that FERC should take a longer view and
17 look at the bigger picture. The gas industry is desperate
18 to make quick money through export of natural gas.

19 On behalf of both Oregon communities and people
20 across the United States, I would like FERC to deny the
21 permit for this pipeline and plant. There are four reasons
22 I would like to describe. First, is that our children and
23 their children need a sound economy with energy
24 independence. Exporting gas weakens the economy over the
25 long term in my view. If we look at Germany and China,

1 they're shifting to alternative and renewable energy.

2 In our country, as we need to make that shift,
3 we will need natural gas, not for export, but for our own
4 use because alternative energy is a poor match, as you know,
5 for the base load. We need natural gas in the shift, the
6 transition time, to back up renewables and to backfill for
7 the energy that renewables produce until the time that we
8 can have enough renewables to manage the base load and
9 renewables can respond quicker.

10 The second reason has to do with the stewardship
11 issue. In the Northwest -- you're from D.C., but in the
12 Northwest we've had 25 years of conflict over the public
13 lands and the federal stewardship of the public lands. So
14 as I see the maps in the lobby, I can see that the pipeline
15 goes over both Forest Service and BLM landholdings. These
16 are public lands held in Trust, not just for Oregonians, but
17 for all Americans. And after years of careful compromise of
18 different interests, we have both a resource management plan
19 and forest research plan -- a forest plan.

20 The pipeline is not consistent with the goals or
21 the actual details of either of those plans. So now we
22 have, after years of compromise of all the stakeholders
23 involved, we have a public plan for how to steward those
24 lands for all Americans and yet, we have private interests
25 who want to make a short-term profit by doing something

1 inconsistent. I can see, even just from the basic mapping
2 in the lobby, that the pipeline is traveling through what we
3 call Late Succession Reserve or (1:12:31.1)* trees with
4 wildlife dependent on them and also very sensitive riparian
5 areas. It makes no sense.

6 Today's quick money plan should not be undoing
7 all that careful agreement. And if you had lived in Oregon
8 through the development, for example, of the Northwest
9 Forest Plan you'd know there's blood and sweat on that plan.

10 The third reason I'd like to touch on is just
11 the way the decision's being made. As a teacher, as an
12 attorney, I've spent a lot of time listening to other
13 people, watching people make decisions and looking at the
14 quality of data that is being produced. This decision is
15 being made very fast, the comment periods are very short,
16 and it feels like some of the most important data is nowhere
17 here. So when I came in, I asked you where is the geologic
18 data and you explained to me that it was going to come later
19 in the process.

20 Because of where I live and my personal
21 experience I can't imagine why this project is even under
22 discussion and I can't imagine why it's been under
23 discussion three times. And I can't imagine why at a
24 scoping hearing that the maps out there wouldn't be geologic
25 maps.

1 In my community many years ago, this peak shaver
2 facility, which was approved, was not originally planned as
3 a peak shaver. It was originally planned as an export
4 terminal. The geologic information -- I don't know because
5 I wasn't at those hearing. I don't know what geologic data
6 was actually produced, but I do know what geologic data has
7 become publicly available since that time. That plant is in
8 a subduction zone, a liquefaction zone. It's surrounded by
9 landslide zones for miles. In either a subduction event or
10 another earthquake, it's a definite blast, okay. So I would
11 say that this plant here the geology doesn't make sense.

12 And last, I just want to say it's incredibly
13 dangerous for all who live near this plant and the shipping
14 routes because of the earthquake/Tsunami event,
15 liquefaction, and landslide. This decision would doom the
16 local population living in the blast zone. And since I live
17 in a blast zone, I drove down here to say please don't do
18 this to another Oregon community.

19 So I have three requests. One, that the comment
20 deadline be extended; two, that you hold scoping in all
21 counties affecting, including Jackson County where people
22 need to be heard; and third, that FERC vote to deny the
23 permit.

24 MR. NEIKIRK: My name is John Craig Neikirk.
25 Neikirk is N-e-i-k-i-r-k, and I live close to where this

1 pipeline is planning to cross Hayne Inlet, which is north of
2 here on the estuary. Haynes Inlet has a geographic fault
3 that runs up through the center of it. That's why it's
4 formed. And so by boring a pipe through a fault zone in a
5 bay is not very good, but I am basically here to talk about
6 the dangers of this pipeline.

7 I'm showing you these. This was from the Final
8 EIS the first time that Jordan Cove went around. Later, the
9 second EIS was stopped before it got to the lower bay of
10 Coos Bay, so it wasn't in. And it needs to be in the new EI
11 Statement that there is definite dangers because if there's
12 leaks it could spread along the bay on the water and an
13 explosion. So this was done by some scientists and
14 submitted in the final EIS.

15 At this moment, we can't reference any of the
16 previous records that were supplied by FERC and by citizens
17 that were in the libraries of the counties that this
18 pipeline passes because recently Jordan Cove's
19 representatives went into the libraries and removed
20 everything pertaining to the earlier procedures on trying
21 to get this through. Some of the librarians said, no, you
22 cannot take it. This is public property. So they wanted
23 until the librarian was out of the library and they went in
24 and they cleared out whole shelves of documents.

25 And this has not just happened in North Bend or

1 Coos Bay. It's every library in every county that these
2 documents were put in and they claim they owned them. Well,
3 many of them were sent directly from FERC to the library and
4 I feel that that was -- you know it's great reference
5 material for the new ones. It's just like this piece that
6 we have here. So that has to -- those documents need to be
7 reinstated to the libraries so that the citizens can review
8 them and see what was already going on.

9 I believe that we're dealing with a product that
10 is a stranded asset. The reason that LNG is being pushed at
11 this point is that solar and wind is coming on so strongly
12 and at such a low cost that it will be pushing the LNG
13 totally out of the market within 10 years, so they've got to
14 dump their assets soon or they're not going to be able to at
15 all. And fugitive emissions from a facility like this are
16 as substantial as major leaks. And the fugitive emissions
17 from both the fracking and the capturing of the gas to the
18 valve heads to everything all the way down the line amounts
19 to a very dirty industry and it's very hard on our
20 environment.

21 And as we know at the moment that we are
22 suffering from a heat wave that is substantial and it looks
23 like it's going to continue. And it isn't just because it's
24 a sunny day today. We are basically facing one of the
25 greatest challenges that mankind has ever seen and that we

1 all have to work together to make it a positive experience
2 for our grandchildren and our great grandchildren and not
3 destroy this planet as we're working towards doing.

4 So I appreciate you listening to my comments. I
5 don't believe in eminent domain for when it's someone's
6 private property. And I think that the National Gas Act
7 should be looked into and rewritten because it's not a
8 democratic process. We're losing our rights. And you know
9 I hate to say it, but it looks like everything my brothers
10 fought for in World War II and my father fought for is going
11 down the tubes. We have to have a very concerted effort to
12 save our world. Thank you.

13 MR. VOS: My name is Janet Vos, J-a-n-e-t,
14 V-o-s, and I'm here today to voice my concerns about the
15 Jordan Cove LNG Project. In reading the material that I
16 obtained when I came in, it looks like it's mainly about
17 environmental issues and that's a big concern to me because
18 I've been a resident of this area for 51 years and I love it
19 here. It's a beautiful place. It was kind of a bittersweet
20 thing to see the mills go, but in the long run it was a slow
21 adjustment. People adjusted and then the economy kind of
22 evened out and our environment improved greatly, the air
23 quality, the quality of our bay, the estuaries, the rivers,
24 everything. Our beaches are much better.

25 I live up the inlet where the pipeline is being

1 proposed and it's getting closer and closer to my residence
2 and it's a very big concern of mine. There's a blast zone,
3 as I understand it, that would reach right up to where I am.
4 And it's not just about me, but the biggest issue with that
5 environmental part is if there were a major catastrophe, and
6 there probably would be because there's going to be an
7 earthquake. It's not a matter of if, it's just a matter of
8 when, that would impact our airport, our major population
9 area, and it would just -- it's almost unbelievable you know
10 or unimaginable what kind of devastation that would cause.

11 And I know that Jordan Cove has assured
12 everybody that they've got this fantastic construction -- a
13 way of constructing so that it would withstand an
14 earthquake, but that's never been tested and I think it's
15 just kind of a big gamble that we shouldn't take with our
16 environment.

17 I also am a major allergy sufferer and I see an
18 allergist and he has been very much against this project
19 because of the air quality concerns that you know even
20 though his practice would probably increase because people's
21 asthma would get worse he still doesn't want to you know
22 support something just because it would give him more
23 business. So I think that speaks volumes when people put
24 health before greed.

25 As far as the inlet where they are planning to

1 put the pipeline there's an amazing amount of wildlife, a
2 lot of it you can't see. It's under the water. A lot of it
3 is above the water, the fowl, the shore birds, and all the
4 other wildlife that live there that are residents. It's
5 going to be completely disrupted and I don't think a lot of
6 people really understand the connection between the smallest
7 organisms to the largest and what kind of impact that would
8 have on our environment in this area.

9 So my objections for this project are all
10 encompassing from the safety, the environment, economic
11 vacuum that it would cause. It would be a very, very
12 short-term economic boost that would, once the project is
13 over and everything leaves, it would create quite a vacuum
14 in our area. And you know we already suffer here from poor
15 economic, socioeconomic issues, and I think that this would
16 just add to that as far as bringing in all these temporary
17 workers that don't have any investment in this area or a
18 vested interest in how our community is with safety. So
19 basically, that's just my input.

20 MS. ROBERTS: Edith Roberts. I have three main
21 areas of concern. I want to talk about safety, economic
22 harm, and environmental issues.

23 So in terms of safety, I'm concerned that this
24 3-foot tube, which will be carrying un-odorized gas for up
25 to 1,988 pounds per square inch and buried 30 inches deep is

1 going to be very unsafe. It's going through 160 miles to
2 southern Oregon forests with 160 miles to a 150-foot clear
3 cut through the forest and a lot of this is going to be
4 preempted from private property owners.

5 Most of the land is designated Class 1 because
6 of the low density, which is going to require lower safety
7 standards with fewer welding inspections, thinner pipe,
8 shallower trenches, and fewer block valves, and higher gas
9 pressure and few patrols, and leaks are raised. This is an
10 area with steep mountains, unstable soils prone to
11 landslides, and annual forest fires. In case of broken
12 pipes and leaks which could fuel serious fires, sparse fire
13 control services would be available to respond to these
14 potential catastrophes.

15 In terms of economics, the threat of eminent
16 domain adversely impacts property values for over 600
17 private landowners along the route with low initial
18 offerings have been offered by Williams Pipeline and a lot
19 of these people -- I've talked to a number of these people
20 and they've made a lot of improvements to their properties
21 and this would go right through their property. They would
22 still own that around it and so it would have devastating
23 impact on a lot of the improvements they've made and
24 they've spent a lot of time and money often on their land.

25 Southern Oregon will see little of the billions

1 of dollars of profit that Veresen, which is a foreign
2 company, will potentially receive and they're be vulnerable
3 to huge costs in destruction of wildlife habitat, fishing
4 and recreation environments as well as potential costs
5 fighting fires and dealing with leaky pipes. The project
6 will result in few local jobs and be harmed by the economic
7 instability caused by a boom and bust business model.

8 Local fisheries and recreational jobs could be
9 lost because of the destructive effects of the project and
10 fishing and tourism and recreation industries could be
11 harmed.

12 In terms of the environment, which is my longest
13 section, the pipeline would travel across two mountain
14 ranges, six major rivers, hundreds of salmon-bearing
15 streams. Seventy miles of pipeline would travel through
16 public forests and waterways that shelter
17 federally-protected endangered species. It would destroy
18 over 3,000 acres of terrestrial wildlife habitat and cross
19 over 400 water bodies supporting salmon streams.

20 The clear cut swath would also fragment habitat
21 for two imperial bird species, the Northern spotted owl and
22 the marbled merlot. The Jordan Cove terminal would super
23 cool and liquefy natural gas for overseas shipping. The
24 terminal would include a marine berth to be dug out of the
25 north spit big enough for two huge ocean tankers, two

1 enormous gas storage tanks storing 80 million gallons of LNG
2 and a new 450-megawatt power plant, all built on top of
3 unstable sand dunes in line with the airport runway in a
4 Tsunami and earthquake zone.

5 In rough seas within sight of the new
6 (1:29:47.4)* shipwreck and near a highly populated city.
7 The Oregonian recently reported that FERC is not requiring
8 Jordan Cove to consider multiple failure events as occurred
9 in Fukushima when the earthquake/Tsunami devastated the
10 Japanese coast. Oregon geologists warned that a similar
11 mega-thrust earthquake off the Oregon coast is overdue. If
12 the power plant and its backup system were to fail, the 80
13 million gallons of LNG would immediately begin to warm and
14 expand.

15 Veresen isn't going to describe that catastrophe
16 in southern Oregon's most popular coastal area and FERC is
17 not requiring them to even consider what would happen.

18 I'll skip the rest. I'll just say that there
19 are a lot of global warming issues with respect to this too
20 because LNG is a worst polluter than CO2 for our climate
21 than coal.

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: Jordasn Cove LNG & Pacific
7 Connector Pipeline Projets

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 Docket No.: PF17-4-000

18 Place: Coos Bay, Oregon

19 Date: June 27, 2017

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

24

Bruce Morgan

25

Official Reporter