

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

Umpqua Community College  
Jackson Hall  
1140 Umpqua College Road  
Roseburg, Oregon 97470  
Wednesday, June 28, 2017

The public comment session, pursuant to notice, convened  
at 4:00 p.m.

1 VERBAL COMMENT SESSION

2 MR. MUNCH: I guess they need my little piece of  
3 land.

4 FERC: Whenever you're ready sir, you can give  
5 your comment.

6 MR. MUNCH: I get one comment?

7 FERC: Five minutes, you have five minutes to  
8 give your comment.

9 MR. MUNCH: Boy. Well, I don't think that fast.

10 FERC: Take your time, sir.

11 MR. MUNCH: Well, I've got 80 acres and I don't  
12 like them putting that cheap pipeline through my property.  
13 Splitting it right in half so I can't even log one part of  
14 it. And you're going through a wet spot. Of course, it  
15 depends on who you are whether it's a wet spot or not. And  
16 I don't like that they've got their land that they just pile  
17 brush on and leave it. Is my five minutes up?

18 FERC: No sir. You have plenty of time to keep  
19 going if you'd like.

20 MR. MUNCH: I don't like being intimidated with  
21 all these people out here. They're workers, wanting a job,  
22 and I can understand that, but they're not going to be  
23 around here when that earthquake hits and I have a fire on  
24 my place. We have a little tiny fire station. It's going  
25 to be a disaster, but only for us that live there. You

1 know. If you're in Salem or Portland it really doesn't  
2 matter. I've had that place since 1944 and my father would  
3 turn over in his grave if he knew this was coming through  
4 Camas Valley. Nobody had even heard of Camas Valley until  
5 now. Now it's a very popular place.

6 My time up?

7 FERC: No, sir. You have plenty of time. You  
8 have three minutes left.

9 MR. MUNCH: Well, I don't know what else I can  
10 say except I don't like being intimidated, and we certainly  
11 are. I don't like my wife and I being separated. We have  
12 the same piece of land, that we're both separated. She  
13 doesn't know anything about the timber, and I'm beginning to  
14 think nobody else does. Because that Cedar doesn't grow  
15 every place but right where they're going. My red cedar  
16 grows there. And everybody knows that it's a wet spot where  
17 the red cedar grows. I shouldn't say everybody.

18 I don't know what else to say; I just feel very  
19 intimidated with all the people down here. Just  
20 intimidating people is not right. That's all I got to say.

21 > MR. DEL REAL: My name is Daniel Del Real. That  
22 spelling is D A N I E L, D E L space R E A L. I'm  
23 affiliated with the Pacific Northwest Regional Council of  
24 Carpenters, and I'm here to speak in favor of the project.  
25 Mainly because with my construction experience I see the

1 type of revenue that construction brings into cities. I  
2 think that that would be something that was good for a  
3 coastal city.

4           With my previous work experience, I used to work  
5 for Anderson Construction Company as a foreman for the  
6 special projects department. Some of the most saddening  
7 things I would see is that I was in charge of going out and  
8 decommissioning Bank of Americas, Merrill Lynch, Meritrust,  
9 that type of thing, when they were not being used as much  
10 anymore. So, the two that actually stood out for me the  
11 most was I did a job in Crescent City and another one in  
12 Aberdeen, both nice beach towns at one point. Actually  
13 seeing them 20 or 30 years later past their prime is just  
14 sad. They've withered away; they're not what they used to  
15 be anymore just because there's no work in that area.

16           So I think bringing in something like this, a \$9  
17 billion bring a project into the area, I feel that it would  
18 stimulate the economy as well is, just give us the kick  
19 start that it really needs again to hopefully turn that  
20 around; not let that area of the coast go the same way as  
21 these other places where there's really nothing there  
22 anymore as opposed to what it used to be.

23           And I do feel that we can do this with minimal  
24 environmental impact. Having highly trained workers that  
25 actually do the work, I feel that with all the

1 investigations prior to breaking ground and what not,  
2 there's a minimal impact to the environment and a lot to  
3 gain from doing the work.

4           FERC: You've got plenty of time if you want to  
5 continue.

6           MR. del REAL: Oh, I'm done.

7 >           MR. RODRIGUEZ: Marcus Rodriguez. M A R C U S R  
8 O D R I G U E Z. I'm with the Pacific Northwest Regional  
9 Council of Carpenters. I'm here today to speak in favor of  
10 this project because of all the construction jobs, carpenter  
11 jobs this will create over the next few years, where workers  
12 who will be making a good, honest wage with benefits. I  
13 personally have traveled all around the State of Oregon to  
14 numerous construction projects; I've seen firsthand the  
15 effects it has on the local economy, as far as boosting the  
16 local economy and helping out the local workers in those  
17 areas.

18           So I am for jobs, and this is a lot of jobs.  
19 That's my statement.

20 >           MR. CLARKE: My name is John Clarke. My address  
21 is 1102 Twin Oaks Lane, Winston. I want to make sure that  
22 my written and my oral testimony maybe can find their way  
23 together.

24           I'm going to start out with the dishonesty of the  
25 applicant. This is a pamphlet that was sent to all of the

1 landowners along with their open houses; they gave them to  
2 the public. Now they take a photograph here that shows,  
3 before construction, and, after construction. You take a  
4 look at this and you lay that tree down, that's only about  
5 30 feet.

6           This is the Ruby pipeline. If you laid that tree  
7 down, it would go the full length of that cut. Here they  
8 show that the grass is in there, but it's not here. So  
9 giving the appearance that time has passed, but if you look  
10 at these clouds, see this cloud, see this cloud, they're  
11 exactly the same. This is a doctored photograph. We will  
12 respect, first of all, property rights. But I just wanted  
13 to bring that out before I start.

14           My comments are about a 12 inch pipeline that  
15 says that they are going to give Coos Bays, or deliver to  
16 Coos Bay, 40 million cubic feet of gas a day. Here is the  
17 contract between Coos County, and Jordan Cove saying that  
18 they are going to purchase 40 million cubic feet of gas a  
19 day. It was signed in 2007. I've highlighted some spots in  
20 here and I'm going to leave you a copy of this; and it shows  
21 that they are buying 40 million cubic feet of gas per day.  
22 So, Jordan Cove is buying the gas that they're dropping off  
23 in Roseburg on the lateral. Basically that's what it is.

24           They've been collecting money, they collected  
25 \$200,000 when they signed this contract. They've gotten

1 \$25,000 a month since they've executed this contract, which  
2 was executed in September of 2007. So for ten years they've  
3 collected, the county, Coos County has collected about \$3  
4 million from that.

5           The other things that I'm submitting -- well,  
6 here, I'm going to do this one page. This is out of your  
7 draft EIS. And it shows that under the current pressures  
8 they can only deliver, here it is, .018 cubic feet of gas a  
9 day which is 18 million cubic feet of gas a day. No where  
10 near 40 million cubic feet of gas a day.

11           If they ran it up to 680 PSI, they could deliver  
12 36, still not the 40 million. So, the total capacity of  
13 that pipe, the 12 inch pipe, that the citizens of Coos  
14 County paid to have installed is going to be used by the  
15 facility. So when they say that they are putting these hot  
16 caps out and all these communities are going to have gas,  
17 that's not true. These are photographs. The yellow marker  
18 for the gas, you see this sign here. This is what the sign  
19 says, it's on both sides of the Bay. Comes right across  
20 here, right across the Bay, and that's where it dead ends;  
21 it dead ends on the Northern Spit.

22           So all the gas that comes from that 12 inch  
23 pipeline goes to Jordan Cove. It does not go to the public  
24 here. I wanted to have that in the record. I put it in the  
25 record last time, too.

1                   And that's what I have.

2                   FERC: So everything this envelope you'd like on  
3 the record?

4                   [Documents for the record]

5 >                MS. HAYNIE: Christine, C H R I S T I N E. Last  
6 name Haynie, H A Y N I E. Address: 940 Washburn, W A S H B  
7 U R N, Lane, Medford, Oregon, 97501. My affiliations are  
8 Rogue Climate, Southern Oregon Climate Action Now, and the  
9 Southern Oregon No LNG Coalition.

10                 So, I have just a few comments. I'll be brief.  
11 I'm here really to comment on my opposition to the Jordan  
12 Cove terminal and the facility and the Pacific Connector LNG  
13 Pipeline. I've commented a lot; I've done this before, but  
14 I just want to say again, I really urge the Commission to do  
15 a complete environmental impact study that includes a full  
16 cycle assessment on all greenhouse gas emissions. I don't  
17 think that's been done in the last EIS statements.

18                 I don't think the climate change has been looked  
19 at enough as an impact. And, I think that particularly the  
20 more recent science that talks about methane as being a  
21 worse greenhouse gas emitter, even than coal. And I urge  
22 the Commission to start looking at really recent scientific  
23 data that is supported by the majority of scientists  
24 worldwide, that this is true.

25                 And, so again, the assessment be up on current



1 science generally, and be related to climate change; and the  
2 other thing is it just makes no sense for us to continue to  
3 build fossil fuel infrastructure in the face of what is  
4 going to be the biggest problem facing the world; and that  
5 is impacts due to climate change that humans are  
6 contributing to through the use of fossil fuels. We have to  
7 start making the transition, and we can't make that  
8 transition at a time when we're putting tons of money into  
9 fossil fuel infrastructure. Those are my main points.

10 FERC: You've got plenty of time, so anything else you want  
11 to say.

12 Ms. HAYNIE: I'll just leave it at that. That's  
13 fine.

14 [Documents for the record]

15 > MS. BAUMANN: My name is Lori Baumann. L O R I, B  
16 A U M A N N and I'm here on behalf of the laborers union,  
17 LIUNA, Local 737. LIUNA is L I

18 # N A. We are in strong support of the Jordan  
19 Cove Energy Project. This project will not only initially  
20 be adding hundreds of family-wage construction jobs but also  
21 maintenance and operation jobs following its completion.  
22 Our members, 2,500 of them, are ready and wanting to be put  
23 to work on this project that will both allow them work  
24 securely for several years and help boost our coastal  
25 economy around the terminal itself. With the utilization of

1 our members, this energy project will be built safely and  
2 efficiently by some of the best trained construction  
3 workers in the world.

4           The Jordan Cove energy project has been under  
5 discussion for years now and should not be delayed further.  
6 The stakeholders have been working on this project  
7 tirelessly and as of earlier this year, with the vote of  
8 measure 6-162, members of the community have spoken by  
9 saying they want to be allowed to have these kind of  
10 projects in their area.

11           The benefits to Oregon's economy as are the long-  
12 term environmental goals it serves internationally. The  
13 ability to produce, store, and export LNG to Asia is crucial  
14 to the global environmental fixes. First, much of the air  
15 pollution created by East Asia comes directly back across  
16 the Pacific to the western U.S. The larger scale export of  
17 natural gas will help move their energy production in a  
18 cleaner direction and as a state that boasts environmental  
19 progress, it is our duty to ensure we do all we can to help  
20 the international effort to combat climate change.

21           Second, this pipeline is a phenomenal method of  
22 transit considering the alternatives. Transporting natural  
23 gas via train or truck not only uses fossil fuels but relies  
24 on riskier modes of transportation, more prone to dangerous  
25 accidents, and spills. The pipeline provides us with safer

1 and less greenhouse gas heavy mode of moving this product.

2           On behalf of LIUNA I strongly urge you to take  
3 these environmental factors under consideration in the  
4 creation of the environmental impact statement.

5           Thank you very much.

6 >           MR. JACKSON: I'm Gary Jackson. I'm a business  
7 rep for the Laborers International Union of North America.  
8 Local 737. Being raised in the area that the Pacific  
9 Connector is going to be routed through, I'm quite familiar  
10 with the landscape and the history of the area. I was  
11 raised in Drew, not far from Tiller. Growing up I attended  
12 school at Tiller Elementary. At that time there was a  
13 robust timber Industry. The town of Tiller had two gas  
14 stations, two restaurants, a grocery store with a sporting  
15 goods section and a meat locker. A tavern, a post office,  
16 several apartments, two lumber mills, and a US Forest  
17 Service complex.

18           Everything now is closed or gone, with the  
19 exception of the post office and the Forest Service complex.  
20 The town of Drew has two stores and they're both gone now.  
21 So, me and the residents, including myself, have left due to  
22 lack of work in the area. The Jordan Cove Pacific Connector  
23 Project has an opportunity to change the situation and help  
24 to revive the economies in towns like Tiller and Drew.

25           There's been much controversy over the pipeline

1 regarding safety and the route. The materials and  
2 technology used in this pipeline's construction is the most  
3 modern, up-to-date there is. Verizen has considered all of  
4 the safety concerns. The environment and cultural impacts  
5 have been taken into consideration, also. As a tribal  
6 member of the Cow Creeks, I'm very comfortable with the  
7 actions and precautions that Verizen has put in place  
8 concerning their historic tribal area. The EIS has been  
9 approved in the past, and I don't see a reason why they  
10 shouldn't approve it again. This project is critical to the  
11 livelihood of this region; not just those two little towns,  
12 but this region in general. It's a \$10 billion project  
13 that has the potential to improve the lives of many  
14 Oregonians and the environment.

15 I've sat on a lot of committees and panels that  
16 have reviewed a lot of the safety of this pipeline as well  
17 as the environmental aspect, and I'm very comfortable with  
18 it or I wouldn't be backing it. I have a lot more at stake  
19 in this than a lot of people do because of my cultural  
20 history with this property. My family has been in that  
21 valley for literally thousands of years. I don't want to  
22 see it destroyed, and I feel it can be comfortably done with  
23 the precautions and stuff and the environmental mitigation  
24 that has been put into place, already approved once already.

25

1           So I would encourage FERC to consider issuing  
2 these permits and approving the EIS. Thank you.

3 >           MR. BROWN: All right. So, my name is Jeffery  
4 Brown. J E F F E R Y. B R O W N. I'm affiliated with the  
5 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 659  
6 in Central Plain, Oregon.

7           So the IBEW Local 659 supports the LNG pipeline.  
8 We are experienced in the construction and maintenance of  
9 electrical grids and hydroelectric infrastructure including  
10 transmission and distribution lines that traverse both  
11 private and public lands including national forests. We are  
12 aware of the diligence that union workers exercise to ensure  
13 the protection of the environment. We are also aware of the  
14 ongoing monitoring and rehabilitation of the lands that  
15 continue through the term of operations and regulatory  
16 compliance with FERC and partnership government and private  
17 organizations.

18           This pipeline will stimulate the local economies  
19 and provide living wage jobs. Additionally, these job  
20 opportunities will provide opportunities for additional  
21 people to enter into apprenticeships and become trained and  
22 skilled careers that will provide for them and their  
23 families after the completion of the construction. We have  
24 no objections at all. And that concludes my statement.

25 >           MR. CARPENTER: My name is Chris Carpenter. C H R

1 I S. C A R P E N T E R. Standard. I'm with the Oregon and  
2 Southern Idaho District Council of Laborers. We're strongly  
3 in support, obviously, of the Jordan Cove Energy Project.  
4 I'm going to try to keep it brief.

5 I think that obviously this project has been  
6 going on for a lot of years now. The project has done a lot  
7 of work to try to work with local communities and  
8 stakeholders. There's been a lot of revisions to the FERC,  
9 well, mostly for the pipeline. Working with local  
10 landowners where it might be going across there, trying to  
11 make sure that it's also going to be as environmentally  
12 friendly as possible.

13 Coos Bay, as you probably know, put it up to a  
14 vote recently, and people didn't say that they do not want  
15 to ban this project; so they're getting excited about the  
16 terminal going in, and all these things, the pipeline going  
17 in. We think that also, our guys are going to be able to do  
18 good work out there on it. We've done this kind of work  
19 before. They've built pipelines before -- not a large  
20 issue; we've already got thousands of miles of pipeline in  
21 Oregon; we don't think this one is going to be much  
22 different.

23 Additionally, we think of the environmental  
24 impact side of it. It will likely cut down a lot of the  
25 greenhouse gas emissions, etcetera, coming out of train or

1 truck alternatives that might end up coming in for this kind  
2 of quantity of natural gas coming across.

3           Finally, I would be really remiss if I didn't  
4 mention that we're also very excited about the massive  
5 number of jobs that will be created by this project, both  
6 for our guys and the other construction industries. That's  
7 about it.

8           FERC: Thank you.

9 >           MR. RANGER: My name is Patrick Ranger; P A T R I  
10 C K R A N G E R. My organization?

11           FERC: Yes, please.

12           MR. RANGER: Laborers International Union of  
13 North America. Thank you for your time today. Let me begin  
14 by telling you that I was not born and raised in the Coos  
15 Bay area. I came there 20 years ago and what I found was a  
16 community of hard working, proud individuals having a tough  
17 time. Both logging and fishing industries were gone and  
18 finding any work was next to impossible.

19           Of course, as people do, they picked up the  
20 pieces but good wage jobs weren't on the horizon anytime  
21 time soon. Myself, I took a minimum wage job until I was  
22 called out on my first pipeline job. I believe this project  
23 would be a godsend for Coos Bay, North Bend, and Charleston.  
24 Sure, they are short term construction jobs involved, but  
25 we're construction workers and that's what we do. Some of

1 us have made a career and a good living building short term  
2 construction jobs.

3           The LNG plant is another matter. Once it is  
4 built it will require services of maintenance that already  
5 exist in the Coos Bay area in abundance. Then you have that  
6 community of hard working people who will deeply appreciate  
7 those blue collar jobs. Please give this project thoughtful  
8 consideration, and the impact your decision will make on  
9 this corner of Oregon will be felt for decades. Thank you  
10 very much.

11 >           MR. RICKER: My name is Mitch Ricker. M I T C H  
12  
13 R I C K E R. I work for the Laborers Union Local 737 out of  
14 Portland. We really support this project and want to see it  
15 go through for our members who live down here. Years ago I  
16 used to live outside of Roseburg here for quite a while, and  
17 obviously don't live here because there's no work. We  
18 really want to see this go through for our members and it's  
19 going to be great for the economy. The jobs that it's going  
20 to leave behind are some really high paying jobs for the  
21 people that will stay working at the facilities. We just  
22 want to show our support.

23 >           MS. HANRAHAN: Carol Hanrahan. H A N R A H A N.  
24 That's it, you don't want to know where I'm from or  
25 anything?



1           FERC: If you want to put it on the record you  
2 can, you don't have to.

3           MS. HANRAHAN: I live in Roseburg, Oregon.  
4 97470. I'm not with any affiliations except the good earth.  
5 So, I'll begin. The points that I would like to cover are,  
6 and their material is, all those jobs that Jordan Cove says  
7 that they're going to have, I think, quote, 'thousands of  
8 jobs,' it's a government contract. They should mention what  
9 those jobs are and their salaries. Just so we can keep up  
10 with the way to do one of these job proposals.

11           And, next, I'd like to know if the use of eminent  
12 domain is for public or private good. And, I'll skip the  
13 next one, it's a little incendiary.

14           An earthquake preparedness for the pipeline in  
15 the case of an earthquake, a tsunami, or a high water rush  
16 into the area that's in the earthquake zone, what are the  
17 protocols they have in place for emergency preparedness --  
18 and I've been asked, someone actually asked me, it's being  
19 tossed it around outside, whether putting in the pipelines  
20 can cause earthquakes. I don't know whether that is true or  
21 not, but if they could check on that.

22           And no one seems to know where the cutoffs are on  
23 the pipelines, lines, is it one line? That's a long  
24 pipeline. Where are the cutoffs on the pipeline in case of  
25 an emergency. Like are they every thousand feet or ten feet

1 or 500 feet, you know, et cetera. In here on the, it's been  
2 mentioned there are payments in lieu of taxes to Coos,  
3 Douglas, Jackson, and Klamath Counties, and it doesn't say  
4 what kind of payments these are. You know, there have to be  
5 specifics in all of these documents, to make people know  
6 what's going on.

7 I know that they say that these jobs on initial  
8 construction will pay an average of \$80,000 per year, but  
9 you have to know what kind of jobs you're talking about. I  
10 used to do government jobs, contracts and that's where I'm  
11 coming from, excuse me for that. All right, eminent domain  
12 again says that Oregonians must profit from the use of  
13 eminent domain. So they would have to prove, FERC would  
14 have to prove that Oregonians would profit. And that's  
15 beyond, that's not necessarily from taxes and revenue in  
16 that regard. Because taking that land by eminent domain is  
17 a negative and giving the counties and the state taxes,  
18 stuff like that is a positive, so they kind of cancel each  
19 other out.

20 Also, according to some of the legal documents on  
21 the Internet, like the Constitution and stuff, property  
22 owners have to be paid full value for their property in a  
23 situation like that. Like this. So, if they are aware,  
24 then the property owners would have to be notified about  
25 that particular point.

1                   And I believe that's it for me.

2       >               MR. LIEBOWITZ: My name is Stuart Liebowitz.  
3       That's S T U A R T. L I E B O W I T Z. I am speaking on  
4       behalf of the Douglas County Global Warming Coalition. The  
5       Douglas County Global Warming Coalition of Douglas County,  
6       Oregon representing approximately 500 residents in our  
7       community urges FERC to consider the climate pollution  
8       generated by these projects in the following context as it  
9       develops its NEPA analysis. The legislature of the state of  
10      Oregon has adopted aggressive short and long-term greenhouse  
11      gas reduction rules in recognition of the significant and  
12      damaging impact of climate change on our State. This  
13      project, if built, will become one of the largest single  
14      sources of greenhouse gas emissions in Oregon. As a  
15      result, the greenhouse gas reduction goals set by the state  
16      may prove unattainable. The impact of the climate pollution  
17      generated by this project needs to be considered in this  
18      context. The economic impact of the failure to meet the  
19      State's greenhouse gas reduction goals and address climate  
20      change will be particularly severe in rural Douglas County,  
21      Oregon. Our community relies on the timber industry as the  
22      most significant generator of jobs and financial security.  
23      Not only has climate change substantially increased the  
24      intensity and number of wildfires over the last 30 years, it  
25      is projected to do so even further as the rate of global

1 warming remains unchecked.

2           This represents a direct threat to the financial  
3 well being of our timber Industry. Exacerbating the  
4 economic toll on our region is increasing ocean  
5 acidification due to carbon pollution. We've already seen  
6 the impact this has had on our shellfish industry, impeding  
7 the development of oysters and mollusks, and recognizing the  
8 potential job losses in these vital industries as well as  
9 the general deleterious effect of climate change, the Oregon  
10 legislature established aggressive goals to reduce  
11 greenhouse gas emissions in our state. The Jordan Cove  
12 Energy Project must be evaluated in this context.

13           Clearly the complexity of the potentially adverse  
14 consequences of this project require a comment period on  
15 scoping longer than 30 days. We urge FERC to extend the  
16 comment period to 90 days to allow the full and fair input  
17 from the public for the scope of its analysis. The Douglas  
18 County Global Warming Coalition is an all-volunteer, grass  
19 roots organization that has worked on positive solutions to  
20 climate change over the last 14 years. We strongly urge  
21 FERC to consider greenhouse gas emissions in the context of  
22 state goals, and extend the comment period to 90 days.

23           Sincerely, The Board of the Douglas County Global  
24 Warming Coalition.

25           [Documents for the record]

1 > MR. GORDON: Bruce Gordon. B R U C E. G O R D O  
2 N. With the capital letters in the proper spot. I've been  
3 coming to these things since 2006 when it was first, at  
4 least to my recollection, it was first proposed. And, there  
5 was a lot of things I found that I was opposed to; but some  
6 things since it changed, has really impacted me a lot. I  
7 live about a mile or a mile and a quarter from the proposed  
8 pipe in the town of Milo, where it's going to cross the  
9 river. But my issue is about eminent domain.

10 In 2006 it was a vote and it was a reaction to a  
11 Supreme Court decision by some land in Connecticut where the  
12 local government took and condemned property to give to a  
13 private entity because it was going to bring in more taxes  
14 for them. A lot of people were pretty upset, and it went  
15 all the way to the Supreme Court to be judged, and the Court  
16 says, yeah, they can do it. So, that created a lot of anger  
17 amongst a lot of people, and it here in Oregon in November  
18 7th of 2006 a measure, the measure number 39 stated that it  
19 prohibits a public body from condemning private, real  
20 property if it intends to convey to a private party.

21 So, when this project turned from import to an  
22 export, that changed everything. What I would have to say  
23 would not have been viable in 2006. So, in our county, it's  
24 going to go through four counties. In our county here, 78  
25 percent of the people in our county voted to -- that said we

1 don't want this to happen. I don't have, I thought I had  
2 the paper, I had it all day today. But I think it's here.  
3 All right. Now I'll be able to tell you the four counties.

4  
5           So, it starts going through Klamath County, the  
6 proposed pipeline, 80 percent of the people say they don't  
7 want to be able to condemn land for private gain. Then it  
8 switches to Jackson County, 53 percent of the people said  
9 that. In Douglas County, our county here, 78 percent said  
10 no, this should not happen. And 75 in Coos County. Now I  
11 don't understand why the will of the people is being thrown  
12 out the window and allowed to happen. I know what the  
13 Supreme Court said but I know what the people of Oregon have  
14 said, and actually in the State, 67 percent. So in the  
15 area, except for Jackson, has been stronger to opposed to  
16 these kinds of taking of private land.

17           I just find this to be a real travesty, something  
18 that is, in fact, I'll give an example. There's a coastal  
19 management unit in Camas which, in our county they had to  
20 get a conditional use permit. Well, in the original import,  
21 the planning commission says, yeah, we'll approve the  
22 project only if it's an import, not export. But then we, it  
23 switched to being an export and the planning commission  
24 switched, too. And we were given a bait and switch. And I  
25 don't want this to happen. Where we are having the rug

1 pulled out from us.

2 I know why this company has re-filed or going to  
3 re-file. Because they're going to have a Republican  
4 administration who is, you know, totally committed to this  
5 kind of stuff and I find it really abhorrent. That's  
6 basically what I have to say.

7 We good? Are we ready to touch that? Hey,  
8 thanks a lot, guys.

9 > MR. CHASM: My name is Richard Chasm. C H A S M.  
10 I live at 730 Hoover Hill Road in Winston, Oregon. I  
11 appreciate the opportunity to address FERC on these scoping  
12 issues. I do understand how the process works, and that  
13 these scoping questions are sideboards that will guide the  
14 EIS process. I have some written comments that I will leave  
15 you with but I wanted to quickly go over them.

16 First of all, I am really disappointed with  
17 FERC's scheduling and the process of these hearings and the  
18 fact that it's at UCC which is difficult for people from  
19 Mountain Hills to get to. The facilities at 7 Feathers in  
20 Canyonville have hosted FERC hearings, and could be done  
21 where it's much easier for affected land owners to actually  
22 attend because they are coming from a long, long, ways a lot  
23 of them. I think that there's a lot going on in the summer.  
24 Events, weddings, vacations, and it's really, the amount of  
25 time we've had to actually receive the documents concerning

1 this proposal and actually read them and understand to make  
2 cognizant statements is extremely truncated and limited.  
3 I'm disappointed with FERC. We've been standing up about  
4 this for over 10 years now. And this is just the monkey  
5 motion. And so, no offense, but I feel that the FERC  
6 process is biased against citizens and landowners.

7           The real issue in the whole magilla is the  
8 earthquake. There's a 100 percent probability of an immense  
9 and historic earthquake off Oregon coast. Very, very,  
10 possibly in the lifetime of this project; and this is  
11 serious business. I don't know a lot about everything but I  
12 was raised in Olalla in the Kamas Valley in coast range and  
13 this is some extremely rugged terrain with absolutely  
14 unpredictable weather. And I mean, regardless of the  
15 earthquake, it shrinks and swells and comes apart every  
16 winter now. Look at the mess along highway 42. And it's  
17 the length of the coast range. And these guys want to build  
18 a high-pressure, rigid pipeline through this? Back on the  
19 other side of Weaver Ridge down into Coos County there are  
20 no slopes above Sitkum. It's solid rock for 1600 to 1800  
21 feet and they're going to dig a pipeline through there?  
22 Where are they going to hang the equipment? This is a  
23 project that, you've got to hang the equipment from  
24 somewhere. There's no tailholes. All the big timber is  
25 gone. There's no big stumps up there anymore. So what are



1 they going to hang their equipment on to get up and down  
2 those hills?

3 I think that this, the Weaver Ridge, Sitkums and  
4 all the river crossings and other sensitive places need to  
5 be designed to withstand significant earthquakes and soil  
6 movement. And I think that the applicant should consider  
7 alternative methods to cross some of these areas. They  
8 should drill rather than trying to go up and down; and I  
9 know that's a complex thing, but the entire Jordan Cove  
10 installation, the powerhouse needs to withstand a tsunami as  
11 well as this earthquake. I mean, it's the real deal; and  
12 I'm the president of a little irrigation district, and we  
13 administer the water in Bear Creek Dam so we've been  
14 addressing dam issues and all of a sudden, boom. Can this  
15 damn survive the earthquake?

16 And we have got a serious issue in front of our  
17 little board right now about what we've got to do to have  
18 this little 90 foot high earthen filled dam survive the  
19 earthquake. Shouldn't these people have to do that, too?  
20 And, I do not respect the Applicant's experts; and that some  
21 of the world experts on tsunamis and earthquakes and what  
22 happens in these events is at Oregon State University. We  
23 need the State of Oregon to have scientific peer-review and  
24 final approval of engineering on these projects.

25 These guys propose to do this, we have a right to

1 see what they're going to do. Because this is life and  
2 death to people out here. And when something goes wrong and  
3 there's a fire, the people out in the hills are going to be  
4 the ones who are going to have to get up there and go.

5           Then finally, I think that how this right-of-way  
6 gets cleared, local people doing the work. A lot of the  
7 debris that will come out is what needs to go in the rivers  
8 for mitigation for salmon and habitat, and I think there  
9 ought to be a lot closer relationship between the applicant  
10 and these restoration agencies. They're out there. They've  
11 got the skills.

12           So, there's my written statements. And I do  
13 appreciate you taking the time to come listen to us.

14           [Documents for the record]

15 >           MS. DEVEAU: Lee. L E E. Deveau. D E V E A U.  
16 I'm submitting the following comments in regards to the  
17 Jordan Cove Energy Project and Pacific Connector Pipeline.  
18 In considering these projects it is imperative that the  
19 Federal Regulatory Energy Commission thoroughly examine and  
20 address the full impacts of the project on water quality for  
21 each stream and wetland impacted. Jordan Cove and Pacific  
22 Connector must be required to rely on up-to-date site-  
23 specific information to evaluate the impacts of the  
24 proposals. Outdated data from previous iterations of the  
25 project including wildlife or plant surveys that may no

1 longer reflect current conditions, must not be allowed.

2 I also request that the Federal Energy Regulatory  
3 Commission extend the comment period for the scoping  
4 hearings from 30 days to 90 days and add a hearing in  
5 Jackson County. Given the magnitude and complexity of these  
6 projects it is imperative that the public has adequate time  
7 to thoroughly examine the documents submitted by Jordan Cove  
8 and Pacific Connector. It is also imperative that a hearing  
9 be held in Jackson County, which is the most populous county  
10 directly effected by these projects. Please note that  
11 Oregon Senators Wyden and Merkley and Oregon Governor Brown  
12 have also requested that the comment period be extended and  
13 a hearing be held in Jackson County. Thank you.

14 [Document for the record]

15 > MS. RAVEN: My name is Amy, A M Y. Raven, R A V E  
16 N. My main concerns about this whole pipeline's safety and  
17 putting the pipeline near where there are forest fires, a  
18 terrific danger of that. In fact, some of the pipeline will  
19 be above ground. If there's no odor to it where you can  
20 tell it's leaking, I think it's very dangerous.

21 And one of the other concerns I have has to do  
22 with pollution to the rivers, to the animals. It's crossing  
23 so many streams. I don't think there's been -- there needs  
24 to be a more current environmental assessment then what was  
25 done in the past with Verizen. I do understand that the

1 jobs and the unions' positions. But I don't think they will  
2 be correct that this company will provide the jobs that they  
3 say they will. I think that they are likely to undercut the  
4 unions and they've done that in other places.

5           There just needs to be a better way to move  
6 whatever it is they're moving; going through Southern Oregon  
7 is not a good thing. I know people whose land is going to  
8 be crossed, and they have no say, so it's right through the  
9 middle of their property. It's not a good thing. The  
10 amount that's being offered for eminent domain is very small  
11 compared to the value of the property itself. The other  
12 argument I have is that eminent domain should not be used  
13 for an international company. It's illegal to use that  
14 process for this purpose.

15           And that's all.

16 >           MR. LOZNAK: My name is Alexander Loznak. A L E  
17 X A N D E R L O Z N A K. And I can begin? I grew up well.  
18 I grew up on my family's farm in Douglas County, but I am  
19 currently going to Columbia University in New York City.  
20 I'm studying sustainable development and am going to get  
21 whatever expertise I can on this. I'm 20 years old, and so  
22 possibly one of the very youngest who is going to testify  
23 today about this project. I'd like to do what I can to  
24 bring a youth voice to the table considering my generation  
25 is the future of this state and our great country.

1           I want to first just express concern about local  
2 landowners and the questionable practice of eminent domain  
3 that I believe is extremely undemocratic, to forcibly take  
4 away these local folks' land as well as local impacts to old  
5 growth trees, local environment, and 400 bodies of water.

6           The main point that I want to drive home, I urge  
7 FERC to consider the cumulative climate change impacts of  
8 this project. That includes production of natural gas,  
9 leaks of natural gas, of methane which is an extremely  
10 potent greenhouse gas, the emissions from transportation.  
11 As we all know, the liquefaction plant in Coos Bay would be  
12 the biggest source of greenhouse gas in Oregon.

13           I did just a quick calculation with some numbers  
14 from EPA and I think the Energy Information Administration.  
15 That said if you were to burn the, I believe, it's 1 billion  
16 feet of natural gas that this project will transport. That  
17 if you burn all of that gas, it would produce the emissions  
18 equivalent to about 4 million standard passenger cars. I  
19 urge FERC -- the state of Oregon Governor Kate Brown  
20 recently committed to sticking with the targets of the Paris  
21 agreement. I urge FERC to consider how the cumulative  
22 emissions of this project will undermine the targets that  
23 Governor Brown committed to under the Paris Agreement, in  
24 the environmental impact statement. It is an incomplete  
25 statement, environmental impact statement unless it

1 describes precisely how this project will undermine our  
2 goals as a state.

3           It is so crucial to consider the impacts over  
4 time, over several decades that this project will be in  
5 operation. But the company, as I understand, has said they  
6 are going to invest \$7 to 10 billion into this project.  
7 Meaning they expect to a return on their investment. They  
8 want to operate this project over the course of decades  
9 during my lifetime. I request that FERC will provide a time  
10 table and study the time period over which this project will  
11 function before being decommissioned and the emissions that  
12 it will produce over that period of time.

13           In closing I'd just like to say there are two  
14 options. If this project is really approved there are only  
15 two logical possibilities: One is that it will continue  
16 operating over the course of decades, spewing untold amounts  
17 of greenhouse gas pollution during my lifetime. That option  
18 is really unthinkable, in my mind. The second option is  
19 that the ambitious climate change policies like our state  
20 has expressed support for will lead to the early  
21 decommissioning of the project, in which case the company  
22 would lose its multi-billion dollar investment in new  
23 infrastructure.

24           To my mind, both of these possibilities are  
25 unthinkable, and I think it would be much more convenient

1 for all parties involved including the public, the companies  
2 involved, and the regulatory agencies to simply deny the  
3 project and not allow it to move forward. If it goes  
4 forward, I think you guys are probably going to get sued,  
5 and as a perspective possible future law student, I'd love  
6 to be the attorney arguing that case.

7           And I think that's everything I had, so thank you  
8 very much.

9           >           MS. FORT: Shelly Fort. My name is Shelly Fort,  
10 S H E L L Y F O R T. I'm a mother, a teacher, a hiker,  
11 and a nature lover. My family and I moved to Oregon for its  
12 natural beauty, forests, endless hiking and outdoor  
13 opportunities and clean air and water.

14           I am concerned about all of the many negative and  
15 dangerous aspects of the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline and  
16 Jordan Cove Energy Project. But today, I will speak about  
17 the dangers to Oregon's land, water, and wildlife. This 232  
18 mile, 36 inch, high-pressure gas pipeline would cross 400  
19 bodies of water in Oregon. These crossings would require  
20 extensive riparian cutting that would increase water  
21 temperatures in streams and of course, have negative effects  
22 on the fish.

23           Extensive dredging for terminal construction in  
24 the Coos Bay estuary would have a catastrophic impact on  
25 these habitats and marine systems. A hundred foot wide,

1 permanent clear cut made for the pipeline would increase the  
2 risks of erosion which would then affect the drinking water  
3 of fish and animals, and ruin the fish habitat. This clear  
4 cut would also sever the connection of tree canopies which  
5 species such as the red tree boa use to travel. The project  
6 would negatively impact 29 federally endangered or  
7 threatened species including Coho Salmon, Marbled Murrelet,  
8 Northern Spotted Owl, six species of whale, and four species  
9 of sea turtle.

10 FERC needs to consider the direct, indirect and  
11 cumulative effects to fish and wildlife that will be  
12 impacted by the proposed LNG terminal and pipeline,  
13 including threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead and  
14 wildlife.

15 Thank you for your time.

16 [Documents for the record]

17 > MS. CHANDLER: Elizabeth Chandler, E L I Z A B E  
18 T H C H A N D L E R. Well, I'm just going to read from this  
19 part that I totally agree with is: I am deeply concerned  
20 about the safety, public health, environmental, climate  
21 pollution and economic impacts of the Jordan Cove LNG  
22 Terminal and the Pacific Connector Pipeline project. The  
23 projects will harm Oregonians, our environment, and our  
24 climate. They are inconsistent with the public interest.  
25 Additionally, I am concerned that FERC's public engagement



1 process would have hurt the public's ability to provide  
2 comment and learn about the projects because of the strong  
3 interest and the region-wide impacts of this project. I  
4 urge FERC to expand the scoping process.

5           Then I want to focus in on, FERC must consider  
6 the climate changing pollution that would be generated by  
7 all aspects of this project. FERC must consider the direct,  
8 indirect, and cumulative impact of fracked and conventional  
9 gas production, transport, liquefaction, and end use.  
10 Including the contribution of leaked methane gas to the  
11 overall carbon pollution from these proposals.

12           Currently, British Columbia's LNG has stalled  
13 because of economic obstacles, perhaps worse than the  
14 political ones, due to the collapse in global prices.  
15 CSykLang.org: Why has BC's LNG industry stalled? I just  
16 read the announcement that France is planning on denying all  
17 new permits for oil and gas drilling, all of it. We should  
18 also lead in this way. FERC can be a model for future  
19 generations of leaders by demonstrating decision making that  
20 reflects thoughtfulness, that is science-based, and grounded  
21 in integrity.

22           I have hope that you will listen to all sides and  
23 recognize that we are in a climate emergency. Together we  
24 can transition to clean energy. This transition translates  
25 to more jobs that are clean and safe and will result, and

1 that will result from denying this pipeline and being more  
2 future oriented and competitive with other countries, and  
3 working together as a nation I believe we can do this.

4 We've done it before.

5 Thank you.

6 > MS. PARTRIDGE: My name is Carolyn Partridge. C A  
7 R O L Y N. Last name is Partridge, spelled like the bird, P  
8 A R T R I D G E.

9 Well, I have a lot of concerns about this  
10 project. I have concerns about the eminent domain. I have  
11 concerns about safety. But I'm really going to stick to the  
12 overarching concern that I have which has to do with global  
13 heating, global warming of the planet. A huge amount of  
14 that is caused by burning of fossil fuels, and I feel like  
15 this project needs to be considered by FERC from that  
16 perspective, the perspective of global warming and trying to  
17 prevent it and how we can prevent it.

18 And so, I feel like, well, I know exactly what I  
19 want to say, and I do. So, they want to consider the  
20 impacts of this project on global warming, not just at the  
21 end use of it in Asia, but the leakage around the wellheads.  
22 The possibility of leaking anywhere along the pipeline. The  
23 possibility of what could happen, if how much methane could  
24 get released if there's an earthquake which it's not a  
25 question of if, it's when, and it will be a large subduction

1 quake. We'll have this facility built right on the  
2 earthquake fault and a tsunami zone.

3           And this is going to be a huge project; and so  
4 rightly the company's going to want to recoup their  
5 investment in this project and so they'll want to see this  
6 project run to the end of its life-span, and that's the  
7 problem. The problem is that approximately 97 percent of  
8 climatologists say that we have to leave 80 percent the of  
9 fossil fuels in the ground in order to prevent catastrophic  
10 global warming; in other words, feedback loops. You work  
11 for FERC; you probably know that -- the feedback loops are  
12 things like the glaciers melting and the ocean expanding  
13 because it's warming, and it's releasing carbon dioxide as  
14 it expands. In other words, things over which we have no  
15 control.

16           The earth itself will start releasing carbon  
17 dioxide that it's been sequestering all this time back into  
18 the atmosphere. At that point, it's catastrophic; what  
19 could happen? So, I want FERC to deny this project.

20           And I do have one other thing to say, and this  
21 could just be off the record.

22           [Not transcribed]

23 >           MS. MCGEE: My name is Debra. D E B R A. McGee. M  
24 c G E E. Under the level principle called the public trust  
25 the government has a duty to protect shared natural

1 resources, to hold them in trust and for future generations.  
2 This public trust is in our U.S. Constitution. The fourth  
3 amendment says the government must guarantee citizens rights  
4 to life, liberty, and property.

5           Ninety-seven percent of the world's scientists  
6 agree on research that says 350 parts of carbon pollution is  
7 the upper limit of a safe, livable, atmosphere. Scientific  
8 research says that in May of 2017 we passed 411 parts per  
9 million of carbon pollution. Scientists say we have warmed  
10 the climate by 1 to 3 and more carbon will mean a 3 to 6  
11 increase. Environmental impact statement must consider  
12 cumulative greenhouse gas emissions that will result from  
13 the Jordan Cove/Pacific Connector project. These emissions  
14 happen during gas production, transportation, liquefaction  
15 and end use burning.

16           Scientific data has shown that due to the  
17 propensity of methane to leak at every junction, what first  
18 was thought to be a clean bridge fuel now is known to be as  
19 polluting as burning coal. By failing to consider the  
20 cumulative impacts of fossil fuel emissions, the FERC is  
21 violating the public's constitutional rights. In order to  
22 uphold all current and future citizens' constitutional  
23 rights to life, liberty, and property, the FERC must  
24 consider greenhouse gas emissions and how they affect  
25 citizens in their environmental impact statement.

1 Thank you. Can I submit this to you?

2 [Document for the record]

3 > MR. NESBIT: James Nesbit, I go by Jim. N E S B I  
4 T. Currently, I'm living in Springfield. I lived in Coos  
5 Bay, before, actually North Bend, worked at the area  
6 hospital for 11 years. So one of my concern, just having  
7 lived there, families do picnics on the North Spit, and I  
8 can't find out if that's going to be open or there will be  
9 no access past, and be sited right across from the airport.

10

11 But then moving on to the other concerns that I  
12 have. Disrupting the people, having to enact eminent domain  
13 seems to be a little unfair. The old growth forest that it  
14 has to go through, right now, old road forests in Oregon are  
15 less than 1 percent of what they used to be, and they used  
16 to be able to protect them a little bit better. Not to  
17 mention the streams, the pipeline goes through five major  
18 streams, the Umpqua as well as the Coos and what not.  
19 That's a concern, and especially with a chance of leakage.

20 I understand they haven't confirmed it, that  
21 there have been some problems with the one in North Dakota.  
22 They do leak. Things go wrong. The train derailment up in  
23 Washington. I mean things happen and presents danger to the  
24 people. Is the gain worth it? I think the jobs have been  
25 overstated of what they're going to create, what they're

1 going to do, and there's going to be devastation on the  
2 recreational industry, so there's a give and take when it  
3 comes to industry.

4 I think the employees will be coming from out of  
5 town. There was a thing in the Roseburg paper that the  
6 contractors here couldn't get enough qualified help. I  
7 don't know if that's a ploy just to get cheaper labor in,  
8 which sometimes happens.  
9 But it is a concern that the game hardly offsets the  
10 detriment to the people along the way and the environmental  
11 along the way. Thank you very much.

12 > MR. WILLIAMS: My name is John Paul Williams. My  
13 main concern is that --

14 FERC: Can you spell your name as well.

15 MR. WILLIAMS: J O H N. P A U L. W I L L I A M  
16 S.

17 My main concern is that FERC should be preparing  
18 a supplemental rather than a full environmental impact  
19 statement. The supplemental EIS should be limited to  
20 updating any dated information from the prior EIS which was  
21 certified only a year and a half ago. It should identify  
22 any potential remaining significant impacts and focus all  
23 the discussion on those remaining impacts and the potential  
24 effects of the proposed mitigation and how effective and  
25 efficient that mitigation will be in alleviating those

1 impacts.

2           The last EIS, it was very, very hard to read. It  
3 had projects discussed in one area, the impacts discussed in  
4 another area, mitigation discussed in another area; I spent  
5 all my time leafing back and forth. Couldn't match them up.  
6 Couldn't determine where the projects are mitigated. They  
7 may have been, but it was impossible to figure it out.

8           Now the baseline for this project, should take  
9 note, the land use has already been approved. This has  
10 always been an industrial zoning. It was formerly a pulp  
11 and paper mill who's air emissions were greater than the  
12 proposed project. The new project, by eliminating the power  
13 plant, will have vastly reduced air quality emissions, and  
14 by now those emissions can be considered less than  
15 significant and I don't see them meriting much discussion in  
16 the environmental impact.

17           This is the third environmental impact statement  
18 on this project, it is an unnecessary duplication and a  
19 waste of energy efforts. I reviewed the Chenier project in  
20 Louisiana; much, much larger and they didn't even do an  
21 environmental impact statement at all. Chenier was approved  
22 with an environmental assessment even though it was much  
23 larger than this project. I don't see the point in forcing  
24 this project through a third EIS. A supplemental EIS would  
25 be much more efficient use of resources.       All done.

1 Thank you.

2 FERC: Thank you.

3 > MS. HEYL: My name is Linda Heyl, H E Y L. Linda  
4 is L I N D A. I'm from Eugene. I'm a volunteer with  
5 350.org LNG. Ferc must carefully and fairly consider JCEP's  
6 claim that supplying LNG to Asian markets will help  
7 ameliorate carbon emissions by supplanting coal use. This  
8 is a faulty argument. There's not guarantee of this. The  
9 use of LNG may be added to the use of coal or other fossil  
10 fuels. The global energy market must shift rapidly away  
11 from fossil fuel. and this may as likely delay the  
12 transition to non-fossil fuel sources of energy.

13 FERC must assure that the pipeline does not pass  
14 under power lines if this is prohibited. I have heard that  
15 in Douglas County it is to pass under power lines and  
16 apparently or perhaps that is not permitted.

17 FERC must require JCEP to demonstrate real  
18 contracts with buyers. FERC must recognize that JCEP has,  
19 according to their website, to date, only preliminary  
20 agreements to Japanese buyers Jera and Itochu. According to  
21 the general overview, documents submitted by the project.  
22 These two buyers together would purchase only 3 MTPA of the  
23 projects' 7.8 MTPA capacity.

24 In the general overview, Section 1.2.2. Global  
25 LNG Market, JCEP describes the falling prices and



1 uncertainty in the global LNG market. It gives no source of  
2 the claim that JCEP expects that that market will recover  
3 and demand will double by 2023. It is not enough to hope  
4 for and there is no reason to assume that Japan will invest  
5 in LNG from the US when its long-term contracts expire in  
6 2020, as JCEP states.

7           FERC must question the concept of or need for an  
8 infrastructure build-out for a, quote 'bridge,' unquote, or  
9 quote 'transition,' unquote. Fossil fuels like LNG. Large  
10 scale non-fossil fuel energy infrastructure can and should  
11 be developed now and will require large investments of  
12 money, resources, and person power. The infrastructure for  
13 the JCEP is not ready and waiting to go. The pipeline, the  
14 terminal, and the huge transport ships must be built. Where  
15 will the energy sector be in seven years, 2024, when this  
16 project is complete? Rather than investing all the money,  
17 resources, and person power needed to develop this so called  
18 'bridge,' which would last 20 to 30 years, and to wring the  
19 last dollars out of fossil fuel, the true need is to invest  
20 in non-fossil fuel energy sources, now.

21           FERC must require JCEP to obtain a new economic  
22 impact, again, economic impact evaluation for the current  
23 application. The 2013 economic impact evaluation by Hovee,  
24 H O V E E and Company is no longer applicable to the current  
25 project design, especially because the South Dune power

1 plant will not be built. Jobs and spending by workers in  
2 the local community are used by JCEP as a selling point for  
3 this project.

4 The 2013 EIE estimated 2,100 jobs over four years  
5 with fewer than 20 percent filled by local residents,  
6 defined as a 50 mile radius. However, the project as  
7 currently planned will require substantially fewer workers  
8 and fewer workers or a shorter bill time would produce a  
9 smaller economic impact to the local economy.

10 And if you like, if possible, I'll leave a copy  
11 of that economic impact report which is now outdated.

12 Thanks.

13 [Document for the record]

14 > Ms. LANZHAMMER: Linda. L I N D A Lanzhammer, L  
15 A N Z H A M M E R. Actually, I live in Jackson County. I  
16 came up here because nobody's coming here from Jackson  
17 County. And I'm not affiliated with any group particularly,  
18 but I do, I'm involved with environmental groups, locally,  
19 but not anything else. So, actually, I've been a resident  
20 of Jackson County for over 20 years.

21 For me the biggest issue really is the  
22 environment and I just see this whole project being very  
23 adverse to a long-term situation. The quality of life in  
24 Oregon, which I think my idea was we were going towards more  
25 renewables, and this is just the opposite of what we should

1 be doing.

2           So, I actually was going to submit this, but I  
3 just thought I'd speak this because I felt it is important  
4 enough. And I put asterisks next to ones that were to me my  
5 biggest issues. And of course one of them being that  
6 they're not coming down to Jackson County, and I think that  
7 is important that all counties involved in this pipeline are  
8 allowed to have commentary periods, and then also urban  
9 centers like Portland because I think of this as a statewide  
10 issue, not just a local issue. And then I just added a few  
11 comments today in handwriting, but really just comes down to  
12 the general quality of life in Oregon and the environment  
13 being a very, very important and vital part of that.

14           So, I just, right now this is the most important  
15 issue in my personal life, more than other things that are  
16 going on politically. I feel like if this pipeline goes  
17 through, if this project goes through and things go haywire,  
18 whatever, down the road, there's no backtracking; we can't  
19 just rewrite any proposal or rewrite a new healthcare act,  
20 we are stuck with this; and I just feel like there's just  
21 too many risks involved.

22           That's really about all. And I have a daughter,  
23 she's almost 30, and I think about her future because, you  
24 know, for me, I can go along with whatever kind of comes up,  
25 and I'll get by, but I just really feel like it's really

1 important that we think about other generations to come and  
2 what we are leaving for them.

3 That's about it. And I'll just submit this with  
4 a few other personal additions. Thank you.

5 [Documents for the record]

6 > Ms. ORNELAS: My name is Claudia Ornelas. That's  
7 spelled C L A U D I A, last name is O R N E L A S. I'm a  
8 resident of Grant's Pass, my zip code number is 97526, and  
9 I'm speaking especially about the eminent domain issue. I  
10 think that the plan to export fracked gas from Canada across  
11 southern Oregon, to Asian markets, across the Pacific is a  
12 disaster.

13 As a tax paying residents of this beautiful  
14 state, we deserve property owner protection. The resources  
15 and natural wonders of our state could be wasted and  
16 permanently damaged. Hundreds of landowners would be  
17 subject to eminent domain, manned takeovers. This would  
18 result in a loss of democratic, constitutionally guaranteed  
19 rights. People will not accept this. Our current social  
20 climate cannot take any more disregard for citizens  
21 recognized rights. A deed of ownership and human ties to  
22 the land have always been one of the highest recognized  
23 American values, and it is so important to protect that and  
24 the land as well.

25 I don't have anything else to say.

1 > MR. BUNCE: Alan Bunce, A L A N B U N C E.

2 The reason I'm opposed to this project is, well,  
3 there's actually many, many levels. Most of them, I'd say  
4 50 percent of them environmental and 50 percent of them for  
5 safety. I have a background as a fireman and first  
6 responder. And also worked for a hazmat, emergency hazmat  
7 clean up crew. Years ago I worked on the New Carissa  
8 cleanup. As a result of that cleanup and Governor  
9 Kitzhobber helped create a regional response team. The  
10 Regional Response Team, Northwest Area Committee, it's all  
11 run by the EPA and the Coast Guard. And their tasks has  
12 been contingency planning the Pacific Northwest coastal  
13 areas. I've worked with that crew for several years.

14 The topic of LNG came up and there is, they have  
15 no contingency plan whatsoever. They don't even know what  
16 they would do if there was a liquefied natural gas spill  
17 into the Bay. I've been on the site of one of the Jordan  
18 Cove Facilities would be located. If they had a spill of  
19 any nature, there is no way that they could contain it. It  
20 would run downhill into the Bay and be carried there to  
21 whichever way the tide is moving. It has the potential to  
22 suffocate wildlife and humans, and when it expands, when it  
23 warms in the river water, and expands, it will fill the  
24 Basin with a potentially hazardous explosive mix of air and  
25 gas when the fuel to oxygen ratio is right.

1           There are so many problems, when I tell people  
2 about what the plan is, I say that if I was a Hollywood  
3 script writer, doing a disaster movie, I couldn't write a  
4 better script.

5           They're talking about putting a three foot  
6 diameter pipe through an area known as the tidy landslide  
7 area, which is very prone to catastrophic landslides. If  
8 there is ever an earthquake from the Cascadius abduction  
9 zone, which experts say we are due, the coast range  
10 mountains here in the landslide area would just about  
11 liquefy, certainly causing catastrophic damage to the pipe.

12

13           The pipe is running through a forested area and  
14 if there was ever a fire, it would also be catastrophic. Of  
15 course, if there was a large earthquake, one of the world's  
16 renowned earthquake experts is actually from OSU, and she  
17 says that the wall of water that we will have will probably  
18 be up to 90 to 120 feet, which would certainly wipe out the  
19 facility on the Spit, in North End. And that's about it for  
20 me right now.

21 >           MS. FILOSI: So, I am Patty Filosi. P A T T Y.  
22 F I L O S I. Shall I speak about my love for the ocean, the  
23 forest, and the precious children who will live with the  
24 consequences created by the decisions that will eventually  
25 come out of these public meetings?

1           Shall I speak about the packet that I just read  
2 about, put out by FERC, that has exemptions and amendments  
3 that I am concerned about? Our riparian zones, for example,  
4 are too fragile, in my opinion to be exempted out of  
5 complete protection.           Shall I speak about my support of  
6 labors and unions and good jobs for all? Why can't clean  
7 energy, the wave of the future, be where folks find jobs so  
8 that labor and the environment no longer have to be at odds  
9 with each other?

10           Shall I speak about my fears over this  
11 geographical area with frequent wildfires and an impending  
12 earthquake which science tells us is a potential  
13 catastrophic mix with the explosive properties of natural  
14 gas?

15           Shall I speak about that this is my first time to  
16 speak up publicly and have my views recorded? Finally, at  
17 age 65, I'm feeling ready and worthy to have my citizen  
18 voice heard aloud.

19           Thank you for listening and for your  
20 consideration.

21 >           MR. BARTON: Philip Barton. B A R T O N. This  
22 pipe is crossing my property for a mile. A pipeline. But  
23 it's crossing a seasonal crick, and no problem. And like, I  
24 don't have any problem with the pipeline as long as they pay  
25 you a decent price, you know. But as far as the

1 environmental impact, I don't see any environmental impact.

2 There's nothing to bother the land too much.

3 I had some more stuff written down, but I just  
4 wanted to say that three or four years ago they had a one  
5 foot natural gas pipeline coming from Coos Bay to Roseburg,  
6 and they made a lot of fuss over that. A little bit of dirt  
7 got in the water and such. A year later, things kind of  
8 healed over, no problem, I don't think, anyway. Not as I  
9 was looking at it.

10 And so, you're not going to keep everything  
11 perfect. Like the rivers. Every time the river comes to  
12 flood stage and gets high, look at the rivers and they're  
13 brown; the dirt comes from somewhere. I lived on the coast  
14 all my life and logging sometimes, a tree would fall in and  
15 dirt and stuff would wash into the crick and stuff, and you  
16 can't help it. I got a rock quarry I have to kind of keep  
17 up. I try to keep the stuff out of the crick, you know, the  
18 dirt; and I have to, I got a little place where it can kind  
19 of -- like, it kind of goes into the settling pond then kind  
20 of -- I guess stuff will fall in if it's soft, but it's not  
21 dirty much. It all is dirty if it's raining hard.

22 I have taken some extra of these sheets because  
23 my family, they kind of all got their name on the property,  
24 and this I want to show them now.

25 I don't really have too much more to say but I've



1 always been -- it's not going to hurt the water. They  
2 pretty well protect it. Like that one in North Dakota Trump  
3 pushed through, it already had two or three of them under  
4 that lake was already, and this wasn't going to be deeper.  
5 Of course, I'm not an expert; I'm not an engineer.

6 My wife's family has been on this property for  
7 since about 1850 because her relations --. My wife's family  
8 is kind of related to the rebels, rebels and the West, and  
9 they married into a bunch of --. And I'm an  
10 environmentalist myself. I want clean water, clean air like  
11 everybody else. But don't be ridiculous. We need jobs, too,  
12 you know.

13 In the 60's they took all our jobs away from us,  
14 you know? Logging.

15 > MR. LEBEL: My name is Jacob Lebel. J A C O B. L  
16 E B E L. I'm from Douglas County. I live in a farming,  
17 next to Roseburg, Oregon and really my main concern today  
18 regarding the Jordan Cove project is the climate impacts.  
19 Both from fracking from where the natural gas will be coming  
20 and also from the entire processing, shipping and burning  
21 and refining of natural gas.

22 As a young person listening to the current  
23 science of climate change and the impact that burning fossil  
24 fuel will have on my future and on the society and  
25 civilization that I will grow up in, the way that it will

1 destabilize and threaten our society is deeply worrying, and  
2 so I really want to FERC to take the climate impacts of this  
3 project extremely seriously in their scoping process and in  
4 all further processes and analysis relating to this project.

5

6           This is an issue that's of, I cannot think of a  
7 more important issue for my generation. So, that is my main  
8 concern. I understand that FERC may take decisions that are  
9 of partisan origin or politically motivated such as the  
10 decision to fast track the Dakota Access Pipeline; however,  
11 I do want FERC to understand that the people that are  
12 impacted by this project are very resilient and basically,  
13 you're going to have a lot of very worried and very angry  
14 people on your hands if this process is not done in a  
15 completely transparent and in a thorough manner which  
16 involves the public.

17           Please do not fast track any scoping processes,  
18 environmental analysis, and make sure that this information  
19 is available for all of the public to see and to understand  
20 what is going on, because this is our land and our water.  
21 This is the place where we recreate, where we fish, where we  
22 grow our food. So, this project, both for its carbon  
23 emissions and methane emissions and through the actual  
24 building of the pipeline which will impact waterways and old  
25 growth forest along its routes which I have had personally

1 visited along the Pacific Crest trail.

2           The eminent domain issues associated with the  
3 pipeline will severely impact our lives. The pipeline route  
4 is currently scheduled to run about a mile out from my  
5 family farm which we've worked on and built over the past 17  
6 years. I am concerned about the risk of explosion or the  
7 fire control relating to the pipeline. I understand that  
8 there are still deep concerns as to whether Jordan Cove has  
9 sufficiently, is sufficiently prepared to deal with those  
10 dangers, and with the more and more droughts and heat waves  
11 that we're getting around my farm, and the possibility,  
12 however remote, of a wildfire sparked by some leak in the  
13 pipeline is very threatening to me and very personal.

14           That's basically what I have to say for today.  
15 Just please make sure that this process is transparent and  
16 done in a nonpartisan manner, and done in accordance with  
17 the science including the science of climate change which is  
18 basically saying that we should not be taking any fossil  
19 fuels out of the ground, we should be transitioning to  
20 renewables. So, this is the lesser of two evils, if it is  
21 lesser at all when we take into account all of the impacts  
22 of the shipping and processing of the gas.

23           So, this is a very important issue for me and let  
24 this be on the record that people out here are worried about  
25 climate change and the impacts of this project on it. They

1 need to be taken seriously. Thank you.

2 > MS. OGIER: Vanessa, V A N E S S A. Ogier, O G I  
3 E R. FERC: All right. Go ahead please.

4 MS. OGIER: Due to the rejection of the scoping  
5 meeting in Jackson County, I drove one and a half hours to  
6 be here this evening. The decision to exclude one of the  
7 four counties affected makes no sense. I urge your  
8 regulatory agency to allow the citizens of Jackson County a  
9 scoping meeting; after all, not everybody has the luxury of  
10 driving three hours on a Wednesday night. Another appalling  
11 decision is to downsize a 90 day comment period to 30 days.  
12 This does not give the public enough time to sort through  
13 the hundreds of pages recently submitted from Jordan Cove  
14 and the Pacific Connector.

15 I strongly urge FERC to consider these issues as  
16 it develops its NEPA analysis for these projects. FERC must  
17 not rely on outdated data from previous iterations of the  
18 Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector projects including  
19 wildlife or plant surveys that may no longer reflect on the  
20 ground conditions. FERC must consider alternatives to the  
21 project as a whole. FERC must also consider alternative  
22 designs to avoid potential impacts from the project. FERC  
23 must spell out specific mitigation measures and plans that  
24 can be relied upon to draw conclusions about the impacts of  
25 the project.

1           FERC should way heavily that negative impact on  
2 private landowners of the Pacific Connector which would harm  
3 private property rights through the potential use of eminent  
4 domain. FERC should address the full impacts of the project  
5 on water quality for each stream and wetland impacted. FERC  
6 should require Pacific connectors to rely on up-to-date and  
7 site specific information to evaluate impacts of the  
8 proposals.

9           FERC should consider the direct, indirect, and  
10 cumulative impacts to fish and wildlife that will be  
11 impacted by the proposed LNG terminal and pipeline,  
12 including threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead and  
13 wildlife. FERC must consider the climate changing pollution  
14 that would be generated all aspects of this project. FERC  
15 must consider the direct, indirect, and cumulative impact of  
16 fracked and conventional gas production, transport,  
17 liquefaction and end use, including the contribution of  
18 leaked methane gas to the overall carbon pollution from  
19 these proposals.

20           FERC must undertake a detailed analysis of the  
21 public safety risk associated with the terminal and  
22 pipeline. In past reviews, FERC has failed to adequately  
23 address fire and emergencies response risks along the  
24 pipeline route. Further, FERC must take a realistic look at  
25 a worst case LNG spilt fire and fire near the terminal.

1           As an Oregon citizen I oppose the proposal of the  
2 LNG project. The Pacific Northwest is overdue for an  
3 earthquake. The terminal would be located in a tsunami  
4 zone. This is only two possible natural disasters along  
5 with the flooding; the pipeline would cross over 400  
6 waterways, wildfires, and landslides or erosion. Along with  
7 the threat of natural disasters the project would infringe  
8 on the rights of over 600 landowners who are some of the  
9 most opposed to the project.

10           The pipeline would increase the carbon footprint  
11 of our state. The gas would be exploited to Asian markets,  
12 not for use in Oregon. The Coos Bay is threatened to be  
13 dredged so that LNG ships can pass in and out every 24  
14 hours. The FERC has twice already deemed this project to  
15 not be in the public interest. Between now and then the  
16 public interest is the same, if not less.

17           I urge your agency to reject the proposal for  
18 this project that only has the interests of a Canadian  
19 company in mind. That's all.

20 >           MR. ESPINOZA: My name is Ernest, spelled E R N E  
21 S T. Espinoza, E S P I N O Z A.

22           As a citizen of Oregon, I urge your regulatory  
23 agency deny the Jordan Cove project for the following  
24 reasons: Climate change is real. This project further  
25 rises Oregon's carbon footprint on the earth. Number 2,

1 that Coos Bay would require dredging for the LNG ships to  
2 enter this small bay and this would affect the livelihood of  
3 local fisherman and a lot of local tourism for the waterway.  
4 Number 3, the pipeline would pass through 400 waterways  
5 including five major rivers that many rely on for their  
6 livelihood. Also in the event of a pipeline failure, the  
7 jobs of thousands would be in jeopardy.

8 I strongly oppose the proposal of this project on  
9 behalf of the best interest of Oregonians, not for the sole  
10 benefit of a Canadian company.

11 > MR. ROTH: My name is George Roth. R O T H.  
12 Traditional spelling for George, and I am representing  
13 myself. And I would like to speak to the larger, bigger  
14 picture of the whole activity. I have a degree in Physics  
15 and Computer Science. I've been involved in technology for  
16 40 years; and I am concerned about the environment and  
17 property rights. But what I wanted to say briefly today is  
18 that as we know, the availability of hydrocarbon as a fuel,  
19 whether it's natural gas or coal or oil or one of its other  
20 forms, is a limited and finite resource on this planet.  
21 It's being used for all kinds of purposes and when it gets  
22 in short supply, there's going to be major problems. You  
23 can imagine them easily yourself.

24 I think that the resources available in North  
25 America should be kept in North America for the needs of

1 North Americans when things get rougher and should not be  
2 sent abroad, and instead allow those countries who are  
3 needing energy sources to continue the development of their  
4 solar, wind, and geothermal, hydro resources because they  
5 are already doing that and those are in the best interests  
6 of them and us.

7           So, I think the whole project of take fuel from  
8 one place in North America, shipping it across with all of  
9 the issues we've heard people talk about, and sending it  
10 offshore is short-sighted in the long run for the security  
11 of our own country and of North America. The time will come  
12 whether we're here or not, our grandkids or somebody will  
13 face challenges that we can't imagine when we start to run  
14 short on those things. We should keep it here. And that's  
15 my basic concern.

16           FERC: Thank you for your comments, sir.

17           [Pause]

18           [Whereupon at 7 p.m., the verbal comment session  
19 concluded.]

20

21

22

23

24

25



## 1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

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

6 Name of Proceeding: Jordan Cove LNG and Pacific  
7 Connector Pipeline Projects

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: PF17-4-000

16 Place: Roseburg, OR

17 Date: June 28, 2017

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

22

23

Dan Hawkins

24

Official Reporter

25

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

5

6 UMPQUA COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
7 1140 UMPQUA COLLEGE ROAD  
8 ROSEBURG, OREGON 97470

9

10 JUNE 28, 2017

11

12

13

14

15 BRUCE MORGAN - REPORTER

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 MS. MUNCH: My name is Carol Munch, C-a-r-o-l  
3 M-u-n-c-h, from Camas Valley, and this is my statement. I  
4 understand that this is a daunting task for you and I thank  
5 you for listening to our concerns. We own 80 acres of  
6 timber in Camas Valley, Oregon. Our family has owned this  
7 property since 1946. We have a home there and we also have  
8 a rental there. Our rental is occupied by a young couple  
9 with one small child. We are very concerned for the welfare  
10 of this family, ourselves, and our community.

11 The pipeline will come very close to our rental,  
12 within a driveway's width. This young family will be in the  
13 greatest danger. We have three wells, two ponds, one life  
14 creek, and one seasonal creek on our property. One pond has  
15 fish in it. There's no way to predict the affect the  
16 pipeline construction will have on our water supply. Camas  
17 Valley is a small community in the Coast Range Mountains.  
18 We are surrounded by mountains with trees. If the pipeline  
19 should leak gas and explode, which they do, this community  
20 would be surrounded by fire.

21 It would be impossible to get to the pipeline to  
22 shut it off. Many people would die. The wildlife would  
23 die. Our beautiful community would be forever changed. You  
24 have already denied this project in the past. I urge you to  
25 deny it once again. This pipeline for our community is bad

1 for our community, our wildlife, and our water supply. Our  
2 very lives are in your hands.

3 MR. MATTHEWS: Good afternoon. My name is Chris  
4 Matthews, C-h-r-i-s M-a-t-t-h-e-w-s. I'm here as a private  
5 citizen. I want to say hello to FERC. I want to thank you  
6 for being here. Thank you for the chance to speak.

7 Precedent is a big thing, as we all know. You  
8 guys have said no twice already. I hope the third time's  
9 the charm. I believe there is a federal law regarding the  
10 pipeline and this type of thing is for the public good. I  
11 do not see any public good in this pipeline or power.

12 They say jobs. There are no jobs. Oregonians  
13 do not build natural gas liquefaction plants or maintain  
14 them. They'll hire out-of-country people to actually do the  
15 clearing. My comment for this is the only jobs for the  
16 Oregonians will be cleaning the toilets in the bathrooms at  
17 the plant.

18 Another thing that, again, very much disturbs me  
19 is that if this permit goes through Veresen has the power of  
20 eminent domain. Again, eminent domain is supposed to be the  
21 taking of private property for the common good. I do not  
22 see any common good coming from the taking of private  
23 property for a foreign corporation. I know people  
24 personally whose land will be affected and it would be  
25 heartbreaking to have a swath through your land. I can't

1 even imagine looking out my window and seeing nothing but  
2 dirt for miles in any direction.

3           When they replant, it's going to be on the ridge  
4 tops. That is the harshest environment there is. It took  
5 hundred of years to get those nice, big trees up there. Of  
6 course, they'll replant, but it'll take generations before  
7 there's anything like that. So again, I just strongly  
8 encourage you to turn this down. Oregon doesn't need this.  
9 Most Oregonians, I don't believe, want it. I mean you can  
10 bus union people in, but again, they're not building  
11 pipelines. They're not building natural gas liquefaction  
12 plants. They're not going to be shipping -- you know they  
13 have nothing to do with the tankers or the shipping.

14           And the other thing, last but not least, I guess  
15 I want to say is so right now there's plenty of natural gas.  
16 But essentially, the more we export, which is good in a way,  
17 but it just means our natural gas is going to be more  
18 expensive for us. So I wish we could just kind of keep  
19 things the way they are. If this thing is so important to  
20 Veresen, why aren't they doing it in Canada? Why are they  
21 going after the four poorest counties in Oregon?

22           And again, how much natural gas will it take for  
23 them to pay for this. It's going to be a \$7 billion  
24 project. It's the most expensive project in Oregon history.  
25 Anyway, it's going to take a lot of time. Again, I want to

1 thank you very much for your time. It was nice meeting you  
2 and have a great afternoon.

3 MR. HAHM: My name is David Hahm, spelled  
4 D-a-v-i-d H-a-h-m. I'm a representative with the Pacific  
5 Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters. I was a 30-year  
6 resident of Lane County. I do represent 20,000 craft  
7 workers who are looking forward to building this project  
8 throughout our six to eight regional council. I'm the  
9 treasurer of a local that represents 1700 drywallers and  
10 metal stud framers throughout the Pacific Northwest.

11 We are looking forward to building this project.  
12 Throughout my lifetime -- let me back up a little bit.  
13 Throughout my lifetime -- I'm 34 years old. I've spent a  
14 lot of time in sports, athletics, and other events up and  
15 down our coast being a resident of Eugene. I've watched  
16 Coos County and much of the coast die over my lifetime.  
17 I've watched shops shut down. Places that I used to  
18 frequent no longer be open and it breaks my heart. I think  
19 it would be irresponsible of us to turn down a responsible  
20 project of this magnitude that's going to breathe \$10  
21 billion worth of money back into our local economy.

22 It is a great alternative to the fossil fuels  
23 that we're currently burning in the Asian countries, being  
24 coal and also nuclear power. This will lower greenhouse  
25 emissions and be a blessing to the world as it sits right

1 now until some of the other clean energies do become a  
2 realistic alternative, but again, I believe that this is a  
3 gift and it would be irresponsible of us to turn this down  
4 in our local economy. Thank you.

5 MR. ADAMS: My name is Clarence Adams,  
6 C-l-a-r-e-n-c-e A-d-a-m-s. I live at 23 Ireland Road,  
7 Winston. I'm an affected landowner out of Tallman, Oregon.  
8 I'm sure everybody's aware that Veresen stole public  
9 documents from the public libraries, claiming they were  
10 obsolete and they didn't want to confuse the landowners  
11 with bad data.

12 Well, I'm going to maintain that they needed to  
13 treat the same -- FERC the same. They need to produce all  
14 new reports so you're not confused with bad data also. You  
15 should be treated exactly the same. I would recommend any  
16 documents signed to prior to March 2016 not be used because  
17 that was the date of the first denial, so anything before  
18 that should be null and void.

19 Also, I would like for FERC to have Veresen to  
20 have a list of landowners within 300 feet of the easement,  
21 not the center line, the easement because of safety issues.  
22 I think there's more out there than they'd like to admit.  
23 So we need to know who those are and they need to be warned  
24 even if they're not affected with either an easement or a  
25 temporary work area, even if they're off the -- they're on

1 non-eminant domain properties so they know what's going on  
2 too.

3           Along with that, a lot of people are concerned  
4 about their domestic water source, so I would like to see  
5 another list -- and by the way, these lists could be  
6 counties and treated like they do the affected landowners  
7 list in the back of the EIS so there's no proprietary  
8 information give out. It should be all straightforward and  
9 above board, but I would like to see a list of landowners  
10 whose water sources -- and it can be either wells, springs,  
11 or creeks that are within 500 feet of the easement so  
12 they've got an idea of what's going on also.

13           I don't know how many documents I've seen that  
14 list the numbers of jobs. Almost all of them are different.  
15 By now they should know within 5 percent or so what jobs  
16 they need and if they can be filled by local or are they  
17 going to bring help from outside in -- highly technical jobs  
18 they need to bring help in. I'd like to see that listed by  
19 county and a list of the actual jobs required that they're  
20 going to fill.

21           And again, I'd like to see how many of those can  
22 actually be filled by local people who can work into a job  
23 and have a career ladder, as of such. You know I guess the  
24 local, non-technical jobs or whatever they have to be. And  
25 I think that's about it for me. Thank you.



1                   MR. CLARKE: My name is Robert O. Clarke,  
2 R-o-b-e-r-t O. C-l-a-r-k-e. I'm the Robert O. Clarke Tree  
3 and Energy Farm. I'm a tree farmer. This project is going  
4 to seriously impact me financially and I'm against it. I've  
5 been fighting this thing since it started as an import  
6 project. I've submitted paperwork, a report from a forester  
7 on a landslide that's off the ridge of my property to bring  
8 to their attention in the go around and I've never heard  
9 from anybody about it and then the project was just killed.  
10 And so I'm afraid now I'm going to have to resubmit all  
11 this information again just to make sure that it gets on the  
12 record.

13                   Another problem that's going to happen, even  
14 though they just cut an easement through when the cut the  
15 easement through a standing stand of timber what ends up  
16 happening is the trees that are left end up being shocked  
17 because now they're exposed to the sunlight and they get  
18 extra stresses on them, so I will have financial impacts  
19 beyond the easement of the property itself with beetle  
20 killed trees, which we have a real problem with right now of  
21 trees dying because of the drought back in 2015.

22                   You can't protect my house from the wind blowing  
23 trees down. My house is located in a thick stand of trees  
24 and your proposed project runs along the ridge top, so when  
25 you open that up it's going to allow for more wind to blow

1 through there. I don't know if it's going to affect the  
2 water issues of my property. I only have a couple of small  
3 ponds for irrigation and I'm on a well. And also the fire  
4 danger, there's no fire hydrants out where I live and so I  
5 don't see how we're going to have water available to us if  
6 something is to happen, especially, in the summertime.

7 I think this is a foolish project and I'm kind  
8 of angry at FERC for having let it drag on this long. I  
9 mean during the recession nothing moved on that project for  
10 at least a couple of years and we just get strung out and  
11 strung out and strung out and then you guys finally killed  
12 the project. That thing should've been killed a long time  
13 ago. This is a bad idea. It affects so many other  
14 industries in Oregon -- tourism, the seafood, and you're  
15 giving special preference to one industry, one industry  
16 that's probably on its way out because everything else is  
17 growing faster -- wind, solar.

18 I'm a firewood producer myself, so this is  
19 almost in a direct competition with me and that's kind of a  
20 conflict there and I just -- our county here, Douglas  
21 County, is going broke and so we're not even going to have  
22 the emergency responders that we need. I mean they're just  
23 talking about making cuts to the sheriff's department in the  
24 next couple of years, so who's supposed to fight this fire,  
25 right?

1                   The last time around they said that the Douglas  
2 Fire Protection Agency was going to be involved in that.  
3 They fight wild land forest fires, not natural gas pipeline  
4 explosions. And I live way up a narrow, dirt road three  
5 miles from the pavement. They're not going to run City of  
6 Roseburg fire trucks up to my house to save my house.  
7 They'll probably just say let's let it burn. So you're  
8 putting me at risk financially, my safety, the value of my  
9 property. I mean there's so many negatives to this thing  
10 and just because these guys want to try to save it is a  
11 joke. Yeah, that's about all I have to say on it.

12                   MS. WALKER: My name is Pat Walker. That's  
13 P-a-t W-a-l-k-e-r. I live in Durham. I have several  
14 reasons for not wanting the pipeline to be Oregon, most of  
15 which are environmental. Methane is a climate accelerant, a  
16 change accelerant much worse than carbon dioxide. And the  
17 affects of it when it begins isn't necessarily noticeable.  
18 It's kind of like having a pond where if it's covered by  
19 lily pad it will die, but it doubles every day. You don't  
20 even -- you know one day before its absolute death it's  
21 only half covered. Three days before it's only like an  
22 eighth. Four days it's only a 16th and yet you're four days  
23 away from absolute death. It just doesn't seem to be as bad  
24 until it's too late. That's what happens with expediential  
25 figures.

1           My first thing is because it is a climate change  
2 accelerant. In addition to that, it also kills plants if it  
3 leaks and it's also dangerous. That's why they add an odor  
4 to methane when the -- or any natural gas when they pipe it  
5 in you know buildings, either commercial or residential. If  
6 they do that, then I think they should also add a dye. Not  
7 just because there are people who can't smell, and there  
8 are, but mostly because we can see the extent of the damage  
9 you know from a distance. There aren't people out in the  
10 fields necessarily noticing a methane leak somewhere, but if  
11 it was purple I think any of us wouldn't drive through a  
12 purple haze without alarming at least the police and  
13 possibly the Fire Department. I think if they did that I  
14 think all of us would understand the extent of the leaking  
15 that's going on, and it is dangerous.

16           California had a leak and they didn't know about  
17 it for some time and when they final did it took them four  
18 months to stop that and that was hundreds of thousands of  
19 gallons an hour. That's a lot of methane in there. And  
20 California has a lot more attorneys and a lot more money and  
21 a lot more regulators to check on these things. Coos Bay  
22 does not. So if they let that tiger out of the cage, I  
23 don't think he's containable in the same manner it would be  
24 in great, big California, so there is that.

1           They say they'll behave, but in fact, they're  
2 powered by money. These people have deservedly a poor  
3 reputation for community spirit. They have more of a  
4 reputation for greed. Fossil fuels are not exactly  
5 improvised. They're making tons of money and so they didn't  
6 learn that because occasionally they look and think, oh, we  
7 could take two dollars less per gallon and still make a tidy  
8 little profit. That won't happen. They're going to go for  
9 the money and they've already crunched the numbers. I'm a  
10 Physics major, so I understand the numbers too. That  
11 they've figured out how much they can do to get away with  
12 cost prohibitive to building as to human life, just like the  
13 airlines do. How much is your life worth on their plane and  
14 that kind of depends on your job and how old you are, but it  
15 means a lot to you or your family hopefully. And that's the  
16 other thing.

17           The last thing is, of course -- I'm sorry.  
18 There's two more things and one of them is that the  
19 employment figures I don't think are going to actually give  
20 Coos Bay what they need. Yes, they need jobs, but how many  
21 of those are permanent, well-paying jobs? Yes, in the  
22 beginning they're going to build, but anything that you  
23 build would do that, including -- this is my last point, so  
24 I'm well within your time -- and that is we could do green  
25 power over there. It's the perfect place. It's got a bay.

1 It's right on the ocean. It's got plenty of solar that it  
2 could work with. It's got wind.

3           There are Pacific islands right now being  
4 financed by banks that are putting in sustainable energy for  
5 their entire population so that they don't have to pay  
6 anything. What they're doing is they're building solar  
7 panels. Of course, they don't work at night the sun being  
8 like it is, but during the day when they have excess power  
9 they pipe water up the top a hill and then at night they  
10 release it for hydroelectric power.

11           It's completely sustainable. They've done it on  
12 more than two islands completely furnished now. I guess we  
13 can check on them. They were financed. Yes, they're paying  
14 that back, but they've saved on the environment. They have  
15 sustainable jobs. They have no electric bill any more and  
16 they're places are coming back as tourist attractions  
17 because they're more beautiful. They don't have the green  
18 cloud boogers hanging over their town and little gas leaks,  
19 which hopefully now will have a dye in them which I'd love  
20 to see. And that is basically all the reasons, major  
21 reasons I have against this pipeline.

22           These people are powered by money and they're  
23 going to pour a ton in this and I don't doubt it. It's a  
24 ton to be made. We need to resist big business. This is a  
25 people thing. Thank you very much for your time.

1 MS. ARANDA: My name is Aida Aranda, A-i-d-a  
2 A-r-a-n-d-a, and I am a member of Laborers Local 737. So  
3 my statement today is just to talk about the workers that  
4 will be working on this project if it goes through. I'm  
5 very concerned that the -- or it's important to me that the  
6 workers on this job are well trained so that the  
7 construction of this pipeline will be done by well-trained,  
8 efficient crews and they'll be overseen by environmental  
9 inspectors.

10 The amount of safety and environmental  
11 precautions are already in place for this project to ensure  
12 that it will be completed in the best possible manner for  
13 our state's natural areas. As this LNG moves to Asia, it  
14 will be providing a much cleaner source of energy and  
15 reduces the pollution put into the air overseas, pollution  
16 that comes back to Oregon.

17 We in Oregon are proud of our environmental  
18 accomplishments and our commitment to clean energy and it's  
19 imperative that we do what we can to aid the global effort  
20 to fight climate change and this project is a step in the  
21 right direction.

22 Aside from the overseas reduction in pollution,  
23 consider that transportation of this amount of a product by  
24 trucks and trains would require a massive amount of fossil  
25 fuels and time spent on the road the pipeline will not.

1                   Finally, I want to address the jobs that will be  
2                   created by this project, hundreds of family wage  
3                   construction jobs, which are necessary for the energy  
4                   project to be completed. Over the next several years, our  
5                   members and members of other construction trades will have  
6                   stable work in their home state and locally in their  
7                   communities.

8                   Additionally, there will be longer-term  
9                   maintenance operations jobs, both at the terminal and  
10                  pipeline and keep those in mind please, as you consider the  
11                  volume and impact of the project and the importance and  
12                  necessity of this project. Thank you.

13                  MR. HARMS: My name is Jeff Harms, J-e-f-f  
14                  H-a-r-m-s. I'm from Springfield, Oregon. I'm here to  
15                  express support for the proposed LNG export facility. This  
16                  project will bring hundreds of carpenters four to five-years  
17                  worth of work, work which provides living wages, good  
18                  benefits, good working conditions, high safety standards,  
19                  and opportunities for young adult through apprenticeship.

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

23                  MR. JENSEN: My name is Matthew Jensen,  
24                  M-a-t-t-h-e-w J-e-n-s-e-n, and I'm the president and a



1 business agent for the Laborers Local 737 here in the State  
2 of Oregon.

3 I support the Jordan Cove Project or Jordan Cove  
4 and Pacific Connector Project and ask that FERC evaluate the  
5 following issues as part of its Environmental Impact  
6 Statement. The economic ripple benefits of construction  
7 workers and the public benefit analysis considering their  
8 income will contribute directly or indirectly to state and  
9 local payroll taxes and increased spending at local  
10 businesses, increase spending with local construction  
11 vendors, job training, increase local charitable  
12 contributions, and increase tourism will benefit the  
13 southern Oregon economy.

14 This project will create 3500 new construction  
15 jobs for two to four years. Of those, 800 will be for  
16 laborers here in the State of Oregon and those workers will  
17 be earning an average of \$80,000 a year, plus benefits,  
18 family benefits, including family medical care, which is  
19 more than double the average wage of southern Oregon  
20 counties.

21 The importance of Jordan Cove in reducing  
22 greenhouse gas emissions since it will displace the new  
23 coal-fired power plants in Asia just like natural gas  
24 displaced coal here in the United States is monumental to  
25 the United States. The reduction of greenhouse gas

1 emissions is a global issue and this project will help  
2 reduce those emissions by providing a new source of cleaner  
3 natural gas to countries that have limited energy resources  
4 of their own.

5           Jordan Cove and the Pacific Connector will  
6 provide great economic benefits to southern Oregon and the  
7 United States by providing the only U.S. West Coast outlet  
8 for Northern American natural gas to Asia. This will help  
9 improve our trade relationships with the Asian countries and  
10 provide needed cleaner energy to important U.S. allies such  
11 as Japan, which has already contracted for half of this  
12 project's capacity. Thank you for your time and  
13 consideration.

14           MR. CULVER: Alright, my name's Zack Culver,  
15 Z-a-c-k C-u-l-v-e-r. I'm the business manager -- current  
16 business manager for Laborers Local 737. I represent about  
17 2500 laborers in the State of Oregon. This project would  
18 hopefully employ or impact around 800 of my members and  
19 their families in a positive way. So as you develop this  
20 Environmental Impact Statement for Jordan Cove Energy  
21 Project, following the will of the Coos Bay voters to not  
22 ban this terminal of construction, we hope that you will  
23 consider the years of work that have already gone into  
24 planning this project.

1           This project has undergone extensive revisions  
2 and planning in order to best work with the local landowners  
3 and stakeholders and is working to ensure it is constructed  
4 safely, efficiently in an environmentally mindful manner.  
5 The environmental oversight on these jobs will be strong and  
6 our men and women in construction are ready to work within  
7 that on the hundreds of jobs that will be created in order  
8 to ensure this project is done right for Oregon and also  
9 safely. The skilled, trained workforce that we have to  
10 provide is second to none. The training that's offered to  
11 our membership around pipelines is extensive and I feel that  
12 this would be the best workforce to be on this project.

13           I would additionally like to emphasize the  
14 importance of reducing our dependence on truck and train  
15 transportation of natural gas as we've moved towards the  
16 proposed pipeline with global concerns around greenhouse gas  
17 emissions and the burning of fossil fuels. It is our  
18 responsibility to do everything in our power to create a  
19 safe alternate mode of transportation. The amount of  
20 on-road hours that will be eliminated by this pipeline is  
21 critical to maintain clean air standards in Oregon. Thank  
22 you.

23           MR. GUZMAN: My first name is Benjamin like  
24 Benjamin Franklin, B-e-n-j-a-m-in, the last name is Guzman,  
25 G-u-z-m-an, and I'm here to support the project. I think

1 it'd be an outstanding way of life for these folks in this  
2 community having a project that's well done. It will be  
3 successful for the community in general. And of course,  
4 safety is an issue and we feel that this company is teaming  
5 up with some qualified workforce. They're going to be able  
6 to put this project you know in the safest way you know to  
7 avoid any kind of environmental problems. So you know we  
8 feel the job creation is important for this community.

9           You know politics, in general, you know come and  
10 go, so we feel the people in this community have a right to  
11 good paying jobs. They can support the community and also  
12 we understand it's going to generate quite a bit of tax  
13 revenue you know for the community for the roads. I just  
14 want to say that I'm 100 percent in favor of it.

15           MS. FELLING: Maggie Felling, M-a-g-g-i-e  
16 F-e-l-l-i-n-g, and I demand an answer to my question of the  
17 incompatible scenario of the expected subduction event,  
18 a/k/a, earthquake of 9.0 magnitude and the Jordan Cove LGN  
19 232 miles long pipeline at 3-foot diameter.

20           Now the Department of Oregon Geological and  
21 Mineral Studies Industries are putting in an advance warning  
22 systems to give us 30 seconds. They're putting this up on  
23 Raxiom Mountain with an \$11,000 grant. We're getting  
24 30-second warning. Okay, they are hoping to some day have  
25 automatic shutoff valves on the natural gas lines around the

1 city. Who's going to have natural gas lines shutoffs and  
2 will they be automated on the LNG?

3           The American Red Cross is hosting all up and  
4 down the coast prepare out loud meetings and they have  
5 extensive proof. Japan is one of them. You know the other  
6 side of this tectonic plate. Also, Mount St. Helene  
7 eruption, surrounding Jackson County (0:31:05.6)\* Mountains  
8 further evidence that this earthquake is going to happen.  
9 What the things the Red Cross says is to hang a tool off  
10 your gas meter so you can turn off the gas and avoid the  
11 explosions and fires that happened all over Japan.

12           Who's going to fight the fires from the LNG  
13 pipeline running through forestland? Who will take care of  
14 this? I need this answered. I demand this be answered.  
15 We will not have firefighters (0:31:41.4)\* of the city and  
16 232 miles of natural gas pipeline. I asked the engineers  
17 when the LNG people were in Medford at the library about  
18 this. They told me all about the safety of the proposed  
19 plant at Coos Bay, he turned around and walked away when I  
20 asked about the safety of the pipeline and are their shutoff  
21 valves. He refused to answer. I demand an answer to this  
22 question.

23           FERC must undertake, because I demand, a  
24 detailed analysis of public safety risks associated with the  
25 terminal and the pipeline. In past reviews, FERC has failed

1 to adequately address fire and emergency risks along the  
2 pipeline route. Further, FERC must take a realistic look at  
3 the worse case LNG spill and fire near the terminal.

4           And really how does this pipeline help Oregon  
5 besides temporary jobs? I demand that FERC should address  
6 the full impacts of this project on water quality of each  
7 stream and wetland impacted. FERC should require Pacific  
8 Connector to rely on up-to-date site and specific  
9 information to evaluate the impacts of the proposals.  
10 Further, I demand that FERC must spell out specific  
11 mitigation measures and plans that are relied upon to draw  
12 conclusions about the impacts of this project.

13           Further, I demand FERC must not rely on outdated  
14 information, data from previous iterations of the Jordan  
15 Cove and Pacific Connector Projects, including wildlife and  
16 plant surveys that may not longer reflect on-the-ground  
17 conditions. Further, I demand that FERC must consider  
18 alternatives to the project as a whole. FERC must also  
19 consider alternative designs to avoid potential impacts of  
20 the project.

21           Has FERC considered solar energy and maybe  
22 investing money in building plants that make batteries to  
23 store solar energy? The Netherlands, all over the  
24 Scandinavian countries this is the way they're going, not  
25 condensing natural gas. Has FERC looked at, and I demand

1 they do, look at the impact to Coos Bay of these 12-story  
2 ships coming and going. I demand answers to my questions  
3 from FERC. Thank you.

4 MR. ANSEN: My name is Eric Ansen, E-r-i-c  
5 A-n-s-en. I'm a laborer with LIUNA, Laborers International  
6 Union of North America. And the reason why I believe that  
7 this pipeline, Jordan Cove Connector would be good for the  
8 community is it should generate 48 million in Oregon  
9 corporate taxes, 62 million in local taxes, and will create  
10 3500 new construction jobs for two to four years and those  
11 workers will be earning an average of \$80,000 a year, plus  
12 benefits, more than double the average wages of southern  
13 Oregon counties. And that pretty much in a nutshell is why  
14 I'm supporting the Jordan Cove Pipeline. The tax revenue  
15 that would be generated yearly on that job is tremendous and  
16 a huge benefit to the local community of the areas of that  
17 pipeline.

18 MR. OHMIE: My name is Rich Ohmie, R-i-c-h  
19 O-h-m-i-e. I'm a laborer with Laborers Union 737 in  
20 Portland. I've coworkers that live throughout the State of  
21 Oregon and the area down in this area particularly and in  
22 eastern Oregon guys are struggling for jobs, living wage  
23 jobs that pay family wage jobs. These guys are ready to get  
24 back to work and make an impact on the community down here  
25 creating long-term jobs for some people as far as the

1 maintenance and export of the liquefied natural gas out of  
2 this area.

3           This process has gone on for a decade plus and  
4 we'd like the job get going and get this product shipped  
5 overseas where they're firing up new coal-plants every day  
6 to get this cleaner-burning fuel available to the source  
7 where they're burning it.

8           MR. WEBER: My name is Steve Weber, S-t-e-v-e  
9 W-e-b-e-r. I work for Seneca Jones Timber Company and the  
10 pipeline has been planned across our property in several  
11 different places. We have some concerns about the  
12 compatibility of the pipeline and timberland. Basically,  
13 the two uses are incompatible. We've been dealing with the  
14 local pipeline company for the last several years and  
15 meeting at several meetings and it doesn't seem like we've  
16 received any assurances that we'll be getting equitable  
17 compensation for the use of our land.

18           We've had experience with past pipelines where  
19 we're unable to use our property because of that pipeline in  
20 that location, so it's basically more than just the strip of  
21 the right-of-way. It affects more land outside the  
22 right-of-way, the pipeline. It just seems like they've  
23 listened to us and listened to us, but nothing has ever come  
24 out of it, no specific resolution.



1           We have another concern if this pipeline goes  
2 forward it's going to soak up the local supply of laborers  
3 and contractors that our company depends on every year to  
4 build roads and to do logging, and we're afraid that that  
5 pipeline company will hire everyone away to go build a  
6 pipeline and we're left holding the bag and not able to get  
7 any of the work done on our property. Maybe they can build  
8 our roads for us. That'd be one way out of it.

9           We have existing agreements, our timber company  
10 and other timber companies that is affected with the  
11 pipeline with the Bureau of Land Management for roads access  
12 and we're afraid that the movement of contractors,  
13 equipment, and the timber that comes from the BLM  
14 right-of-way is going to adversely affect some of the  
15 roads. We're really concerned that some of those -- we  
16 built a lot of -- we have a good relationship with the BLM  
17 for the use of those roads and we want to continue that in  
18 the future and not have this third party come in and upset  
19 that.

20           We also had experience in the past where the  
21 pipeline was located on our property parallel to a property  
22 of the federal government. We felt like if this is a  
23 federal project the pipeline should be on as much federal  
24 land as possible and not utilize our land. And it was on  
25 ground that was very easy to move pipeline, very gentle

1 ground. It could've been just moved 30 feet and been  
2 completely on the Bureau of Land Management. We were told  
3 that was impossible because an EIS was written and you  
4 couldn't do it again. Well, here's our opportunity to fix  
5 that.

6           So we realize that this easement that's being  
7 asked for is perpetual, which means forever, but the design  
8 life of the pipeline is limit and maybe the easement should  
9 be limited as well. So I want to thank you for allowing us  
10 to make input into this process and if you have any  
11 questions you can contact me at Seneca Jones Timber Company  
12 or Monica Geldon (ph) at Seneca Timber Company in Eugene as  
13 well. I left our name and address at the sign-in sheet. So  
14 thank you again and like I said if you have any more  
15 questions, do be afraid to ask. Thank you.

16           MR. ZINDA: My name is Chris Zinda. My name is  
17 spelled C-h-r-i-s Z-i-n-d-a. I'm from Elkton, Oregon. I  
18 am a homemaker and activist and a writer. I lived in  
19 Lakeview, Oregon for a number of years and have been an  
20 activist against the Ruby Pipeline and the Department of  
21 Defense Red Rock Biofuels Project. I have written  
22 extensively about the issues with that concerning bomb  
23 trains, development and use of the Ruby gas to facilitate  
24 the project and how these bomb trains will be going through

1 Indian Nations, the Pit River and the north fork of the Pit  
2 River to market.

3           As part of this project, the Red Rock Project,  
4 they're going to be destroying thousands of archeological  
5 sites as a result of this. All of this is the result of the  
6 illegal Bush/Cheney Energy Taskforce that was done during  
7 that time period and enabled by environmentalists who have  
8 colluded through time like Western Watersheds and others to  
9 be bought off.

10           I have chided them through my writing. I have  
11 written about these issues and what it means. And so my  
12 issue for FERC is -- give you my background. I have a  
13 Master of Public Administration and a degree in Political  
14 Science. I have a background in NEPA compliance. I'm very  
15 much interested in whether or not you are going to be  
16 prepared in your document to discuss the protests that are  
17 going to be coming our way and getting information and  
18 consultation as well from the FBI and the Department of  
19 Homeland Security.

20           I'm not interested in having any tiger swans in  
21 this process, but I find it quite interesting you're going  
22 to end up with two sets of pseudo-North Dakota protests in  
23 your midst at the same time. That would be once they  
24 commence in Lakeview and start pushing oil along these bomb  
25 trains to market. And two, when you build this line, you're

1 going to have that. And so as part of your NEPA document,  
2 I'm very much interested in whether or not you're going to  
3 include in the socioeconomic section the security that  
4 you're going to be having to require for this because it's  
5 not going to be as easy as the Ruby.

6           And part of the thing that I've tried to do is  
7 to give some ethical weight to the environmentalists who  
8 colluded like Western Watersheds and the Sierra Club and  
9 others over the Ruby because they're not going to do it this  
10 time. You know they're not going to do it this time and so  
11 the plan itself needs to include for what I think DHS and  
12 FBI consider to be one of the foremost domestic terrorist  
13 threats in the nation. Well, it's coming. I mean I'm not  
14 threatening it. I'm just suggesting that people -- you've  
15 seen what happen at Dapple and you've seen what's building  
16 to now. And you have two issues now with which to address  
17 here in Oregon, which is arguably the most liberal, radical  
18 environmental area in the country. You have a  
19 responsibility to address this in your DEIS, and that's all  
20 I have to say.

21           MS. HANSON: My name is M.A. Hanson. I would  
22 like to make a statement to FERC. First of all, I don't  
23 understand. You've already said no twice. Who doesn't  
24 understand no, but anyhow, I would like to read an email  
25 that was sent to me from Norway. "Climate News Network:

1 Natural gas will have to be phased out, along with coal, if  
2 the world is going to keep safe from dangerous climate  
3 change and that seems likely to happen far sooner than most  
4 official forecasts. According to a new report, if  
5 countries want to reach their Paris Agreement goals of  
6 limiting the long-term world temperature rise to 1.5  
7 Celsius, then many of the proposals to increase gas  
8 production and distribution will be unnecessary. New  
9 terminals and pipelines will never be fully used and will  
10 become stranded assets."

11           The authors also warn that unless countries  
12 realize quickly that further investment in gas production is  
13 both unnecessary and damaging to the climate they may lock  
14 themselves into emissions that they cannot afford to make.  
15 The report "Foot off the Gas" is published by the Climate  
16 Action Tracker organization, an independent, science-based  
17 assessment which tracks countries emissions commitments and  
18 actions.

19           The CAT's members are Climate Analysts,  
20 Eco-FYS's, New Climate Institute, and the (0:46:33.3)\*  
21 Institute for Climate Impact Research as a collaborator.  
22 Double over assessment, the report says part of the problem  
23 is government's guided by project projections from the  
24 International Energy Agency, IEA, are overestimating the  
25 need for natural gas, both to replace coal and to act as an

1 emergency backup when supplies from intermittent renewables  
2 falter. The IEA annual reports have consistently  
3 underestimated the speed of growth of renewals, but they  
4 have also failed to grasp the increased role of other  
5 technology like biogas, battery storage, and hydrogen to  
6 even out any intermittently end supplies of electricity from  
7 solar and wind it says.

8           One example is China where in 2016 the IEA  
9 projected renewals would rise to 7.2 percent of the power  
10 supplied by 2020, but at the end of 2016 they'd already  
11 reached 8 percent. Additionally, in India, the Middle East  
12 are also seeing renewables rising faster than mainstream  
13 projections. This is by the New Climate Institute.

14           Changes in the way grids are organized are  
15 already happening in Europe, together with the building of  
16 long distance connectors between countries that exchange  
17 renewable energy when one has a surplus. These developments  
18 cut the need for generation from gas. Two-way exchange, the  
19 best known example is hydroelectricity from Norway being  
20 used to boost wind energy supply in Denmark and the reverse  
21 happening when there's a surplus of wind energy in Denmark  
22 and Germany.

23           Already many of the very expensive pipelines for  
24 transporting gas are underutilized and expensive ports and  
25 facilities to export liquid petroleum gas will never be used

1 at full capacity the report claims. For example,  
2 utilization rates of U.S. natural gas infrastructure are at  
3 54 percent and are even lower in Europe at 25 percent. This  
4 overinvestment in natural gas infrastructure is likely to  
5 lead to either emissions overshooting the Paris Agreements,  
6 1.5 Celsius and 2 degree Celsius goals or a larger number of  
7 stranded assets as they shift to cheaper renewables takes  
8 place. That is also by the Climate Analyst Group.

9           The report sees a dwindling role for natural gas  
10 towards the middle of the century because of increasing  
11 competition from renewables that continue to get cheaper.  
12 It is contrary to the official line that gas consumption  
13 will continue to rise and it is an important bridging fuel  
14 towards a carbon-free world. Natural gas is often perceived  
15 to as a clear source of energy that complements variable  
16 renewable technology, however, the present issues with  
17 emissions during gas extraction and transportation that  
18 show that gas is not as clean as thought and natural gas  
19 will disappear from the power sector in the Paris Agreement  
20 compatible world where emissions need to be around zero by  
21 mid-century.

22           Doubt is also cast on the possibility that gas  
23 can be used along with carbon capture and storage. Although  
24 the report says that some gains can be made, it is expensive  
25 technology and even more costly if it is going to be a

1 reliable way of reducing emissions to nearly 400 percent.  
2 Currently, too many greenhouse gases will still escape into  
3 the atmosphere at various stages of the process.

4 MS. PRENTICE: Barbara Prentice, B-a-b-a-r-a  
5 P-r-e-n-t-i-c-e. There are so many hazards involved with  
6 this pipeline, but I'm concerned especially about the  
7 terminal. There's a potential disaster in siting an  
8 explosive LNG export facility in the Cascadia Subduction  
9 Zone. Cascadia can make an earthquake almost 30 times more  
10 energetic than the San Andreas to start with and then it  
11 generates a Tsunami at the same time, which the  
12 side-by-side motion of the San Andreas can't do, says Chris  
13 Goldfinger, a professor of geophysics at Oregon State  
14 University.

15 The Cascadia lies under water where the oceanic  
16 plate actually drives under the North American plate. The  
17 Cascadia Subduction Zone derives its name from the Cascadia  
18 range of volcanic mountains that parallel the fault from  
19 afar and from how one plate subducts or goes under another.  
20 There is no way of predicting when Cascadia will author the  
21 next big one, Goldfinger says.

22 You know I'm a grandmother and actually I'm a  
23 raging granny and when I think about what my grandson's life  
24 is going to be I worry and I certainly worry that if this



1 earthquake happens that it will destroy much of the coast,  
2 along with the factory.

3 MS. PHILLIPS: Yeah, my name is Diane Phillips  
4 and I live in Azalea, Oregon and I have so many things I'd  
5 like to say, so I will send in comments, but first of all,  
6 I'd like to comment on this process. I don't think it's a  
7 very good process. I think it takes some of the public  
8 trust out of this whole FERC hearing. We don't get to  
9 interact with any of the -- hear the other comments. We  
10 have to wait for these to come out and I don't know how long  
11 that's going to take.

12 But first of all, I am confused because I  
13 thought this was voted down and here we are again. I don't  
14 know if there're any changes or if there is anyone out there  
15 interested in buying this gas. That doesn't have seemed to  
16 change and so I object that there isn't a good purpose or  
17 need for this project, other than to make a Canadian  
18 company, who I understand is registered in the United  
19 States, but they're still a Canadian company rich at the  
20 expense of all the citizens of Oregon that will be affected  
21 and those include the landowners on the pipeline and those  
22 that live in the community.

23 I'm very concerned about the water resource and  
24 the fact that we're going to -- long after the jobs are gone  
25 we're going to be left with irreversible consequences and

1 I'll probably still be there while most of these people will  
2 be very long gone. I've been here since -- fighting this  
3 project since 2004 and now it's 2017 and I'm still here and  
4 I doubt very many people that are involved with FERC or  
5 anybody else or even the agencies are the same people any  
6 more.

7           And the fact that I have to spend my time doing  
8 this once again for I can't figure out why is very  
9 disturbing.

10           Again, on the water resources, I live near the  
11 East Fork of Cow Creek and there's cinnabar in the soils  
12 there. That's an issue. I don't have very specifics on the  
13 project, so it's hard to comment on a lot of it. I think  
14 the river crossings are of very serious consequence because  
15 you're putting a fixed project, the pipeline, into a dynamic  
16 system where shade and fish resources like spawning habitat  
17 is very much of a concern.

18           I also have a big objection to the pipeline  
19 going through the habitat of the catacortus cacti, which is  
20 a rare plant in Oregon found nowhere else in the world and  
21 there is no way to mitigate that. They won't grow in any  
22 other type soil, except for low elevation serpentine and  
23 there's only about four places in Oregon that that exists  
24 and that's where the flower grows, so that is an absolute  
25 problem.

1           I'm also concerned with the safety issues of the  
2 earthquake and the potential Tsunami on the coast or an  
3 airplane hitting it if they have a miss approach from the  
4 airport there. Those were all concerns in the past.  
5 Nothing has absolutely changed.

6           The benefit is jobs, but I feel like the costs  
7 absolutely are higher. The impacted landowners have for  
8 years put up with this and some have died. Some have died  
9 not being able to sell their property. The amount of money  
10 that Williams is offering is ridiculous. I've heard 80,000  
11 for 35 acres. You know it used to about 200,000, so I guess  
12 there's an improvement there, but I know from the landowners  
13 -- I used to be the head of Oregon Citizens against the  
14 Pipeline. We had 400 members, approximately, and there was  
15 few, about 10 percent, 20 percent in some places that were  
16 in favor or at least didn't care. The rest were against it  
17 for all the impacts to their land and themselves and their  
18 highest economic -- usually, their property is what they own  
19 that has the most value and to take something like that for  
20 not a good need is absolutely crazy.

21           And I don't understand how we're going through  
22 this one more time. I understand it's not a trial. You  
23 don't get two trials if you don't like the outcome of the  
24 first one, but is that how the FERC process works? And  
25 also, I would like to see the alignment maps. I have not

1 seen a detailed map of what exactly the easements are on  
2 people's property. I want to see the staging areas. I want  
3 to see all of it. Thank you very much.

4 MR. WARREN: Craig Warren, C-r-a-i-g  
5 W-a-r-r-e-n. My main concerns with all of this are safety  
6 issues. It traverses along a known lightning path strike  
7 area, wild fires as well; 232 miles of pipe cannot stay  
8 sealed. Each above-ground metering station gauge is there  
9 for a put-in to monitor how much loss is between seams. You  
10 have an imminent 9.0 to 9.6 earthquake offshore. All of  
11 these things combined make it an entirely unsafe project.  
12 I, however, have a different idea and plan that goes with  
13 it.

14 Rather than to do the pipeline, which is a very  
15 reckless means of distributing this resource and  
16 nonrenewable fuel in Midland, Oregon have a clean, gas-fired  
17 steel mill and I'm sure that the people that own the fuel  
18 are part of the 1 percent that run the planet's economy.  
19 They'll have no problem getting a military contract. Trump  
20 has already put into his America First project that -- his  
21 proposal that the military would get 23 billion.

22 It would be easy to get a contract. You could  
23 make tanks, missiles, anything you want, but there you have  
24 it. You can make jet parts. There would be thousands of  
25 employed people permanently, not just a thousand for three

1 years and next to no safety hazards with this. So that's  
2 pretty much what I had to do in a nutshell. I condensed  
3 half an hour's speech into that. Everybody wins. Thank  
4 you.

5 MS. KIRK: My name is Skye Kirk, S-k-y-e  
6 K-i-r-k. I'm here today to talk about how I feel about this  
7 pipeline being brought in and I am pretty confused. There's  
8 a lot of young people that are confused. I am highly  
9 disturbed that there are going to be some private landowners  
10 who have building their homesteads for a long time who are  
11 -- their land is going to be completely disrupted, years and  
12 years of hard work completely gone.

13 I'm also disturbed that it's going to go into  
14 our groundwater and that it could reach into people's well  
15 water. That really freaks me out. I came here from  
16 Bellingham, Washington and up there three young kids died  
17 actually because a pipeline exploded. That was a really big  
18 deal in my community and I saw it first hand, the families  
19 that were devastated due to that pipeline. It's a very real  
20 thing. It can happen. It could happen to you know,  
21 unfortunately, the people are working on the pipeline's  
22 kids. It could happen to anybody. I'm sure that there is  
23 another way you know out there to do whatever we need to do  
24 without this pipeline disrupting landowners and without it  
25 possibly exploding and leeching into our environment and

1 hurting communities and people. And I guess that all I  
2 really have to say.

3 MR. BOVEE: Hello, I'm Douglas Bovee from  
4 Eugene, Oregon. I'm a physician and I'm very interested in  
5 this project for multiple reasons. The starting point, I  
6 understand you folks are interested in environmental impact.  
7 The biggest concern here is this project will contribute to  
8 further pulling out of fossil fuels from the ground and then  
9 eventually burn and then carbon dioxide going into the  
10 atmosphere and I have concerns for our planet on that global  
11 level. We need to stop burning fossil fuels and we need to  
12 stop pulling fossil fuels out of the ground.

13 This project is part of that process. The  
14 people of Oregon have a right to have a say in this project  
15 and we do not want it in our state. Most of us do not want  
16 this project in our state. We want to stop burning fossil  
17 fuels and we want to keep them in the ground.

18 And some of the specific concerns that I have  
19 are the LNG terminal on the Bay. The proposed LNG terminal  
20 looks to be a redo of Fukushima when the Cascadia Subduction  
21 Zone creates an earthquake. We're going to have a massive  
22 Tsunami. I'm very concerned about how that Tsunami could  
23 impact that plant and the people around it. I think it  
24 could be a gigantic environmental disaster for the Coos Bay  
25 area.

1           I'm also very concerned about leaks of gas from  
2 pipelines in dry forest. I see the pipeline itself as a  
3 scar across our state and I just fear in a big way the risk  
4 of a leak of methane gas in the middle of a dry forest where  
5 there's a spark or a small fire. I'm worried about that  
6 turning into a massive fire and with loss of life and  
7 property and our spectacular forest that we have in this  
8 state.

9           So those are my main concerns and I sure hope  
10 that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission takes our  
11 concerns to heart in a serious way.

12           MS. STOCKETT: Jasmine Stockett, J-a-s-m-i-n-e  
13 S-t-o-c-k-e-t-t, resident of Myrtle Creek, Oregon. First of  
14 all, I'd like to categorically state that I am against the  
15 pipeline, but I have one issue -- for a myriad of reasons,  
16 but I have one issue that I am extremely concerned about and  
17 that is the subduction zone, okay, folks. It's 800 miles of  
18 fault line and if it goes off, it's going to be -- if part  
19 of it goes off, it'll be an eight. If it all goes off, it  
20 will be a 9.6, okay. And personally, I'm not an engineer,  
21 but I am not certain that there is any way to build this to  
22 make sure that it's safe.

23           And the big issue is you look at Fukushima now  
24 and they say, well, why did they build a nuclear reactor  
25 there with the seismic zone, with the Tsunami risks? And

1 you know we've got another risk here which is this is  
2 forested land. So if we get a subduction zone event, which  
3 will be four to five minutes. Okay, I've lived through 17  
4 seconds of a 7. And I'm telling you an 8 is 100 times  
5 stronger, a 9 is a thousand times stronger, so my big worry  
6 is safety because I don't think there's -- if that  
7 subduction zone event goes off in the summer, the state's  
8 going to burn up.

9 I'm telling you right now that unless they do  
10 extreme measures and I'm not asking, I'm not requesting, I  
11 am demanding for myself and for the over four million other  
12 Oregonians that we have to go, if it has to be built, and  
13 I'm against it, but I understand that it absolutely has to  
14 be extremely vetted. And I mean I want to see seismic  
15 studies. I want to see the Tsunami risk assessed. I want  
16 to see huge buffer zones. I want to see the shaking seismic  
17 sensors so that as soon as it starts shaking they should  
18 shut off those valves immediately and there should be a lot  
19 of valves -- and there's got to be a bigger buffer because  
20 I'm telling you right now I came here from California and  
21 I'm basically cheating on California now because I'm falling  
22 in love with Oregon. I've been here a couple of years and  
23 you know this is an extreme risk. I can't even believe  
24 they're thinking about it. There's so much forest there.  
25 You know what happened -- I mean in San Bruno there was a



1 pipeline about this big. I think it was like 300 whatever  
2 -- okay, we're talking -- I don't know how much because I'm  
3 not an expert in that, but I'm telling you right now if a 9  
4 goes off and it's in the summer and that starts fires up the  
5 state's going to burn up.

6 I mean we're going to have serious issues and  
7 there's a lot of money coming out at the end, okay. They  
8 don't want to pay people the proper amount of money, so  
9 that's another issue, but that's not as important as entire  
10 state, our livelihood. This thing is three miles from me.  
11 And you know what that's just me, but you know what, I love  
12 the forest. I love the whole state. I've fallen in love  
13 with it and I don't want it to get ruined by some guys who  
14 are going to come here and pay people pennies on the dollar  
15 who are not going to do the proper safety stuff and I mean  
16 I personally don't think there's any way to build it to make  
17 it safe, but you guys -- FERC, whatever it's your  
18 responsibility. You work for me.

19 And there are four million people -- what'd you  
20 think is going to happen? What do you think is going to  
21 happen in the 9.6? That's like 10,000 times as strong as a  
22 7, you know. So I don't know. I'm not an engineer. I don't  
23 know how to do it, but if you have to build I'd better start  
24 seeing some major -- all of the safety stuff and I want to  
25 see the science too. And if you can't prove -- you know

1 what kind of bond are they going to put up? Like how much  
2 is forest worth, you know? They probably can't put up --  
3 you think now if Fukushima that they're -- you know those  
4 people, Daiichi, is paying for what really happened there?  
5 No. So what I'm saying is that we all love the state, okay.  
6 We live here.

7           It doesn't matter what ilk you are you know a  
8 small amount of people are going to get most of the money  
9 out of this, okay, and we're the ones that are taking the  
10 risks. You know I don't have any property on the line, but  
11 we are all going to be taking a risk and with all the heat  
12 waves now that we have, you know what, I mean what if this  
13 thing hits in June 20 and this thing (1:08:11.3)\* I'm  
14 telling you right now we're going to burn up. The state  
15 will have an extreme, extreme event and that's my main issue  
16 is safety, you know.

17           And there's eminent domain. There's  
18 environmental. There's gas. There's that it's going to  
19 China. All that stuff is very important, but we're talking  
20 about where we all live. We're talking about our forest,  
21 our wildlife, our tourism, our timber industry. And I'm  
22 telling you that thing will be a conflagration and it'll get  
23 out of control and there'll be no way to stop it. There  
24 won't be a way to stop it, so please, please if you have to  
25 build it I want to see all the safety things to a 9.6.

1           MR. GOW: My name is Bill Gow, B-i-l-l G-o-w.  
2 I'm a landowner. This partly goes through my property.  
3 They want to steal my land to put this through there.

4           Okay, I'm going to start out with what the  
5 affect this project has had on our area and what it's done  
6 to us personally. Okay, we've been fighting this thing for  
7 over 10 years and we've been going to meeting and I don't  
8 think people realize the affect that it's had on us as  
9 landowners.

10           This isn't bringing money to this county. It's  
11 stealing money from us landowners. The money I've spent  
12 going to meetings, going to all this stuff I could've spent  
13 that time -- I could've built a barn by now with the money  
14 I've spent and added an asset to my property instead of  
15 trying to protect what I already own. This isn't about  
16 trying to get extra. This is about trying to protect what I  
17 already own and really bothers me that nobody has ever  
18 understood that this has taken a devastating affect on us  
19 landowners, devastating. This is the third go around that  
20 we're going through on this thing and they are -- my whole  
21 family lives on my ranch and it supports our family. And  
22 if they put this pipeline through my ranch, they're going to  
23 devastate our economic unit. Then my kids will be living  
24 like you know people that live in Portland and Washington,  
25 D.C. and whatever else in some shithole somewhere else and

1 then my grandkids will be gone. I mean people I don't think  
2 realize the devastation that this pipeline is doing to our  
3 family, to our family units as property owners. And the  
4 reason we choose to be out in the private setting isn't for  
5 the money and money isn't what this is about for us  
6 landowners.

7 I've had people say, well, you know you'll get  
8 your land back when they get done with it. I said since  
9 your wife over here. You can have her back when I get done  
10 with her. You know I mean that's how ignorant these people  
11 are, you know. I mean it's unbelievable. And they say,  
12 well, there's got to be a price. I say is there a price on  
13 your children? There's no price on something that -- they  
14 say, well, it's only real estate. I said that's your  
15 biggest problem. It's not just real estate. This is what  
16 my family lives on and this is what they're going to  
17 continue to live on, some of my grandkids are on and I want  
18 to protect that.

19 And this project is going to cause devastating  
20 consequences for us landowners. It already has. We can't  
21 sell our property. I mean it's just on and on, not that I  
22 would anyway, but I mean it's just devaluated everything and  
23 we get no compensation for that. They've offered me \$14,000  
24 to go through two miles of my property. It's a joke what

1 they've offered me. Take 26 acres from me and I mean that's  
2 how bad this outfit it. They stink to high heaven.

3           You know the last round of scoping I offered  
4 some alternative routes that they could take, never even got  
5 looked at. Never even were looked at. You know I'm at mile  
6 post 71 to 75 in that area there and if you look at the maps  
7 -- I was going to bring one with me, but I couldn't get a  
8 copy of one. It goes up like this and it comes back down.  
9 They could cut straight across it and miss me and they never  
10 even looked at that.

11           And I'll tell you another thing about this deal.  
12 This is a Canadian company that wants to send natural gas  
13 over to the Pacific realm. What part of that is going to  
14 help the American people? That's not going to help us one  
15 bit and this job deal a joke. It's going to cost more jobs  
16 than it's going to create. And they want to send our --  
17 let's keep our natural gas here in the U.S. and use it here.  
18 Let's not send it over to Canada -- I mean over to the  
19 Pacific realm from Canada. And let's take it here and make  
20 manufacturing jobs here in the United States. And that's  
21 something that I've really pushed on this for a long time.

22           If Canada thinks it's such a great idea, put it  
23 on the Canadian coast, but I tell you what, it's kind of  
24 like what they did to the people in Appalachia. They went  
25 in there and they devastated those people's lives and they

1 never did recover from that and their kids have never  
2 recovered and they pushed them into towns and now they're  
3 all on drugs and opioms and that place is a mess just  
4 because big money comes in an area and they create a few  
5 jobs for a few years and as soon as they leave all that goes  
6 and then there's nothing there for the people because  
7 they've lived that way for 100 years and they're happy. And  
8 then when you change that lifestyle you can't go back to  
9 that because they've ruined their ranches. They're ruined  
10 their streams. They've ruined everything and that's what's  
11 going to happen in this project. They're going to take --  
12 give a little bit of money out to people and then they're  
13 going to devastate their lives and there's no going back.

14           Once they ruin your place, you can't put it back  
15 to what it was and you can't put your family structure back  
16 together. You can't put anything back together. It just  
17 devastates you and there's no putting those worms back in  
18 that can once that can is opened and I don't think people  
19 understand the dynamics of how much trouble this project is  
20 going to cause. And you know, and like I say, if it's such  
21 a great -- okay, so it's going to be actually a negative job  
22 creator and these are long-term jobs that we have here now.  
23 It's not like a bunch of short-term construction jobs.  
24 These are long term. You know my whole family lives on my  
25 ranch and have a job there.

1           Here's another thing. On my property there's a  
2 protected species that's called the catacortus cacti. It's  
3 an endangered species. The BLM just went and spent a bunch  
4 of money clearing the area to make it so it wouldn't be  
5 competitive against it. Now the pipeline goes right through  
6 the middle and that's the only place in the world it grows  
7 on my ranch there and a couple of other little places right  
8 through that ridge there and they're going right through the  
9 middle of that and I just can't even believe that they're  
10 going to let them go through that after they spent all that  
11 money to upgrade their habitat. I mean it goes dead  
12 through the middle of it and I think that needs to be looked  
13 at because there needs to be some alternative routes looked  
14 at.

15           And it really bothers me that they haven't  
16 looked at alternative routes. Put it in Canada. You know I  
17 mean the Canadians are the people. And the use of eminent  
18 domain gets me as an American citizen by a Canadian company  
19 is just atrocious. Okay, I guess I'm out of time

20           MR. ORNELAS: My name is Valente Ornelas.  
21 That's V-a-l-e-n-t-e O-r-n-e-l-a-s, and it's Valente  
22 Ornelas. And this is my statement.

23           I am deeply concerned about the safety and  
24 public health, environmental climate pollution, and economic  
25 impacts of Jordan Cove LNG Terminal and Pacific Connector

1 Pipeline Projects. The projects will harm Oregonians, our  
2 environment, and our climate. They're inconsistent with the  
3 public interest.

4           Additionally, I was concerned that FERC's public  
5 engagement process will hamper the public's ability to  
6 provide comment and learn about the project. Because of the  
7 strong interest and the region-wide impacts of this project,  
8 I urge FERC to expand the scoping process. The scope of  
9 this project is so complex. It will take much more than 30  
10 days for the public to research and make informed comments  
11 about it. We need at least 90 days and the expansion of the  
12 number of scoping locations. Definitely include Jackson  
13 County and areas in northern Oregon.

14           In addition, this is a dangerous project for  
15 Oregon and the planet as well. The extraction process for  
16 the gas itself causes major pollution and ecological damage.  
17 Cutting across hundreds of rivers and waterways is a threat  
18 to Oregon's ecology. That cannot be allowed. And that's  
19 it.

20           MR. COOK: My name is Michael Cook,  
21 M-i-c-h-a-e-l C-o-o-k. I'm a resident of Douglas County.  
22 My objection to this, more than anything else, is how  
23 incredibly stupid could we be to build a LNG plant in a  
24 Tsunami zone and I just feel like that is completely bizarre  
25 and crazy to do that, okay.



1           And then the second point that I'd like to make  
2 how many noes has this project gotten, three? So if they  
3 get a yes, do we also get another chance? How many second  
4 chances does each side get? That's what I'd like to know.  
5 And I think it's totally unfair that they keep coming back  
6 and coming back and coming back, even though they've gotten  
7 noes, noes, noes and it has nothing to do with America. It  
8 has all to do with Canada and Asia. It has nothing to do  
9 with this county, so that's my point.

10           MR. MESKEL: My name is Micah Meskel,  
11 M-i-c-h-a-e-l M-e-s-k-e-l, and I represent the Audubon  
12 Society of Portland. I'm going to start with some specific  
13 concerns and then if I have time I'll talk about some  
14 broader issues, but to start, I'd like to note that the  
15 public process around this has been hugely inadequate,  
16 boarding on a NEPA violation, both for the services for fish  
17 and wildlife, for Forest Service, BLM, and FERC itself.

18           The limited notice of the meeting was quite a  
19 concern, especially for folks to organize during the summer,  
20 having two weeks notice is hugely inadequate. The format of  
21 these scoping meetings are hearings. They're not hearings.  
22 It appears to be an intentional way to diffuse community  
23 support or opposition. And also, leaving out Jackson County  
24 as a site for one of these meetings just it's so obvious

1 that that was to diffuse the opposition from a big  
2 population center.

3 And we think that both Jackson County and since  
4 the significance of this project is of statewide  
5 significance that there should be a scoping hearing in the  
6 (1:20:05.2)\* Valley or in northern Oregon to make it  
7 accessible to portions of the state that are interested.

8 I'll talk about some of the data concerns I  
9 have. I think FERC needs to collect new data for wildlife,  
10 especially, that reflect on-the-ground conditions. Much of  
11 the data that was taken from 2013, 2014, 2012 does not  
12 reflect on-the-ground conditions, both for habitat, but also  
13 occupancy. Specifically, my concerns are around northern  
14 spotted owls and marbled merlots both listed species that  
15 are affected by the pipeline location and many, many  
16 locations. The conditions have changed. Territories of  
17 individual birds have changed and that needs to be reflected  
18 in both the routing of the pipeline, but also mitigation for  
19 that.

20 I urge that FERC uses other federal agencies  
21 with expertise to get that data, specifically, U.S. Fish and  
22 Wildlife, U.S. Geological Survey, and the U.S. Forest  
23 Service and to rely on consultants of the project  
24 proponents. There are a couple of specific sites that I  
25 think that data needs to be reconfigured, one of which is

1 the site of the Scout's Creek fire through the Umpqua  
2 National Forest, which is in lake recessional reserve. And  
3 there was a fire in 2015, which was after the survey was  
4 done and it's now created forging and other important  
5 habitat for northern spotted owls, specifically, and the  
6 regeneration of that forest and that needs to be taken into  
7 consideration.

8 I have more general comments that I have around  
9 the location of the pipeline through northern spotted owl  
10 habitat is the concern with the fragmentation that it is  
11 causing with that habitat. We think that there can  
12 definitely be a rerouting around those lake recessional  
13 reserves that are going to keep those reserves in tact,  
14 which is hugely important, especially, for northern spotted  
15 owls, who are susceptible to issues with fragmentation.

16 Also, the data around the terminal location near  
17 the Siuslaw National Forest. I'd like to see some  
18 consideration of how filling of those wetlands will  
19 potentially adjust the hydrology of the Forest Service lands  
20 that is just upstream and up to topography from that  
21 location. I feel that filling of that in 30 second. Thank  
22 you.

23 FERC must consider cumulative impacts of the  
24 project, specifically, around ESA species like northern  
25 spotted owls and marbled merlots. FERC must consider how

1 fragmentation of habitat might increase pressure from bard  
2 owl encroachment on northern spotted owls.

3           So we think that the scoping period should be  
4 extended from 30 days to 90 days. Public hearings shall  
5 have testimony in front of the entire group. FERC must  
6 consider alternatives to the project as a whole. FERC must  
7 also consider alternative designs to avoid potential  
8 impacts. FERC must spell out specific mitigation measures  
9 and plans that are relied upon to draw conclusions about  
10 the impacts.

11           FERC should weigh heavily the negative impacts  
12 of the private landowners of the Pacific Connector, which  
13 would harm private property rights through the potential use  
14 of eminent domain. FERC should address the full impacts of  
15 the project on water quality for each stream, wetland, and  
16 wetland impacted. Thank you very much.

17           MR. DALMAN: My name is James E. Dahlman.  
18 That's D-a-h-l-m-a-n. I am an affected landowner and I  
19 would just like to say do any of you in this room remember  
20 this date, Thursday, September 9, 2010. It was the San  
21 Bruno pipeline explosion and I remember it clearly as if it  
22 happened yesterday. I was in the area when the pipeline  
23 exploded. There were numerous safety issues that had failed  
24 with PG&E and the pipeline.

1           I have a major concern with this pipeline  
2 running right next to my house and that I have to go to bed  
3 every night knowing that I have a 36-inch diameter pipe with  
4 1400 pounds per square inch of pressure near me. I served  
5 my country for four years during the Vietnam War and one of  
6 the things that I served to protect was property rights. I  
7 feel that this pipeline will ruin my property value because  
8 it will be stuck with the stigma of the haunted house  
9 affect, which will lower my property value by as much as 40  
10 percent. Nobody is going to want to buy my property with a  
11 pipeline on it.

12           So when my wife and I get on in years and we  
13 can't live on the large property any more, we'd like to sell  
14 it and move on and use the money to help us in our older  
15 years and this is not going to be possible with the  
16 pipeline.

17           The major concerns that I have is I understand  
18 that most of the steel used in this pipeline is going to be  
19 coming from China. I have numerous friends who live in the  
20 Bay area and they Bay Bridge was built by Chinese steel and  
21 I hear them telling me constantly of bolts breaking, steel  
22 cracking, and everything else. If this had been a school or  
23 a hospital, I wouldn't really have that much problem, but  
24 considering that it's a foreign company that wants to use my  
25 land as a thoroughfare so they can make profit by selling

1 the gas in Asia I don't see any benefit for me, except that  
2 I may one day experience a pipeline explosion again that I  
3 experienced in San Bruno. Thank you.

4 MS. DAHLMAN: My name is Joan Dahlman, J-o-a-n  
5 D-a-h-l-m-a-n, and I'm an affected landowner. We bought  
6 this property 10 years ago. We retired to Oregon because we  
7 wanted to own property. We've always had small lots and  
8 this was 40 acres and my husband was real excited about it.  
9 It was our dream house. It sets on the top of hill.  
10 There's a beautiful view and we just love the trees. There  
11 are so many trees here in Oregon. And this is just has been  
12 a nightmare these past 10 years just fighting this thing  
13 constantly. It's been really stressful and it's not been  
14 the golden years at all.

15 We don't want our dream property to be destroy  
16 by removing trees and digging up the ground for the 34-inch  
17 -- the 100-foot wide ditch or clearing that has to be done.  
18 We're worried about the explosions also. We really would  
19 never have bought the property if we had ever thought that  
20 this pipeline was going to go through here. We have two  
21 neighbors that live nearby us. One has been trying to sell  
22 their property for a year. They actually don't have the  
23 pipeline on their property, but they're next door to it and  
24 they have not been able to sell for a year.

1           Another couple has been trying to sell for two  
2 years and they cannot sell and they're next door to where  
3 the pipeline would go. And then the neighbor up the hill  
4 from us she has probably within 24 yards -- 24 or 25 yards  
5 the pipeline runs to her house. She'll never sell that  
6 house. She'll be stuck there for the rest of her life until  
7 she dies. Her husband died recently from all this stress --  
8 partially was part of the whole thing.

9           Once again, we will lose about a third of our  
10 value. That's what we've been hearing consistently from  
11 people. Our view will be affected because our deck faces  
12 where the pipeline comes down the hill. It's not on our  
13 property, but it's our view. It's going to take out all of  
14 the trees that are in front of us, and like I said, we live  
15 on the top of a hill. We have a great view.

16           The pipeline is of no value to us at all. It's  
17 just using our land. We take all the loss. We have no  
18 natural gas to our home now and we won't get any either.  
19 This foreign company is using our land to profit to  
20 transport natural gas to a foreign entity using  
21 high-pressure line.

22           FERC has denied this twice because the losses to  
23 our properties and the waterways and everything within  
24 Oregon outweighs the gains to the foreign company. So this  
25 is ridiculous that that we have to keep fighting this over

1 and over and over again. We're just getting really stressed  
2 out and can't enjoy our retirement. FERC has rejected this  
3 twice, so it's time to just put this whole thing to rest.  
4 Veresen should be permanently denied because they've already  
5 been denied twice.

6           They have the right to access our property  
7 whenever they want to. And our understanding is once an  
8 easement is created that other utility companies and such  
9 can put their things in that pipeline too, so we're really  
10 losing a lot of our privacy that we were hoping for, so  
11 where does privacy U.S. citizen rights come into play this  
12 whole thing? This does not benefit our home, our  
13 community, or our state, so it's not really fair to take our  
14 property.

15           And I would like to just request that you please  
16 deny this a third time and put this nightmare to rest so we  
17 can go on living our lives, just our normal lives.

18           MS. DURAN: My name is Patti, P-a-t-t-i, last  
19 name is Duran, D-u-r-an. I am completely opposed to this  
20 whole project. It was already turned down twice. There are  
21 too many implications in the negative to even consider  
22 something like this. I would just ask that Jordan Cove  
23 considers the following remarks. The ecological standpoint  
24 it's going to go through four separate counties. What will  
25 happen if and when this is no longer profitable and they



1 want to stop producing the gas? I'm also opposed to them  
2 using eminent domain. I think that there is nothing to be  
3 gained by anybody in any of these counties. I think it is  
4 solely being done for the purpose of making money at the  
5 cost of environmental, at the costs of families that have  
6 passed down land for many generations, of ruining that for  
7 them, the ecological impacts of leaks, of disturbances going  
8 under rivers, wildlife disruption. Who's going to be  
9 responsible for fixing anything if something goes wrong, for  
10 example, a leak anywhere in any of this 235 miles of  
11 pipeline.

12                   It's ridiculous. They've been turned down twice  
13 and they're only -- it's solely for their own purposes.  
14 It's not for anybody in any of the counties. The damage  
15 that this is going to do is immeasurable.

16                   MS. STONE: Okay, my name is Roshanna Stone.  
17 I'll spell that for you. R-o-s-h-a-n-n-a, the last name is  
18 Stone, and I am landowner and I am unequivocally opposed to  
19 this pipeline and have let our opinions be known for over 10  
20 years and we are really tired of this situation and do not  
21 want to have the pipeline in Oregon. We do not want it on  
22 our property. We feel that there are damages that occur in  
23 nearby water sources. We're worried about the safety of the  
24 pipeline. We don't feel that it's needed or necessary to  
25 have in Oregon and we also are opposed to the use of

1 eminent domain and taking the way the uses of our  
2 properties.

3           And I'm basically here today -- I will follow  
4 up, of course, with letters to FERC, but I am really  
5 disappointed in FERC and lost our confidence in that agency  
6 allowing to have public meetings where the citizens can get  
7 together and hear the comments of each other in a forum and  
8 have a group setting. This format is basically just totally  
9 unacceptable. Cutting out Jackson County and not having a  
10 meeting in Medford is also unacceptable. And we are  
11 requesting that the FERC hold additional public meetings,  
12 which are of a format where we are all together and can hear  
13 each other and to come back and do this again because the  
14 system the way that it's now set up is just not right and  
15 needs to be redone.

16           The only other thing I would like to say is the  
17 short time period to get the comments in. In the first week  
18 of July is also unacceptable. That does not allow enough  
19 time for us to restart this process with FERC. We need more  
20 time. And also having it the first week in July when  
21 people are on vacation for the July 4th holiday is also  
22 unacceptable. So I want to go on record saying that FERC  
23 needs to take a relook at this whole process and come up  
24 with something that will better suit the citizens of Oregon,  
25 those that have an interest in this project and are unable

1 to comment and be part of the process and then to  
2 renegotiate some timeframes and start this all over again.  
3 So that is the finality of my comments today.

4 MS. SOHL: I'm Paula Sohl, P-a-u-l-a S-o-h-l.  
5 The three things that are on my mind today, one is I'm angry  
6 about the theft of public documents by the company from our  
7 public libraries and wonder if FERC -- I think it's  
8 materials that FERC had provided and the company has taken  
9 and I hope that that will be followed up on and that those  
10 materials can be returned or replaced by FERC so that people  
11 are able to compare the old plans to the current plans for  
12 the project.

13 I'm also concerned about the cost of these  
14 processes, these scoping processes. The scoping day today  
15 and I wonder if the company is bearing the burden of this  
16 cost that's been repeated now for the third time. Mostly,  
17 I'm opposed to the fossil fuel infrastructure continuing to  
18 be put in and the threat to our atmosphere because I believe  
19 that climate change is a real threat to our future and the  
20 future of our children, so I am not in favor of this project  
21 going forward.

22 I also was here as part of a group that did a  
23 little flash mob, zombie dance today, so I've been working  
24 on a zombie song and I only have one verse so far, but I'll  
25 sing it and then I'll be done.

1                   We're here to be complainers. Resistance is  
2 no-brainer. We need to become saner for our posterity.  
3 That's it.

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: Jordan Cove LNG and Pacific  
7 Connector Pipeline Projects

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: PF17-4-000

16 Place: Roseburg, OR

17 Date: June 28, 2017

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

22

23 Bruce Morgan

24 Official Reporter

25

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

5

6 UMPQUA COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
7 1140 UMPQUA COLLEGE ROAD  
8 ROSEBURG, OREGON 97470

9

10 JUNE 28, 2017

11

12

13

14

15 DANIEL VOIGTSBERGER - REPORTER

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2                               MR. TRISTANY:   Okay, my name is Joe Tristany,  
3   T-r-i-s-t-a-n-y.   I'm representing myself.   Okay, I would  
4   like to address some public safety issues.   I live less than  
5   half a mile away from the electricity towers where they plan  
6   to put the pipeline.

7                               Now there's about roughly nine lines and they  
8   carry 500,000 volts apiece.   Now I don't understand why they  
9   want to do that.   Electricity and gas don't mix.   If there's  
10  an explosion, it'll kill me, my wife, the three  
11  grandchildren, my daughter and my son-in-law.   There's no  
12  way to get around it.   It's too close.   We have neighbors on  
13  the right side of us too.

14                              Now the second thing I'd like to address is if  
15  there's a forest fire caused by the pipeline does the  
16  pipeline company expect the taxpayers to pay for putting it  
17  out?   There should be -- the pipeline should be required to  
18  put money in a contingency fund, around 10 to \$20 million  
19  for firefighting and for replanting of trees.

20                              The soil on Douglas County is not stable at all.  
21  During the rainy season, it has a tendency to shift and  
22  slide.   On my property one year during the winter it slid  
23  four feet.   The next year, another heavy rain year, it slid  
24  six more feet right up against the barn.   There's nothing  
25  stable about the ground around here at all.

1           The main market for the natural gas, from what I  
2 understand, is going to be China. Has anyone given any  
3 thought that there might be sanctions put on China by the  
4 U.S. Government if China does something that America doesn't  
5 like? In the future there'll be no way of knowing how the  
6 relations between the United States and China will be then  
7 what are we going to do with all the gas in the pipeline?  
8 Who are we going to sell it too?

9           Now the government officials say there are  
10 terrorists who are members of groups who want to do harm to  
11 America. A 50-caliber rifle can shot an incendiary round  
12 that explodes on contact up to two and a half miles. Are  
13 there going to be armed guards on this pipeline? Are they  
14 going to guard the substations, the pumping stations,  
15 metering stations, compressor stations? I haven't heard  
16 anybody address this issue.

17           Coos Bay is going to have a gas inlet facility,  
18 metering stations, a gas conditioning plant, storage tanks,  
19 LNG transfer lines, ship-loading facilities, and associated  
20 equipment, very easy targets for a terrorist.

21           I heard someone out there say that if the gas  
22 doesn't kill you the explosion will. In this country, we're  
23 guaranteed by our government life, liberty, and the pursuit  
24 of happiness. There's no guarantee of life if you live near  
25 a pipeline that can kill you and your family. There is no



1 liberty if you are forcing it on people who don't want it to  
2 begin with. There is no happiness if you're constantly  
3 concerned whether the pipeline is going to leak and if  
4 there's going to be an explosion.

5 I would like to quote our governor, Governor  
6 Brown, "I want to make Oregon the most  
7 environmentally-friendly state in America." There's nothing  
8 environmentally friendly about the pipeline. It's a safety  
9 hazard to the citizens of Oregon.

10 MR. HALLMARK: My name is Allen Hallmark,  
11 A-l-l-e-n H-a-l-l-m-a-r-k, like the card company, and I  
12 live in Talent, Oregon. I'm representing myself here, but I  
13 do belong to Rogue Climate and Southern Oregon Climate  
14 Action Now, but not I'm not an official spokesperson for  
15 either of those organizations.

16 First, I wanted to say that I'm voicing my  
17 strong objections to this process that FERC has imposed on  
18 these scoping hearings. Notice to the public of only 30  
19 days prior to this hearing was not nearly long enough.  
20 Ninety days notice is standard and should've been given in  
21 the case here. Holding hearings in three of the counties  
22 impacted by the LNG terminal and its pipeline and not  
23 holding one in Jackson County is inexcusable.

24 By not scheduling a scoping hearing in Medford  
25 or another city in Jackson County, FERC is demonstrating

1 that it wants to limit negative testimony about the project  
2 as much as possible. This is not fair to the people of  
3 Jackson County, especially, folks who own property along the  
4 projected path of the pipeline through Jackson County.

5           The process of requiring individual testimony to  
6 FERC hearing officers in private where their testimony  
7 cannot be heard by other members of the public is totally  
8 wrong-headed. Members of the public deserve to be able to  
9 hear what other members of the public are saying about these  
10 projects. To make all testimony private is an obvious  
11 attempt to keep these hearings from being transparent and  
12 open to scrutiny by the public, which is shameful.

13           Now let me outline some of my objections to the  
14 siting of an LNG terminal at Jordan Cove on Coos Bay. This  
15 project is of little benefit to the people of Oregon since  
16 it is designed to ship natural gas in the form of liquefied  
17 natural gas to foreign markets. Since all or much of the  
18 natural gas to be supplied to the terminal, if this is  
19 approved, would come from hydro-fracturing or fracking gas  
20 wells. And because no pipeline is free from leakage for  
21 long, this project would cause untold amounts of methane and  
22 other global warming gases to escape into the atmosphere  
23 causing Oregon's contribution to global warming and hence,  
24 to climate change, to soar.

1           Since the power plant to convert regular natural  
2 gas into liquefied natural gas will be needed or noxious  
3 greenhouse gases and compounds will be released into  
4 Oregon's atmosphere with no benefit, other the jobs needed  
5 to build the projects and a few to run the LNG terminal if  
6 it is completed and goes online.

7           Here's some of my objections to the proposal to  
8 route the 36-inch diameter natural gas pipeline from Malin  
9 to Coos Bay. FERC will undoubtedly have to use eminent  
10 domain to acquire much of the land to build the pipeline  
11 since so many property owners in the proposed path of the  
12 pipeline have testified that they will not sell access to  
13 the pipeline. Use of eminent domain should be illegal since  
14 the citizens of Oregon and the U.S. will not benefit from  
15 the project, except in a very small way from the  
16 construction jobs and the few permanent jobs created.

17           The potential damage to southern Oregon's  
18 amazing forests, rivers, creeks, and Coos Bay should an  
19 explosive accident occur along the pipeline should make any  
20 regulatory body refuse to approve it. Making profits for a  
21 Canadian corporation while putting our pristine Rogue River,  
22 Umpqua River and their many tributaries, their forests and  
23 much more at risk is just not worth it at all.

24           Methane has now been shown to be a very potent  
25 greenhouse gas, according to the information I've read.

1 While I'm not a scientist and I haven't read the scientific  
2 papers myself, I have it on good authority that while  
3 burning natural gas is much cleaner than burning coal or  
4 oil, the damage to the climate from global warming caused by  
5 leaking gas from the wells, from the pipelines, from the LNG  
6 terminal and from the LNG ships and then from the pipelines  
7 in the country where the LNG is offloaded will constitute a  
8 large amount of leakage that will add substantially to  
9 global warming. Thank you.

10 MS. MCLAUGHLIN: My name is Stacey McLaughlin,  
11 S-t-a-c-e-y M-c-L-a-u-g-h-l-i-n. I am an impacted  
12 landowner that is affected by this project. They want to  
13 put the pipeline -- the Pacific Connector gas pipeline over  
14 a mile through our property. It crosses both parcels of our  
15 property. We have been personally affected by the lack of  
16 ability to develop and sell our property as a result of the  
17 threat of eminent domain.

18 Two weeks ago, my husband was hurt in an  
19 accident with his excavator, rolled it, and came home and  
20 said I don't think I can keep doing this. It's just too  
21 hard on me. We need to think about selling. And in  
22 contacting a realtor, they said you guys are on the pipeline  
23 route. That's going to affect the sales price of the  
24 property.

1                   This project has been going on for over 13  
2 years. I've had enough. We've been held hostage to this  
3 project for 13 years. Jordan Cove, Veresen, the Canadian  
4 company that owns both the Pacific Connector and Jordan  
5 Cove; have used the people of the State of Oregon as  
6 gambling chips to facilitate their profits for their  
7 company. They do not have buyers for this. They do not  
8 have the opportunity to facilitate this project without  
9 taking property from people who do not want their property  
10 taken through eminent domain.

11                   And I want to complain about this process. I  
12 think it's irresponsible of you to be holding a process  
13 where people don't get to hear what everyone else has to say  
14 or how they feel about it. And then you have to send us off  
15 online later to read comments when I live in a rural  
16 community. I don't have access to the Internet. We have  
17 limited data. It's so slow I can't download any of your  
18 documents. And in Douglas County, as of June 1, our public  
19 library is closed, so we do not have access to our libraries  
20 for any of the information that you have. This process is  
21 not transparent and it's supposed to be public and  
22 transparent.

23                   The safety of this pipeline -- I wish you were  
24 holding these meetings in August so you could see what it's  
25 like here and know that it is hot, dry, and very subject to

1 wild land fires. They have not included that in any of  
2 their resource reports in the past and say it's no big deal.  
3 We also have on our coastline the Cascadia Subduction Zone  
4 and it is not if it is when that earthquake hits and to try  
5 and facilitate this project in that zone is irresponsible of  
6 any government.

7           Having spent 38 years of my life serving the  
8 public sector, I know that we have a responsibility and a  
9 calling to make sure that our communities are safe. This  
10 project does not keep me or my family safe. It also goes  
11 across the ridge of our property, which is where water comes  
12 from, so we're very, very concerned about any of the water  
13 issues and also the wetlands.

14           The other thing that's really disturbing to me  
15 is the fact that it goes across 400 water bodies. Any  
16 mitigation is often taken place somewhere else and I think  
17 that is something I don't want to see happen. When the  
18 (0:12:59.1)\* River is at its highest degradation level that  
19 it can be at -- I mean there's no other level. It can't go  
20 to a 6 because it's at the highest and they want to drill  
21 under it. You have a responsibility to the future to say no  
22 to things like that.

23           The other thing is, and I'm not sure. I guess  
24 it would be a question that I would have to ask you and that  
25 is whether or not that you have to take climate change into

1 account in your assessment. And if you do, then I think  
2 it's really important that we look at what those long-term  
3 affects and impacts are going to be with respect to the  
4 natural gas pipeline.

5           The thing that I think is most important to me  
6 with all of this is the fact that this is a rigged process.  
7 It feels very unfair and already that a decision has been  
8 made when the Trump Administration publicly comes out and  
9 names this project, through Gary Cohen, and says that they  
10 are supportive of it and they will see this project through.  
11 So that tells me that this is not a legitimate organization  
12 or a legitimate agency and that this process is being  
13 threatened and I don't have a fair and equitable chance.

14           The other thing that's very disturbing to me  
15 about this is that Jordan Cove has come into our local  
16 communities. They've spent over a million dollars in a  
17 local election to rig it. They come into our communities  
18 and they hand out bribes under the guise of a grant, looking  
19 for favor to create favor within the local communities and I  
20 think that's something that ought to be regulated and  
21 stopped.

22           I think that FERC has a responsibility to the  
23 communities and to this public. I understand -- I'm not  
24 finished quite yet. I'm getting there -- that these  
25 projects and these applicants need to be held accountable

1 and at some time you have to freaking say no. You can't  
2 keep saying yes without prejudice because my life has been  
3 on hold for over 13 years as a result of this project and  
4 I'm frankly sick of it.

5 MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you for having me here. My  
6 name is Juan Sanchez and I want to deliver my written  
7 statement. Thank you and have a nice evening.

8 MR. MURILLO: My name Samuel Murillo. It's  
9 spelled S-a-m-u-e-l, Murillo is M-u-r-i-l-l-o. I'm a  
10 representative with the Pacific Northwest Regional Council  
11 of Carpenters. I'm from Cascade Locks. I'm in favor of the  
12 project. I'm not going to waste a whole lot of you guys'  
13 time because I'll be down in Cline Falls, so I have a  
14 written statement for you that I'd like you guys to take and  
15 I'll see you down in Cline Falls.

16 MR. GARCIA: My name is Luis Roger Garcia,  
17 L-u-i-s R-o-g-e-r G-a-r-c-i-a. And I want this project to  
18 go forward. Basically, what it comes down to in a nutshell  
19 jobs, not only for my members that I represent, but for  
20 other trades, as in electricians, plumbers, and et cetera.  
21 And it's going to be good for Coos Bay for local jobs to run  
22 the facility.

23 MR. SCIRE: My name is Joshua Scire. My last  
24 name is spelled S-c-i-r-e. I'm representing the Pacific  
25 Northwest Regional Council of Carpenters. The developers



1 have committed to 100 percent union labor and that means  
2 several hundred of my members will have work for upwards of  
3 five years and union paychecks are what are economy needs.  
4 Union paychecks feed families, provide insurance, and keep  
5 pensions funded.

6           The fact that this project should be built by  
7 qualified, high-trained workers, if it's going to be built,  
8 it needs to be built safely and to the highest industry  
9 standards. I'm in support of jobs and job alone, plain and  
10 simple.

11           MR. LEE: My name is Ron Lee, R-o-n L-e-e. I  
12 represent the International Union of Operating Engineers,  
13 Local 701. I'm for this project and it'll put a lot of our  
14 members to work in a high-paying job. It's just we're for  
15 it because we have skilled and safe operators, many that  
16 have previous experience on pipeline work and it'll help the  
17 whole community of southern Oregon, Coos Bay and surrounding  
18 areas and also permanent stationery engineer work for the  
19 plant in Coos Bay. That's all I have.

20           MR. MARIS: Hello, my name is Matt Maris,  
21 M-a-t-t M-a-r-i-s. I'm with Laborers International Union  
22 North America, Local 737 here in Oregon. I would really  
23 like to see this project get going. I have met members from  
24 southern Oregon here who told me that they didn't  
25 necessarily want this job. This job wouldn't be great, but

1 that them and their families need this job. They've been  
2 subsidizing on 20,000 and \$25,000 a year and they have a  
3 chance to quadruple that kind of money one year on the  
4 pipeline. No construction job that we work on provides as  
5 many man hours as a pipeline, so it would be a huge benefit  
6 for our membership and all the other trades and the local  
7 economy and it's obvious spending some time in Coos Bay  
8 yesterday that this economy down here is not doing nearly as  
9 well as it is in the upper valley and it can really use some  
10 permanent down there at the plant that that we built.

11 And the final thing is I believe this project  
12 would be good for the overall environment by selling natural  
13 gas to our partner in Japan. It would greatly reduce the  
14 use of coal in East Asia, which would reduce greenhouse  
15 gases, so I believe it would be a win/win in the long term.  
16 That's all I have. Thank you.

17 MR. SUTHERLAND: My name is John Sutherland,  
18 J-o-h-n S-u-t-h-e-r-l-a-n-d. I'm with the Oregon Laborers  
19 Union. I'm here to support the Jordan Cove and Pacific  
20 Connector Project and ask the FERC to evaluate the following  
21 issues as part of its Environmental Impact Statement. The  
22 impacts to Jordan Cove approximately 10 billion capital  
23 investment in Oregon and how its approximately 48 million in  
24 annual Oregon corporate taxes and 62 million in annual local

1 taxes and payments in lieu of taxes. It will benefit the  
2 state and southern Oregon's economy and local government's.

3 Klamath County will receive approximately 5  
4 million in its tax revenue every year, the facilities and  
5 operations, providing a much needed boost to the county tax  
6 revenues. The economic ripple benefits of construction  
7 workers and the public benefit analysis considering their  
8 income will contribute directly or indirectly to state and  
9 local payroll taxes, increase spending at local businesses,  
10 increase spending at local construction vendors, job  
11 training, increase local charitable contributions, increase  
12 tourism, and more.

13 This project will create 3,500 new construction  
14 jobs for two to four years and those workers will be earning  
15 an average of \$80,000 a year, plus benefits, more than  
16 double the average wage of southern Oregon counties. The  
17 limited impact, if any, to streams and rivers since more  
18 than half of the bodies of water that will be crossed are  
19 intermittent and dry will they will be crossed. The use of  
20 modern construction methods such as horizontal directional  
21 drilling, which will go well below the bed and banks of  
22 rivers will also help avoid impacts.

23 This project will be built by highly skilled and  
24 qualified union trades people with years of experience  
25 safely building industrial facilities, including natural gas

1 pipelines such as the Ruby Pipeline, which was completed in  
2 2011. The importance of Jordan Cove in reducing greenhouse  
3 gas emission since it will replace new coal-fired power  
4 plants in Asia, just like natural gas displaced coal here in  
5 the United States. The reproduction of greenhouse gas  
6 emissions is a global issue and this project will help  
7 reduce those emissions by providing a new source of cleaner  
8 natural gas to countries that will limit energy resources of  
9 their own.

10 MR. ROLLER: My name is Bruce Roller, last name  
11 is R-o-l-l-e-r. I'm affiliated with Local 737 out of the  
12 Portland area, been a union laborer for the last 20 years,  
13 primarily, working highway construction within the state.  
14 As a worker, I can see that this project would be a huge  
15 benefit to not only the region, Coos Bay, and southern  
16 Oregon, but as well as the state itself because of other  
17 contracts that would be let and contractors in the Portland  
18 area that would be vying for work down south.

19 And I support the pipeline project and  
20 understand its complexity, but also realize that it's the  
21 safest way to transfer the LNG and I support that particular  
22 piece and believe that, from what I've seen from -- I'm not  
23 engineer, but from the meetings and things that I've gone to  
24 that the engineering of the actual Coos Bay facility is top

1 notch. And adjustments are always being made to ensure the  
2 safety of the public as well as the people constructing it.

3           With the boom with work, Oregon really needs,  
4 even though our unemployment rate appears to be low, I think  
5 those are false numbers, me personally, I believe that we  
6 need that boom to increase the payroll taxes revenue for the  
7 state and help them get ourselves out of our financial  
8 situation. So with that being said, I support the project  
9 and I support the use of the push to use Oregon people, to  
10 put them back to work and have a successful completion to  
11 this project. That's it.

12           MR. FENISON: Hi, my name is Chad Fenison,  
13 F-e-n-i-s-o-n. I am a laborer out of Laborers Local 737,  
14 and I just want to talk about what the pipeline means to me.  
15 To me, it means good jobs for people that want to work and  
16 I've worked pipelines all across the United States, so it's  
17 really personal for me. This one has a lot of controversy  
18 because it's not in an existing right-of-way, which a lot of  
19 them are in existing right-of-ways. But I think that it  
20 would be a good project, that if it goes union it would be  
21 really good for the area. I think, economically, it's going  
22 to be really good for the area.

23           It's going to bring a lot of funds you know into  
24 the area, into the county. Half the people that work on the  
25 pipeline, if it goes union, will be from this area because

1 they'd have to use locals for half the crew. The other half  
2 of the crew is going to be from all over the United States,  
3 guys that do this kind of work. And I've been on a lot of  
4 pipelines myself, personally, so I know that if you do them  
5 responsibly it could be a great project. It could be  
6 environmentally sound.

7 All the pipelines I've been on in the past had  
8 inspectors watching each crew. So if you did any kind of  
9 environmental you know faux pas or you spilled diesel on the  
10 ground or got blasting on the ground or coating on the  
11 ground or anything like that they stop you right there. You  
12 have to clean it up. So I know firsthand that you can do  
13 pipelines environmentally responsible and I'm looking  
14 forward to this project going through. I've been a steward  
15 all across the United States for the laborers on pipelines  
16 and I know for a fact that if you do a pipeline with a union  
17 company they're responsible and it's an ethically produced  
18 thing.

19 I also know that the non-union companies they  
20 cut a lot of corners and that's kind of why we're in this  
21 situation right here is because there's a lot of bad  
22 practices out there that people that aren't professionals  
23 do, just like you know a dentist that you know doesn't use a  
24 proper hygienist you're going to have some problems. So  
25 it's the same thing with the pipeline industry. If you use

1 quality people, you're going to get a quality product. If  
2 you use people that aren't reputable or not environmentally  
3 sound, then you run into issues like all the protests and  
4 what not. So anyway I'm looking forward to this project  
5 going through. Thanks a lot for you guy's time. Have a  
6 great day.

7 MR. HEILMAN: My name is Robert Leo Heilman and  
8 I reside at 2870 Weaver Road, Myrtle Creek, Oregon. And I  
9 will give my testimony in the form of a poem by Mr. Tim  
10 McNulty from the book in Blue Mountain Dust. It's called  
11 Poem to Rid the Woods of Jeremiah's Monsters. Because you  
12 see monsters most everywhere these days and today on the  
13 path out from the cabin had to carry big sticks to fight  
14 them and cried when the weight slowed you down and even  
15 though I haven't seen them I know they're there too. So I  
16 make this poem to rid the woods of monsters. All you  
17 monster eyes that see only to ravish the poor and voiceless  
18 of the world go blind, hands that snatch the very ground  
19 from beneath unborn feet go limp. Teeth that tear the last  
20 thin shreds of what is green and holy around us fall out.  
21 Hunger that knows no rest eat yourself. You monsters that  
22 come flickering out of your bomb shelter souls to strike at  
23 the life we try and to make in spite of you may you become  
24 the bad dreams you push on us and our children and never

1 wake. Meantime, keep out of these woods. You're scaring my  
2 friends. Thank you.

3 MS. HAWS: My name is Cindy Haws, C-i-n-d-y  
4 H-a-w-s. I am a rancher, a landowner impacted by the  
5 pipeline. I'm also affiliated with Friends of Family  
6 Farmers and Uncoiled Watersheds and other organizations  
7 here. I am a professional wildlife biologist, so I have a  
8 very deep knowledge and understanding of the ecology of this  
9 area and I've worked here for a number of years in the past  
10 for the U.S. Forest Service as the Umpqua National Forest  
11 wildlife biologist, so I'm very aware of the area impacting  
12 both the forest and on private land.

13 I would like you to consider completely opposing  
14 the project. I completely oppose it because it's going to  
15 have such significant direct, indirect, and cumulative  
16 affects on so many people, both locally as well as  
17 regionally as well as nationally as well as worldwide.

18 And it's very important that you consider the  
19 cumulative affects that FERC requires the consideration of  
20 cumulative affects of not just the direct impacts locally of  
21 the pipeline, but also the cumulative affects of the  
22 fracking and the impacts of the methane that is produced by  
23 that fracking all the way to mainland and also the methane  
24 that's produced by the pipeline from mainland to Jordan  
25 Cove, also the CO2 and the methane that's going to be



1 produced from the liquefaction plant and the fact that that  
2 plant is going to take up so much energy used by -- and so  
3 much CO2 that the state will have in the future very limited  
4 amounts of flexibility, including me, myself, and my  
5 livelihood because all a sudden we'll have a big, huge  
6 liquefaction plant putting in a whole bunch of CO2 in the  
7 air for one single purpose and that is for a company's  
8 profit and a company that doesn't even live in the United  
9 States and profit is not what these kinds of plants should  
10 be about and it's not going to have public service.

11           Instead, it's going to have adverse impacts to  
12 seven billion people, plus it's going to have adverse  
13 impacts to two million species because all species are going  
14 to be impacted by the cumulative affects of the methane and  
15 CO2 into our climate, making our climate unusable and that's  
16 very clear and so that gets back to the fact that you need  
17 to consider that it's going to jeopardize so many species  
18 and wildlife species, both aquatic and terrestrial all over  
19 the world as well as locally. There are a number of  
20 impacted fish and I depend on fish for my livelihood and I  
21 depend on water for my livelihood. And water is really  
22 critical and the water will be impacted. It's already being  
23 impacted by other projects and so it's going to be further  
24 impacted by this project.

1                   It's going to be crossing 400 of our water  
2 bodies and that's going to have huge, long-term impacts for  
3 what, a few jobs, short-term six months or better. Wow.  
4 And the amount -- and that's going to take my job away and I  
5 want everybody to understand that because I am a farmer. I  
6 depend on that water and that water will be impacted by what  
7 you're doing and I depend on the air and I depend on the  
8 climate. And what I know about the climate right now is  
9 that we are getting to the point where the temperatures are  
10 so bad that it will cause cell tissue damage permanently and  
11 we will not have a planet.

12                   And so what you are proposing has an impact on  
13 that and it is totally unnecessary and that's what's really  
14 key. It is not going to benefit our people at all. It's  
15 not going to benefit anybody, but a very small amount of  
16 people for a very short period of time for jobs and the rich  
17 people for their typical reasons.

18                   There is huge problems with the fact that there  
19 is unstable slopes in most of the pipeline area and those  
20 unstable slopes I'm aware of once they are disturbed will  
21 never, ever, ever be stabilized. You can do all the  
22 engineering you want. I've measured the impacts many times  
23 with the roads for logging roads, et cetera. I know that  
24 you will not be able to mitigate those impacts and that's  
25 real key here because you're going to be causing jeopardy

1 for two million -- and I want to reference those two  
2 million species, that's E.O. Wilson and I've got tons of  
3 other literature I can reference here, but I don't need to  
4 because E.O. Wilson summarizes it quite well.

5           And from an economic standpoint, I want you to  
6 know that it's going to have a huge economic impact on  
7 people because there's lots of people who don't make their  
8 livelihoods off of oil and gas and those people are going to  
9 be very significantly impacted. And so from that  
10 standpoint, it's my understanding, according to E.O. Wilson,  
11 that we're going to have a loss of habitat. We're going to  
12 have pollution and we're going to have overuse and  
13 exploitation. And the amount of economic impact is three  
14 times actually the worldwide -- what'd you call it -- the  
15 worldwide GDP, Gross Domestic Product (sic). And so I want  
16 a thorough economic analysis done that considers the impacts  
17 to people who depend upon the water, not big water companies  
18 or that sort of thing. I'm talking about people who are  
19 going to be damaged from all of the climate impacts and the  
20 direct and indirect impacts.

21           MS. REID: My name is Janice Reid, J-a-n-i-c-e ,  
22 last name R-e-i-d, and my comments are mostly about the  
23 environmental cost of this project. I feel that this  
24 project is going through a lot of spotted owl habitat. It's  
25 a threatened species at the present, currently, being

1 considered for endangered. And I believe that this is not  
2 in the best interest of this species or many of the other  
3 species that are associated with the older forest that it's  
4 going through.

5 I also feel that the environmental costs are  
6 not really being considered in this. The long-term  
7 environmental costs associated with putting a project  
8 through and the future cost to the next generation is not  
9 being considered and so I am opposed to this project on  
10 those grounds. I see time and time again explosions of  
11 pipelines, leakages, and I'm just not sure that this  
12 pipeline can protect the environment -- the environment can  
13 be protected from this kind of construction and I feel that  
14 the risks associated with landslides, earthquakes, potential  
15 terrorism activity could be devastating to this area as it  
16 goes through the very high, fire-prone area. This is one of  
17 the most highly fire-prone areas of the state and so that's  
18 my comment. I am opposed to it on environmental grounds.  
19 Thank you.

20 MS. LARSON: Diana Larson, D-i-a-n-a  
21 L-a-r-s-o-n. I'm here of my own accord. I'm not paid. I'm  
22 not paid by anybody to be here. I'm just here because I  
23 care and these are my kids.

24 FERC has a responsibility to every organism in  
25 the State of Oregon, from the microscopic life we can't see

1 with the naked eye to the giants of our beautiful forest. I  
2 am here to comment on the Pacific Connector gas line, Jordan  
3 Cove. I understand this project will impact at least 400  
4 rivers, streams, and wetlands in Klamath, Jackson, Douglas,  
5 and Coos Counties. This, by itself, without mentioning the  
6 potential for disaster at some later point, will have a  
7 far-reaching negative impact on the fish and wildlife all  
8 through the valleys and the communities it passes through.  
9 Our salmon, steelhead, and wildlife are already suffering  
10 and endangered.

11 FERC must use the most current data to assure  
12 more than adequate care is taken for our lands and  
13 waterways. The laws governing eminent domain should be  
14 enough to stop this project. This project is for the  
15 benefit of a foreign company. It has no benefit to the  
16 common welfare of the communities it passes through after  
17 the short-term job surge, man camps installing the pipeline  
18 nor will it be maintained at the expense of serving or for  
19 the use of the communities that it rips through. It has no  
20 place here.

21 FERC has a tremendous responsibility and needs  
22 to be sure to take the necessary time to do adequate due  
23 diligence to mitigate any and all issues relating to this  
24 project and to be sure to inform communities well in advance  
25 of what those mitigation measures might include. There are

1 any number of safety issues related to the pipeline --  
2 slides, forest fires, Tsunami, earthquake. It is my  
3 understanding parts of the pipeline are above ground,  
4 hunters, guns. Some parts of the line are Class 1 safety  
5 standards. How does FERC decide which families don't  
6 matter?

7           Thirty days for citizens to absorb all the  
8 information, hundreds of pages, is not enough time. The  
9 comment period should be extended and it should absolutely  
10 include people of southern Oregon, Jackson County, and  
11 Portland for scoping meetings. Why are these areas excluded  
12 if FERC cares to do a thorough review? Why must mankind  
13 inflict yet another hideous scar across this planet making  
14 it a clear and present terrorist target, decimating  
15 additional land and environment to the benefit of, yet  
16 again, a single species man and ultimately for the same old  
17 thing the all mighty dollar?

18           Is there a valid reason they cannot use the  
19 power line path. To follow the power line would be much  
20 easier. It is already void of all vegetation, no eminent  
21 domain, no old growth. Of course, there will still be the  
22 same issues with landslides and the earthquakes, but the  
23 earthquake not if, but when. I do not know of anyone that  
24 feels this pipeline is a necessity. What is a necessity is  
25 for the human species to wake up and realize they are not

1 the only ones that have rights to this great planet and its  
2 resources.

3 It is way pass time to start figuring out how to  
4 live in harmony with the earth and all the creatures instead  
5 of going along blindly and ruining everything, then say,  
6 oops, I guess we made a mistake.

7 FERC should be looking for environmental options  
8 in place of LNG, consider all the negative impacts related,  
9 not just from the pipeline itself, but the fracking, the  
10 leaked methane, and carbon pollution. It is horrifying to  
11 witness the way man is destroying the environment on so many  
12 levels and seems blind to it. FERC is in a position to  
13 change this.

14 Jackson County was left out of the hearing  
15 schedule because FERC claims it has limited resources and  
16 feels like it already has a good understanding of how  
17 Jackson County residents feel about the project. They need  
18 to be able to get their comments on the record for an  
19 absolute understanding, not just a good understanding.  
20 Thank you.

21 MR. NEU: My name is James Neu, N-e-u is the  
22 last name and I'm with 350.Eugene. Scoping hearings should  
23 be held in Jackson County as well as the other three  
24 affected counties by this project. The scoping hearings  
25 should be held in cities such as Eugene, Salem, and

1 Portland. This is a project in our state and all residents  
2 should be given the opportunity to comment.

3 Scoping comment period should be extended from  
4 30 to 90 or 120 days due to the complexity of the project.  
5 People should be able to testify in front of an entire group  
6 at public hearings and not individually as we are today.  
7 FERC should not rely on outdated data from previous Jordan  
8 Cove Pacific Coast Pipeline Project applications. FERC must  
9 consider alternates to the projects, as a whole, and  
10 alternate designs to avoid potential impacts from the  
11 projects.

12 FERC must spell out specific mitigation measures  
13 and plans that relied upon to draw conclusions about the  
14 impact of the project. FERC should weigh negative impacts  
15 the project would have on private property via eminent  
16 domain. FERC should consider direct and indirect cumulative  
17 impacts to fish and wildlife through the entire footprint of  
18 the project. FERC must consider the climate change impact  
19 of the project's affect for its lifetime, starting at the  
20 fracking process, transport, liquefaction, plant and end  
21 use.

22 FERC must undertake a detailed analysis of the  
23 public safety risks associated with the proposed terminal  
24 and pipeline, including fire risks, LNG spill risks, seismic  
25 affects on the facility, and Tsunami impacts.



1           There will be four super tankers per week equal  
2 eight four-hour periods every week that the commercial  
3 fishing industry will be destroyed by this closure of this  
4 port. There are greater than 100 streams and crossing that  
5 are tunneled and construction process would lead to possible  
6 blowouts of construction process lubricants into the river  
7 ecosystems.

8           Safe standard parameters at the Jordan Cove  
9 facility has changed from two miles to a half mile. How did  
10 this happen, when and what federal agency authorized this  
11 safe zone to be restricted? Southwest Oregon regional  
12 airport located in North Bend is only 1.1 miles from the LNG  
13 storage tanks and the FAA issued four notices of presumed  
14 hazard for two LNG tanks at the terminal and two towers at  
15 the South Dune Power Plant. We're still waiting for  
16 findings and airport study. How is that material related to  
17 this project was removed from the Coos County Library? How  
18 can a private agency affiliated with this project remove  
19 documents from a public library?

20           This project does nothing for the State of  
21 Oregon, other than disturbing ecosystems, polluting rivers  
22 and streams, and possibly a catastrophic fire explosion at  
23 the Jordan Cove liquefaction plant. This project will  
24 benefit a Canadian company that exports frack, liquid  
25 natural gas from American soils to Asian markets at the

1 expense of polluting American soils and risk to the  
2 residents of Oregon who will lose their properties by  
3 eminent domain.

4           This project is not in the best interest of the  
5 residents of Oregon. I respectfully urge Federal Energy  
6 Regulatory Commission to deny this project. Thank you for  
7 the opportunity to speak.

8           MS. BLOOMGARDEN: My name is Robin Bloomgarden,  
9 B-l-o-o-m-g-a-r-d-e-n. Robin is spelled like a bird.

10           So on December 17, 2009, the Federal Energy  
11 Regulatory Commission, FERC, approved the Jordan Cove  
12 Pacific Connector liquefied natural gas LNG import facility  
13 in Coos Bay and the associated pipeline across four  
14 counties. There are a multitude of concerns about this  
15 project, including threats to public safety, our environment  
16 and private property rights.

17           FERC did the public a disservice with that  
18 deeply flawed analysis of the project by neglecting to fully  
19 analyze the proposal, including impacts on water quality,  
20 water supplies, wetlands, wildlife, safety, habitat, old  
21 growth, and invasive species. The pipeline from Malin,  
22 Oregon would require hundreds of water body crossings, clear  
23 cutting of remaining old growth forests on public lands. It  
24 would cross steep, remote terrain prone to landslides where  
25 emergency response is limited to local volunteers and

1 impacts 675 private landowners with eminent domain before it  
2 reaches Coos Bay.

3 Perhaps most troubling, FERC has failed to  
4 demonstrate a public need for this project. Questions also  
5 arise as to why Jordan Cove LNG illegally removed shelves  
6 worth of documents from libraries in counties along the  
7 route, including materials from the government regulatory  
8 agencies, that's you guys. This creates yet another barrier  
9 for comparing new and old document changes by all parties.

10 You may ask how does this project fit into our  
11 National Energy Policy. The answer is it does nothing for  
12 Oregonians or the nation, while Pembina's stockholders reap  
13 the profits. Why should we be a sacrifice zone so they can  
14 cash in at our expense?

15 FERC's own chairman, John Wellinghoff, disagreed  
16 with the 2009 approval of this project, saying "Based on my  
17 review of the evidence, I believe that there are reasonable  
18 alternatives that would more efficiently, more reliably, and  
19 in an environmentally preferable manner meet the projected  
20 energy needs of the markets that the Jordan Cove Project is  
21 intended to serve; therefore, I conclude that the Jordan  
22 Cove Project is not in the public interest and I  
23 respectfully dissent from today's Order."

24 FERC, since that ruling in 2009, has turned down  
25 this project twice, so why are we still here, all this for a

1 few temporary local jobs? I guarantee you that most of the  
2 long-term employees will come with Pembina, leaving locals  
3 with nothing but crumbs. Those promised few temporary jobs  
4 could instead turn into many good jobs if Coos and the other  
5 counties involved would instead look at training locals for  
6 the emerging and necessary post-fossil fuel paradigm of  
7 clean winds, solar, and wave energy delivery, as well as  
8 building new and retrofitting old structures for energy  
9 conservation. Deny the permits for the last time. Thank  
10 you.

11 MS. MARIA: I'm assuming that almost everybody  
12 here is going to cover most of the environmental issues.  
13 The fact that liquid gas leaks period and we have a lot of  
14 forest fires. If we had the pipeline up last year, it  
15 would've been right over the proposed route of the pipeline.  
16 I can only imagine what that would've done. It's going  
17 under our waterways. I've heard around 400 times. And the  
18 issue of public (sic) domain cannot be emphasized enough.  
19 The criteria taking land based on public domain refers to  
20 the public good and this in no way possible is a positive  
21 for the public domain.

22 It's Canada and going to Asia. It isn't even  
23 ours to deal with. My most important thing to me is as a  
24 landowner I'm a member of the Women's Land Trust in Days  
25 Creek and that has been owned in Trust for the Women of

1 Oregon for 40 some years and it would be devastated. The  
2 pipeline is scheduled to go right through our land, in  
3 forested areas, increase the temperature, and destroy  
4 habitat and our natural resources on the land. We, at one  
5 point, were offered \$200 for all 147 acres. It's  
6 impossible. It just defies reason that anybody would even  
7 consider in the State of Oregon to do something this  
8 devastating and I can't even imagine wanting to do it  
9 anywhere. And yet, I understand our country is  
10 criss-crossed with pipelines such as this for profit.  
11 That's all I have to say.

12 MR. GROSSMILLER: My name is Luke Grossmiller.  
13 It's spelled L-u-k-e G-r-o-s-s-m-i-l-l-e-r, and I'm with  
14 350.Eugene.

15 My main concern with this project is that the  
16 pollution caused by burning and processing LNG gas will  
17 leave the future in worse circumstances than the present and  
18 I don't want any jobs created that are going to do that. So  
19 if we're going to make new jobs, I think it's our  
20 responsibility to make jobs that produce a better future and  
21 that's really what we're investing in here. And that's all  
22 I have to say right now. Thank you.

23 MS. KNITTLE: Okay, my name is Christa Knittle,  
24 spelled C-h-r-i-s-t-a, last name K-n-i-t-t-l-e.

1           I would say the main thing I represent is First  
2 United Methodist Church in Eugene, Oregon, where -- because  
3 I'm a Christian and I believe we're supposed to take care of  
4 God's creation and use our brains for the benefit of  
5 creation. And we're living in a time of -- you know all the  
6 scientists are telling us the climate change. We need to  
7 quit extracting fossil fuels and develop renewable energy.  
8 So we have the resources and the technology in this country  
9 to develop renewable energy, so we need to move in that  
10 direction instead of building up more fossil fuel  
11 infrastructure that is causing climate change.

12           And so I'm opposed to the Jordan Cove LNG  
13 Terminal and the Pacific Connector Pipeline because they  
14 harm the citizens and the environment and our climate and  
15 are not supporting the public interest. They're only  
16 supporting corporations that are profiting. And China is  
17 going to renewable energy as well, so it doesn't make sense  
18 to sell them natural gas because they also are beginning to  
19 develop -- you know rely more on renewable energy. So we  
20 have solutions and we need to develop new technologies that  
21 are safe and clean.

22           So there's just too many negative impacts on  
23 private landowners and it's not right to use eminent domain  
24 for the benefit of a private company. Eminent domain is  
25 intended to support the common good, not you know corporate

1 profit. And it really concerns me that the pipeline will go  
2 through 400 streams and rivers, which is very damaging,  
3 especially to the tourism economy, which is how a lot of  
4 people make their living and it's a sustainable you know  
5 field of work.

6           So we need to protect those jobs and not harm  
7 them with fossil fuel projects because the pipeline company  
8 has an accident record and putting a pipeline through a  
9 remote area in the arid West where the summers are getting  
10 drier and drier you know it's just too much potential for  
11 accidents.

12           And also the terminal will be built in a Tsunami  
13 zone, which makes no sense whatsoever and I've heard  
14 university professors talk about how ill-conceived this  
15 project is and nevertheless it's being brought up again. So  
16 I think we need to listen to our scientists who are there to  
17 serve the public good and telling us that this is a  
18 disastrous idea.

19           So basically, we need to develop. We need to  
20 promote clean, safe jobs for the people of Oregon. That's  
21 the main thing.

22           MS. TUCKEY: My name is Shasha, S-h-a-s-h-a,  
23 Tuckey, T-u-c-k-e-y, and I came with 350.org (0:55.51.7)\*  
24 production and the people and I'm here again because I was  
25 here yesterday in Coos Bay and I'm just observing again.

1 We're just still kind of confused and want to know why  
2 there's not a public hearing where we could all talk in  
3 front of each other. This makes me really nervous to come  
4 back here and talk in this situation, so I have a hard time.  
5 So I'm sure other people aren't able to depict themselves or  
6 even talk the way that they would like to because of the  
7 situation. It's really intense. So that's all I have to  
8 say.

9 MR. ROGERS: My name is Sean Rogers, S-e-a-n  
10 R-o-g-e-r-s. I've got a speech impediment. Sorry if I  
11 can't pronounce that right. I'm affiliated with World  
12 Climate. So I hope your day is going well and I'd like to  
13 thank you for listening to everyone here.

14 So my main argument against the pipeline is that  
15 we have yet to cultivate Mars. Funny, I know, but my point  
16 is that until we find somewhere else to live, we need to  
17 wait and hold back on polluting and destroying our current  
18 home.

19 Now this pipeline might not be the last straw,  
20 but it will get us closer to breaking the camel's back, so  
21 please consider the climate-changing pollution that would be  
22 generated by this project. Thanks and have a fantastic day.

23 MR. THOMPSON: My name is Cary Thompson, C-a-r-y  
24 T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n, and I'm mostly with 350, Eugene Chapter.  
25 And so my comments are mostly on safety issues of the



1 pipeline. I'm very concerned about the safety issues  
2 involved with the proposed Jordan Cove pipeline and  
3 terminal. The facility is to be located on a sands pit in a  
4 Tsunami and earthquake zone in Coos Bay.

5           In geologic terms, Oregon is due for an  
6 earthquake and/or related Tsunami event soon. We are  
7 overdue for the West Coast subduction zone event, which  
8 could be up to 9.1 on the rector scale. The Jordan Cove  
9 facility will jeopardize some six thousand citizens living  
10 and working within the potential blast zone surrounding the  
11 proposed terminal should there be an accident. This  
12 terminal processing compressed volatile gas with potential  
13 for a mass destruction. The local Coos Bay airport is also  
14 within the blast zone.

15           In addition, the proposed LNG pipeline will  
16 require using eminent domain to locate the 36-inch pipeline  
17 as processes hundreds of private properties. The pipeline  
18 is under pressure and has a lot of leakage potential.  
19 Pipelines always leak. So that's my statement.

20           MS. HINE: My name is Patricia Hine,  
21 P-a-t-r-i-c-a H-i-n-e. My concern today that I'd like to  
22 share has to do with the safety risk to the community where  
23 the pipeline will be going through. It's my understanding  
24 that the pipe itself is thinner than other pipe that go  
25 through more populated areas and they use fewer fasteners in

1 the rural areas and I, myself, am a rural landowner in  
2 central Oregon and so I am sensitive to the fact that  
3 cheaper materials and safety concerns are adhered to and  
4 used in remote areas instead of ones that would value people  
5 who are in the rural areas just like they do in the more  
6 popular areas. So this is a way of economically making a  
7 little more money on the backs of people's safety, so this  
8 is a safety approach.

9 I'm also aware that these pipelines are going  
10 through forests, which are beginning to dry out due to the  
11 drought. I, myself, live on five acres where all of our  
12 (1:0050.3)\* are 80 percent now dead outside of Springfield,  
13 Oregon and I know things are drier and to put a natural gas  
14 pipeline with less safe parameters through a drying forest  
15 seems like an explosive proposition, not to mention the LNG  
16 terminal in Coos Bay where there is a Tsunami zone and  
17 subduction zone and we are scheduled for an earthquake  
18 within 50 years and this is within that timeframe. So that  
19 seems irresponsible just for the community and citizens  
20 there.

21 So I would ask that our federal regulatory  
22 agencies would be looking out for the public good and the  
23 public health and public safety. And while we're on the  
24 subject of safety and while the news is covering terrorism  
25 constantly, then I can't forget to think about how this

1 would be a really good target from a terrorist, for example.  
2 And I have been speaking with farmers who live on the  
3 pipeline route who are afraid of having long-range rifles  
4 pierce the casing of the gas pipeline and create a danger  
5 and fire explosion from that. So I thought I would throw in  
6 a concern around terrorism since that is a very popular  
7 topic right now. So those are my comments. Thank you for  
8 looking out for the people.

9 MS. CHILDS: My name is Lisa Childs, and I am  
10 here to make a comment regarding the Jordan Cove Pipeline.  
11 I represent the interests of tens of thousands of people of  
12 Oregon who cannot be here. I am associated with  
13 organizations such as (0:35:10.2 backup)\*org, Western  
14 Environmental Law Center, Rogue Climate Action, et cetera,  
15 et cetera, et cetera. People who could not be here because  
16 they're either working or they're taking care of family  
17 members or community members. I represent those people.  
18 And what they are telling me is that this project that there  
19 is a problem, an economic, environmental, and health  
20 consequences of the dangerous LNG Jordan Cove, Oregon and  
21 Pacific Connector Pipeline.

22 The dangers, environmental, economic and health,  
23 this is the third time we're here and this is the last time  
24 we're coming, okay. We're drawing a line in the sand, okay.  
25 The citizens of Oregon demand freedom from corporate and

1 governmental collaboration designed to seize and/or destroy  
2 the private property of Oregonians.

3           Number one, it's in the constitution. Do not  
4 violate landowners' constitutional rights, life, liberty,  
5 the pursuit of happiness and so forth and so on. The  
6 citizen of Oregon demand freedom from environmental  
7 degradation caused by methane gas leaks, LNG explosions,  
8 toxic chemicals associated with the extraction, the  
9 transportation, storage and use of liquid natural gas. It  
10 is also a target for terrorists. And if anybody's concerned  
11 about terrorism, then they are lying about supporting a  
12 terrorist target sitting in the ocean off the coast.

13           Not only a terrorist attack could this be  
14 subjected to, but a Tsunami, okay, common sense. Okay. I'm  
15 looking for people -- the people of Oregon demand the  
16 freedom from the permanent pollution of our aquifers, water  
17 sources, wells, rivers, oceans, and all waterways, including  
18 the wetlands. You know, FERC knows, scientists know, all  
19 the people involved in this project know that this is an  
20 1850 technology and we live in the 21st Century. You need  
21 to give the money, the subsidies, the trillions of dollars  
22 that go in subsidies to the fossil fuel industry needs to be  
23 moved to the alternative energy projects.

24           We have solar windows, solar doors, solar roofs,  
25 solar blinds, awnings. We have electric cars, 100 percent

1 electric cars. We've 100 percent electric buses. We have  
2 high speed rails. We have amazing technology. Go to solar,  
3 thermal, magazine.org and educate yourself about the 21st  
4 Century technology that we are telling Veresen you want to  
5 come to Oregon, you come here and you open up a 21st Century  
6 new solar farm or you put the money into solar roofs or  
7 electric cars and electric buses. We have alternative  
8 technology. This is 1850 technology and Oregon will not  
9 allow it.

10                   Finally, how I'm doing on time, big boy?

11                   MALE SPEAKER: You've got a minute left.

12                   MS. CHILDS: Okay. This project threatens  
13 Oregon's robust, multiple billion dollar tourist industry.  
14 Do you understand economies? Okay, that's all people talk  
15 about is money, money, money, economy. You are going to  
16 destroy -- this project will destroy our tourist industry.  
17 It's a robust, multibillion tourist industry, our expanding  
18 winery industry as well as our numerous small businesses  
19 that the tourist industry supports.

20                   The citizens of Oregon say no. They said no  
21 twice and they're saying no again. No Jordan Cove pipeline.  
22 No pollution. No oil train explosion. The history of the  
23 fossil fuel industry is an abomination. If I went to  
24 somebody asking for money and I talked about all my  
25 accidents, they'd throw me out of the room. Who do you

1 think you're kidding? Do not insult the intelligence of  
2 the American people.

3 We say no.

4 MR. RYAN: Okay, my name is Tim Ryan, R-y-a-n.  
5 You've got the first name spelled correctly. Affiliation  
6 just concerned property owner, I guess, or don't want this  
7 to go through my property. Okay, we own land here, a ranch  
8 here in Douglas County, which has a couple small streams and  
9 some springs going through it, so I'm very familiar with how  
10 these streams can, in the middle of the winter, become  
11 large. And my concern is you're running these pipelines  
12 through here and be digging this in this summertime and in  
13 the wintertime you won't be quite aware of the amount of  
14 erosion that can happen in these areas.

15 I know you're probably going to do a good job of  
16 crossing the rivers, but we have a lot of small streams and  
17 a lot of wetlands that are highly corrosive -- gravel and  
18 water is highly corrosive, so consequently, this pipe is  
19 going to be subject to a lot of corrosion and stuff, or  
20 could be, depending on -- it's an unknown as to where it  
21 would happen. So I feel that you really need to double  
22 contain this pipe in those areas so that there can't be  
23 because if there was a spill or a leak and you're using a  
24 thinner wall pipe in the rural areas because of less

1 population, I guess, or whatever you have a better chance of  
2 this pipe failing due to corrosion.

3           So if it was doubled contained and monitored, it  
4 would eliminate that problem and it's a big problem and I've  
5 read everything you guys have and I have not seen where you  
6 have addressed this. And I think this issue really needs to  
7 be addressed. Thank you for your time.

8           MR. HAMILTON: Okay, my name is John Hamilton.  
9 I live in Ashland, Oregon. I'm here as an individual. I  
10 recently retired from a federal agency, Fish and Wildlife  
11 Service. I'm not speaking on their behalf.

12           First of all, I live in the Rogue Valley. I use  
13 the Rogue River. I'm concerned about the future of the  
14 Klamath River and there needs to be a scoping meeting in the  
15 Rogue Valley. There needs to be a scoping meeting in  
16 Medford and the comment deadline needs to be extended to 90  
17 days and it should not be in this format. It should be in a  
18 format where there's a group of people.

19           First of all, this project is going to affect  
20 anadromous fish and it's going to affect fisheries on those  
21 two rivers, so there should be an analysis of Tribal,  
22 recreational and commercial fisheries that are affected by  
23 these projects. The action area in the scope of the project  
24 should include the range of anadromous fish on the West  
25 Coast of the United States and in the Pacific Ocean because

1 it will affect those fish, their life cycle and how it  
2 extends much further than just the rivers they cross.

3           The cumulative affects should include climate  
4 change and the contribution of the project to climate  
5 change. And specifically, the pipeline crossing at Miller  
6 Island, state game area, it needs to be analyzed for  
7 long-term affects to anadromous fish in the Klamath River,  
8 which is slated for removal of dams and slated for  
9 restoration of anadromous fish runs. So that's something  
10 that needs to be addressed in the putting together the  
11 drafting of the analysis that goes forward. You know and  
12 that's about all I got.

13           MR. JOSEPH: My name is Rob Joseph, R-o-b  
14 J-o-s-e-p-h. I'm just a resident of southern Oregon. I'm  
15 not affiliated with any organization. Whatever benefit in  
16 the short-term is reaped by the jobs generated in building  
17 this pipeline, the long-term potential problems with a  
18 320-mile pipeline going under hundreds of rivers and streams  
19 and over mountains in an earthquake and Tsunami zone will  
20 dwarf those benefits. The affects on the landowners alone  
21 should enough to kill this project, which has been killed  
22 twice, only to come alive again.

23           FERC was right to deny the permit and should  
24 again do the right thing. By stealing documents out of the  
25 Coos Bay Library, the company shows a desperation to control



1 information its knows is damaging to its mission. Please  
2 put this to rest once and for all.

3 MR. VERBERKMOES: Yes, my name's James Martin  
4 Verberkmoes, last name V-e-r-b-e-r-k-m-o-e-s. I am here  
5 just simply as an individual citizen, a lifelong resident of  
6 Roseburg and Douglas County representing only myself.

7 So I'd like to express this to FERC. Please do  
8 not authorize the Jordan Cove Project. I will submit five  
9 reasons not to do so. Number one, climate change is real  
10 and this project ships fuel to other countries to continue  
11 heating up the atmosphere with carbon dioxide and methane.  
12 Better to leave the unfracked gas in the ground.

13 Number two, a Cascadian subduction event is  
14 likely in the next 50 years off the Oregon coast and the  
15 resulting earthquake and Tsunami pose very significant  
16 threat of damage to both the pipeline and processing plant  
17 in Coos Bay. Please do not add the extreme likelihood of  
18 fire and pollution from Jordan Cove to coastal and inland  
19 residents on top of what will already be a catastrophic  
20 event.

21 Number three, providing natural gas to American  
22 manufacturers that have fled the United States opening  
23 factories overseas for cheap, foreign labor, lacks  
24 environmental regulations and tax havens cost American jobs  
25 and contributes to the income inequality here at home. If

1 these companies, American or Chinese, want cheap, natural  
2 gas, let them build their factories here in the United  
3 States and contribute to long-term employment for U.S.  
4 citizens.

5           Number four, this project rides roughshod over  
6 property owners in Oregon to benefit a Canadian company,  
7 Veresen.

8           Number five, this project has already been  
9 rejected for good reasons. This continued push to enrich  
10 wealthy companies at the expense Oregonians is an outrage  
11 and fuels an ever-increasing anger at the federal  
12 government. I urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
13 to listen to the people. Thank you.

14           MR. LENK: Karen Lenk, K-a-r-e-n L-e-n-k. I'm  
15 opposed to the Jordan Cove Pipeline. The temporary benefit  
16 of jobs pales to the huge environmental risks it poses. I  
17 would like FERC to consider all climate-changing pollution  
18 that would be generated by this project. For our children's  
19 and grandchildren's health and well being, we need to be  
20 moving towards renewable resources and away from fracked  
21 gas.

22           I live in Jackson County. I request a scoping  
23 hearing in Jackson County and an extension of the scoping  
24 comment period from 30 to 90 days.

1                   One last thing, I am concerned about the  
2 pipeline company's employees removing FERC pipeline  
3 information from public libraries along the pipeline route.  
4 Those should be replaced. That's it.

5                   MS. WESTOVER: So my name is Sarah Westover.  
6 It's S-a-r-a-h W-e-s-t-o-v-e-r. I live in Phoenix, Oregon  
7 in Jackson County and I want to start by saying that I think  
8 it's incredibly important that FERC provide ample  
9 opportunities for public input throughout this process. I  
10 think that this format is particularly cumbersome because it  
11 doesn't allow for folks who are giving testimony to hear  
12 each other's comments and to build off of one another, so I  
13 would certainly advise FERC to reconsider the way that  
14 they're administering these.

15                   I also really want to advocate for FERC to have  
16 a scoping hearing in Jackson County. I had to drive an hour  
17 and a half here today. Many folks that we work with in  
18 southern Oregon don't have Internet access, cannot give  
19 comments online. So failing to provide a hearing I think is  
20 a political decision and I think it's wrong and I think FERC  
21 should reconsider that.

22                   I also need FERC to know that two weeks notice  
23 is not enough notice for a project of this scope and  
24 magnitude to the public. Lots of people want to weigh in  
25 on this and that's not enough time.

1           In terms of comments about scoping, I really  
2 encourage FERC to evaluate climate impacts. There are a  
3 number of environmental impacts related to climate. All  
4 ecosystems rely on climate. That should be part of the  
5 consideration. Also, FERC should consider and study impacts  
6 on waterways and social impacts to communities and to  
7 landowners who would be adversely economically impacted by  
8 the proposed pipeline.

9           I also want to encourage FERC to consider the  
10 most up-to-date information and require the company to  
11 provide the most up-to-date information. In fact, here in  
12 our communities the pipeline company has actually gone into  
13 rural libraries and taken out public information from those  
14 libraries that does not belong to the companies that was  
15 provided by FERC.

16           And I would like to ask FERC to officially  
17 restore those documents that were taken out of our rural  
18 libraries. I guess the company went into these rural  
19 libraries saying that the information was outdated and so  
20 they took like the DEISs from the previous proposal out of  
21 our libraries, but we need to be able to see those to see  
22 how the project has changed. And the company, I guess, has  
23 destroyed those documents, so I'm officially asking that  
24 FERC restore those documents to our rural libraries in

1 Douglas, Coos, Klamath, and Jackson Counties. I think  
2 that's it. Thank you.

3 MS. ROBERTS: My name is Edith Roberts,  
4 E-d-i-t-h R-o-b-e-r-t-s. I am very concerned about the  
5 safety, public health, environmental, climate pollution, and  
6 economic impacts of the Jordan Cove LNG Terminal and Pacific  
7 Connector Pipeline Projects and think they are inconsistent  
8 with the public interest.

9 Also, I'm concerned that FERC's public  
10 engagement process hampers the public's ability to provide  
11 comment and learn about the project. And this has been  
12 reinforced by a conversation I just heard that said that the  
13 comments probably will not be used by FERC or anybody and  
14 the value is just in doing it. I think if other people  
15 can't hear the comments, then I see very little value in  
16 doing this process.

17 Anyway, I feel that FERC should schedule scoping  
18 hearings in Jackson County because the pipeline goes through  
19 Jackson County. It makes no sense to exclude them from the  
20 meetings. Also, it should include scheduling a hearing in  
21 northern California as well because it's going to affect the  
22 whole state. The scoping comment period should be extended  
23 from 30 to 90 days because of the complexity of the project  
24 and the hundreds of pages of reports recently submitted by  
25 Jordan Cove and Pacific Connector.

1           People should be allowed to testify to the  
2 entire group at the public hearings so we can hear the  
3 testimony of others. Also, as it develops its NEPA analysis  
4 for these projects, FERC should not rely on outdated data  
5 from previous iterations of the Jordan Cove and Pacific  
6 Connector Projects, including wildlife or plant surveys that  
7 may no longer reflect on-the-ground conditions and it should  
8 spell out specific mitigation measures and plans that are  
9 relied upon to draw conclusions about the impacts of  
10 projects.

11           Many of the mitigation plans included in the  
12 previous NEPA FERC report seemed totally inadequate to me,  
13 and I did read some of them. FERC should weigh heavily the  
14 negative impacts on private landowners being affected by the  
15 Pacific Connector, many of whom have invested heavily in  
16 time and money in their properties and the pipeline often  
17 goes right through the middle of these properties.

18           Also, FERC should address the full impacts of  
19 the project on water quality for each stream and wetland  
20 impacted and require Pacific Connector to rely on up-to-date  
21 and site-specific information to evaluate the impacts of the  
22 proposals. FERC needs to consider the direct, indirect, and  
23 cumulative impacts to fish and wildlife that will be  
24 impacted by the proposed terminal and pipeline, including  
25 threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead, and wildlife.

1           Also, FERC should include concerns about global  
2 warming and consider the climate-changing pollution that  
3 will be generated by all aspects of this project. The  
4 direct, indirect, and cumulative impact of fracked and  
5 conventional gas production, transport, liquefaction and end  
6 use, including the contribution of leaked methane gas to the  
7 overall carbon pollution from these proposals since methane  
8 gas is much more damaging or stronger than the CO2.

9           Most importantly, FERC needs to undertake a  
10 detailed analysis of the public safety risks associated with  
11 the terminal and pipeline. In past reviews, FERC has failed  
12 to adequately address fire and emergency response risks  
13 along the pipeline route. Further, FERC should take a  
14 realistic look at a worse case LNG spill and fire near the  
15 terminal. And this is particularly important because the  
16 area is considered a lower risk since it's in a rural area  
17 and the pipeline is thinner quality and it requires fewer,  
18 but various kinds of inspections. So that's my testimony.

19           MS. LYONS: My name is Sandra G. Lyon, L-y-o-n,  
20 and I'm an affected landowner in Days Creek, though I'm  
21 speaking to many issues that I'm concerned about other than  
22 my being a landowner.

23           My first issue is the use of eminent domain.  
24 And I realize that this is just a law that FERC might have  
25 to follow, but my concern is that it's a foreign country

1 that is forming an LLC, limited liability, in the U.S. to  
2 use. If something were to happen, they would have a limited  
3 liability and I will be losing my land only through eminent  
4 domain for the benefit of a Canadian company.

5 Another concern I have is of the fire  
6 possibilities. It was addressed in the last couple of  
7 rounds. They said they would do a little training for local  
8 fire departments, but I talked to DFPA. They said that the  
9 kind of fire that this would be if there were to be a  
10 rupture would be something that they would have no ability  
11 to fight, so I would like to see far more concern or money  
12 or preparation for our local firefighters who already are  
13 dealing with summer with extremely difficult fire  
14 conditions.

15 The other thing is the valves are too far apart  
16 and not automatic. If they could address making the turnoff  
17 valves more frequent. The third thing is earthquakes. We  
18 all know that there's going to be, and scientists have said  
19 there's going to be a big earthquake of the size that caused  
20 the Fukushima disaster and Tsunami. It's only a matter of  
21 time. To put the terminal in that zone and the pipeline  
22 through the area, it is predicted that all bridges will be  
23 taken out as far west as I-5. If there were to be a fire in  
24 those instances, there would be no way for help to get to  
25 any of us.



1                   Natural resources are a particular concern of  
2 mine. I don't think enough effort has been produced to  
3 consider natural resources and our fish. I particularly  
4 live on a cold water creek that runs year round. A recent  
5 statement made by the pipeline folks said that it's no  
6 worry. All the creeks go dry in summer. They're obviously  
7 misinformed and I want to see that addressed. There's no  
8 way they can mitigate for these rare creeks and resources,  
9 fully grown trees shading the creeks,

10                   Also, the salmon are listed, our Coho are listed  
11 on the listed ESA list and they haven't even considered such  
12 things as these rare endemic fish, the Umpqua chop, Umpqua  
13 pike minnow, and Umpqua dace that live only in the Umpqua  
14 and mostly in the south Umpqua. I saw no concern for them  
15 and how they would be handled as well as lamprey, steelhead,  
16 coastal cutthroat Chinook.

17                   One of my big concerns is that not enough or  
18 factual data has been entered about the geology of our area.  
19 The pipeline goes up very steep slopes. And directly across  
20 from our house we can see landslides. If they would go out  
21 and look, there are landslides there that occur due to  
22 logging. It would be disaster to put pipeline up these  
23 steep slopes and think that they aren't going to erode with  
24 winter rains here. And that's the summary of my comments.

1           MR. NICHOLS: Okay, my name is Robert Nichols,  
2 N-i-c-h-o-l-s. I'm representing my farm, which is located  
3 on 800 Weaver Road in Riddle.

4           So I do not support the project. Near as I can  
5 tell, I get a 97-acre pipe yard 500 feet from my house with  
6 no compensation. Pipe trucks associated with the unload  
7 site at the Riddle Bypass Weaver area you have to pass  
8 through an unregulated intersection, which has had multiple  
9 vehicle wrecks in the last five years, including at least  
10 fatality that I'm aware of.

11           Foreign corporation using eminent domain to take  
12 citizens' property with little to no compensation and export  
13 a strategic fuel is simply outrageous. I would suggest that  
14 we need to consider what Thomas Jefferson would say right  
15 now. The East Fork Cow Creek crossing associated with the  
16 pipeline is in the steepest, most unstable lands on the  
17 Umpqua National Forest. It's in the Klamath Mountain  
18 Province, which is notoriously unstable. And I'm pretty  
19 sure you guys can't meet the Clean Water Act for a  
20 turbidity or a bed load standpoint.

21           Private property owners are expected to carry  
22 the risks without any of the gain associated with risks of  
23 pipeline failure, leakage, or any other risks. The benefits  
24 go to the sellers of the fuel, not to private property  
25 owners. And the project, based on research done in

1 Australia and other place, will increase the cost of natural  
2 gas; therefore, being an adverse affect on the population of  
3 Americans, not a benefit.

4           So in closing, during last iteration, I got an  
5 eminent domain threat letters in March of 2014 saying to  
6 have status in an appeal, I had to respond by June of 2013.  
7 I would sincerely hope that you guys have your act better  
8 together than last time. That is all.

9           MS. ROTH: My name is Virginia Roth, R-o-t-h.  
10 And my concerns mostly evolve around eminent domain. And I  
11 wonder if FERC will consider whether fair compensation is  
12 even possible when granting the power of eminent domain to  
13 multinationals because I think they'll probably give the  
14 right of eminent domain, but then take the property --  
15 they'll take the property by force. And this helps  
16 corporations to abuse their power of fair compensation.

17           If a family you know is very -- I know that  
18 families are very upset with the eminent domain thing and I  
19 think that if a family is super over the top upset about it,  
20 I think that if at all possible an alternate pipeline route  
21 should be considered to be buried on other property you know  
22 near them, people that don't really care or are interested  
23 in getting the monies from this.

24           I also think that FERC should consider the  
25 damages to families and farms along the route, especially,

1 when the guys are there, the Pacific Connector staff are  
2 freely operating all their machines with all their loud  
3 noise and everything else and brush clearing that families  
4 will be very affected by this and they'll lose their  
5 personal sense of privacy and security and they just may go  
6 crazy with all the noise and everything going around them.  
7 So I would like FERC to consider that, the loss of privacy.

8           And lastly, they should consider the safety  
9 impacts to the families living on the farms. The pipeline  
10 route under a Class 1 pipeline safety standard they should  
11 consider that. Okay, those are my concerns and I thank you.

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 28, 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 Voigtsberger

25 Official Reporter