

## 6.0 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS AND RESPONSES

---

### INDEX

<u>Document Number</u>	<u>Commentor</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>PUBLIC MEETING</b>		
PM1	Public Meeting at Arlington, Washington .....	6-3
PM2	Public Meeting at Redmond, Washington .....	6-24
PM3	Public Meeting at Yelm, Washington .....	6-68
<b>FEDERAL AGENCIES</b>		
FA1	U.S. Department of the Interior .....	6-134
FA2	Fort Lewis Military Reservation .....	6-135
FA3	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency .....	6-142
<b>NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES</b>		
NAT1	Lummi Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office .....	6-148
NAT2	Lummi Nation Natural Resources Department .....	6-149
NAT3	Nooksack Indian Tribe Natural Resources Department .....	6-155
<b>STATE AGENCIES</b>		
SA1	Washington State Department of Ecology and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife .....	6-159
<b>LOCAL AGENCIES</b>		
LA1	Councilmember Dan McShane, Whatcom County Council .....	6-224
LA2	Snohomish County .....	6-227
LA3	City of Arlington Community Development .....	6-244
<b>COMPANIES AND ORGANIZATIONS</b>		
CO1	Premier Gentle Care .....	6-246
CO2	Saddleback Subdivision Residents .....	6-253
CO3	Saddleback Subdivision Residents .....	6-264
CO4	Saddleback Subdivision Residents .....	6-269

INDEX (cont'd)

<u>Document Number</u>	<u>Commentor</u>	<u>Page</u>
CO5	Wildlife Land Trust .....	6-276
CO6	Chehalis Power Generating, L.P. ....	6-283
CO7	Pipeline Safety Trust.....	6-288
CO8	Bricklin Newman Dold, LLP.....	6-292

**INDIVIDUALS**

IND1	Judi Pavao.....	6-295
IND2	Julian and Veronica Mart.....	6-296
IND3	Tim and Mary Gray .....	6-304
IND4	Gwendolyn O. Walsh.....	6-308
IND5	Lee and Mary Geil .....	6-309
IND6	Rajeev and Harinder Sundher .....	6-316
IND7	Susan Austin .....	6-318
IND8	Shawn and Angela Pickett .....	6-320
IND9	William and Carla Porter .....	6-323
IND10	Julian Mart .....	6-326
IND11	Julian Mart .....	6-347
IND12	Lee and Mary Geil .....	6-352
IND13	William and Constance Elliott.....	6-355
IND14	Tim and Mary Gray .....	6-362
IND15	Gerald Gibson and Susan Boyden .....	6-372
IND16	Scott and Michelle Ballantine.....	6-378
IND17	Hope Szudzik.....	6-386
IND18	Mr. and Mrs. Kim-Fu Lim .....	6-388

**PROJECT APPLICANT**

A1	Northwest Pipeline Corporation .....	6-389
----	--------------------------------------	-------

**Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses**

**PUBLIC MEETINGS**

18523  
FIELD

1

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MEETING

4

5 FOR THE

6

7 CAPACITY REPLACEMENT PROJECT

8

9 NORTHWEST PIPELINE CORPORATION

10

11

12 Docket Nos. CP05-32-000, -001

13 FERC/EIS - 0178D

14

15

16 APRIL 11, 2005

17

18

19 The Public Comment Meeting was taken before  
20 JoAnn Bowen, #2695, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and  
21 Registered Professional Reporter, and a Notary Public for  
22 the State of Washington, on April 11, 2005, commencing at  
23 the hour of 7:00 p.m., the proceedings being reported at  
24 Hawthorne Inn & Suites, 16710 Smokey Point Boulevard,  
25 Arlington, Washington 98223.

26

# Public Meetings

1

18523  
FIELD

2

1 APPEARANCES  
2  
3 DOUGLAS SIPE  
4 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
5 888 First Street Northeast  
6 Washington, D.C. 20426  
7 202-502-8771  
8  
9 TIFFANY YELTON  
10 Department of Ecology  
11 Northwest Regional Office  
12 3190 - 160th Avenue Southeast  
13 Bellevue, Washington 98008  
14 425-649-4310  
15  
16 AMY DAVIS  
17 Natural Resource Group, Inc.  
18 1000 IDS Center  
19 80 South Eighth Street  
20 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
21 612-347-6789  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

# Public Meetings

1

6-4

18523  
FIELD

3

1 ARLINGTON, WASHINGTON; MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2005

2 7:07 P.M.

3 MR. SIPE: Good evening. On behalf  
4 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, referred to  
5 as the FERC, I would like to welcome you all tonight.  
6 This is a Public Comment Meeting on the Draft  
7 Environmental Impact Statement, DEIS, for the Northwest  
8 Pipeline Corporation's proposed Capacity Replacement  
9 Project. Let the record show that the Public Comment  
10 Meeting began at 7:07 on April 11, 2005.

11 My name is Doug Sipe. I am the FERC  
12 project manager for the project. Amy Davis, in the rear  
13 of the room, is with the Natural Resource Group. NRG is  
14 the consulting firm that assisted us in the preparation  
15 of the DEIS. The FERC was the lead federal agency for  
16 the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, review of  
17 the project, and the lead agency for the preparation of  
18 the EIS.

19 The Washington Department of Ecology is  
20 the lead state agency with the responsibility for  
21 complying with the State Environmental Policy Act, SEPA,  
22 and participated as a cooperating agency in the  
23 preparation of the EIS. Tiffany Yelton from the  
24 Department of Ecology is here tonight and will expand on  
25 her role in the process in a few minutes.

26

# Public Meetings

1

18523  
FIELD

4

1                   The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also  
2 participated as a cooperating agency in the preparation  
3 of the EIS to satisfy its NEPA responsibilities under  
4 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the  
5 Rivers and Harbors Act. This meeting is a joint NEPA,  
6 SEPA Public Comment Meeting.

7                   We also have -- no, we don't. DOT was  
8 going to be here, but they couldn't come tonight.

9                   The purpose of tonight's meeting is to  
10 provide each of you with the opportunity to give us your  
11 environmental comments on the DEIS. We are here tonight  
12 to learn from you. It will help us most if your comments  
13 are as specific as possible regarding the Draft EIS.

14                   If you wish to speak tonight, please be  
15 sure to sign the speakers' list. I have two people on  
16 this list right now. I just want to remind everyone that  
17 this is a meeting for everyone else to tell me what they  
18 think about the DEIS. So, hopefully I get more response  
19 on that.

20                   If not, you can pick up one of the green  
21 handouts that provide instructions that make it easy for  
22 you to send written comments to us. The speakers' list  
23 and the handouts were both at the sign-up table where you  
24 came in.

25                   We are in the midst of a 45-day comment  
26

# Public Meetings

1

18523  
FIELD

5

1 period on the Draft EIS. A notice of availability of the  
2 Draft EIS was issued for this project on March 11, 2005.  
3 The comment period will end on April 25, 2005. It's  
4 during this period that we receive comments on the Draft  
5 EIS. All written comments received during this time  
6 period or verbally tonight will be addressed in the FEIS,  
7 which is the final. We ask that you provide comments as  
8 soon as possible in order to give us time to analyze and  
9 research the issues.

10 I would like to add that FERC strongly  
11 encourages electronic filing of any comments. The  
12 instructions for this can be located on our website at  
13 [www.FERC.gov](http://www.FERC.gov) under the e-filing link. The green handouts  
14 at the sign-in table also tell you how to file. The  
15 green handouts have basically everything you want to  
16 know.

17 If you received a copy of the Draft EIS,  
18 and I hope you all read it before you came here tonight,  
19 you automatically receive a copy of the Final EIS. If  
20 you did not get a copy of the draft and would like to get  
21 a copy of the final, please sign the attendance list in  
22 the back of the room and provide your name and address  
23 and we will make sure you get a copy of the final.

24 During our review of the project, we  
25 assembled information from a variety of sources,  
26

# Public Meetings

1

6-7

18523  
FIELD

6

1 including Northwest, you the public, other state, local  
2 and federal agencies, and our own independent analysis  
3 and field work. We analyzed this information and  
4 prepared a Draft EIS that was distributed to the public  
5 for comment.

6           Once we have addressed the public comments  
7 on the Draft EIS and completed the Final EIS and mailed  
8 it out, we will forward that on to our commissioners.  
9 The commissioners at FERC will use the Final EIS as one  
10 of the tools to determine whether to approve or deny a  
11 certificate which would be the FERC's authorization for  
12 the project.

13           The Department of Ecology and the U.S.  
14 Army Corps of Engineers will use the Final EIS in support  
15 of their permitting efforts. Tiffany will say a few  
16 words now for the Department of Ecology's role in the  
17 process.

18           MS. YELTON: Thank you, Doug. My  
19 name is Tiffany Yelton, and I'm one of two coordinators  
20 working on this Department of Ecology project.

21           MR. CLARK: Can you turn that up a  
22 little bit so we can hear? He has hearing problems.

23           MS YELTON: Is this working okay? Is  
24 that okay? I'm one of two coordinators on this project.  
25 What that means is that the State of Washington is

26

# Public Meetings

1

18523  
FIELD

7

1 divided up into regions. This project covers two  
2 Department of Ecology regions. So, I work with all the  
3 technical staff at Department of Ecology to comment on  
4 the Environment Impact Statement for this project.

5 And once the Environmental Impact  
6 Statement has taken into account public comments,  
7 comments from other agencies, and the final is issued,  
8 Department of Ecology will review that final  
9 Environmental Impact Statement and to make a  
10 determination about adopting it as the State  
11 Environmental Policy of the EIS for the project.

12 And then once that's done, Ecology will  
13 finish the review of the permit applications that we will  
14 receive on this project, and we will make permanent  
15 decisions.

16 What I thought I would do today is I will  
17 hang out in the back of the room after the public  
18 comments have been taken. I can talk a little bit  
19 one-on-one with people about the permits that the  
20 Department of Ecology issues for a project like this and  
21 answer any questions you might have about Department of  
22 Ecology's role. So, thank you for your time.

23 MR. SIPE: Thank you, Tiffany. I'd  
24 like to point out that Northwest is here also. So, after  
25 the meeting, if you guys have any questions or concerns  
26

## Public Meetings

1

18523  
FIELD

8

1 or anything you need to address with them, besides the  
2 government agencies, they are here to answer your  
3 questions for you. They are the gentlemen over there in  
4 the back corner of the room.

5 We will now begin the important part of  
6 the meeting with your comments. When your name is  
7 called, please step up to the microphone, which, I can  
8 just hand the person the microphone. I can walk it back  
9 to you if you want to talk. State your name for the  
10 record. And when you speak, when you state your name,  
11 spell your name so the court reporter can get it please.

12 Your comments will be transcribed by the  
13 court reporter to ensure that we get an accurate record  
14 of your comments. A transcript of this meeting will be  
15 placed in the public record at PERC so that everyone has  
16 access to the information collected here tonight.

17 So, now, the first speaker on the list  
18 will be Charles Clark.

19 MR. CLARK: Charles Clark. You got  
20 questions to fire at me or do you want me to talk to you?

21 MR. SIPE: I want you to talk to me.

22 MR. CLARK: Well, first off, what we  
23 got in your paper is one thing or another about whether

PM1-1 | 24 you're going down here on the Pilchuck whether you're  
25 going to go ahead and go through with that or you're not

26

# Public Meetings

1

6-10

PM1-1 Based on a map review, your property is not within the portion of Northwest Pipeline Corporation's (Northwest) system where the loops associated with the Capacity Replacement Project would be constructed. Your property appears to be within the portion of the system where the existing 26-inch-diameter pipeline would be abandoned in place. Although Pilchuck Creek would be crossed by the Mount Vernon Loop, your property is south of the terminus of the loop. Therefore, the crossing of Pilchuck Creek would be at a location approximately 20 miles north of your property.

18523  
FIELD

9

PM1-1  
(cont'd)

1 going to go through that, put the line through there?

2 MR. SIPE: I'm not going to address  
3 -- I'm not going to answer many questions. I just want  
4 to hear your comments and your concerns. And then after  
5 the meeting concludes, I will answer questions.

6 MR. CLARK: That is a concern on my  
7 piece of property. I want to know. If they claim what  
8 you sent out that you was going to -- or the State wasn't  
9 going to -- one of the properties that they wasn't going  
10 to go through on. I wanted to know if that was the case  
11 or what you had planned on doing on it.

12 MR. SIPE: Okay. That is addressed  
13 in the DEIS. We will talk to Northwest after the meeting  
14 on that.

15 MR. CLARK: All right. That's one of  
16 the things I wanted to know about. And what do you want  
17 to address on? Anything else you wanted to know?

18 MR. SIPE: I want to know everything  
19 you want to tell me.

20 MR. CLARK: There's not much to tell  
21 you. You guys are on through there and whether you are  
22 going to continue to go through there or whether you're  
23 going to shut it down.

24 MR. SIPE: So, your major concern is  
25 are they going cross your property and go across the

26

# Public Meetings

1

18523  
FIELD

10

PM1-1  
(cont'd)

1 Pilchuck Creek?

2 MR. CLARK: Yes.

3 MR. SIPE: The next speaker is Carl

4 Weimer.

5 MR. WEIMER: Thank you. I'm going to

6 sit down because it's more relaxing. My name is Carl

7 Weimer. I'm the executive director of the Pipeline

8 Safety Trust. Carl with a C. Weimer, W-E-I-M-E-R. 1155

9 North State Street, Bellingham, Washington. I'm also the

10 chairman of the governor-appointed Citizens Committee on

11 Pipeline Safety here in Washington State. And I'm a

12 member of the Federal Department of Transportation's

13 Technical Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Standard

14 Committee. I think I got it all right. But I'm here

15 tonight speaking on behalf of the Pipeline Safety Trust.

PM1-2

16 We basically support this replacement

17 project because of the severity of the stress corrosion

18 cracking in the existing pipeline. This makes sense to

19 replace that existing pipeline because of all the

20 cracking. And we appreciate FERC coming out and holding

21 three meetings to get citizens' input and hopefully

22 people will show up and give you their input. To us it

23 makes sense to replace this because of the problems in

24 the existing pipeline.

25 There are some concerns we have that we

26

# Public Meetings

PM1-2 Thank you for your comment.

18523  
FIELD

11

1 would like addressed in the Final EIS. The first one of  
2 those concerns is the difference -- when you read about  
3 the safety of the pipeline in the current EIS, it talks  
4 about how FERC doesn't set safety. That's done by the  
5 Office of Pipeline Safety within the Department of  
6 Transportation. You have a memorandum of agreement that  
7 if something is brought up that's to your knowledge that  
8 there's something unsafe about this pipeline, you direct  
9 it to them. So, I would like to bring something up to  
10 your attention.

PM1-3

11 This pipeline runs through a lot of Class  
12 1 and Class 2 areas that are not required to have any  
13 kind of internal inspection at all at this point because  
14 of a lack of federal regulations doing that. Those areas  
15 run next to people's houses in rural areas. And  
16 basically by not requiring an inspection in those areas,  
17 the Department of Transportation has devalued the rural  
18 people versus the people that live in cities, saying if  
19 they get killed, it's not worth as much as somebody in  
20 the city. So, we would ask that this be changed so the  
21 regulations for high consequence areas along this  
22 pipeline also apply to Class 1 and Class 2.

PM1-4

23 And somewhat in support for that, I don't  
24 know if you've seen it, but there's a study done in 2002,  
25 a "Model For Sizing High Consequence Areas Associated  
26

# Public Meetings

PM1-3

Research on pipeline maintenance has concluded that the use of internal inspection devices is one of the best ways of checking for corrosion and irregularities in an underground steel pipe. While the use of internal inspection devices is not currently required by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS), Northwest would periodically use these devices to inspect the loops. In addition, Northwest would conduct leak detection surveys along its entire pipeline system using periodic aerial patrols, weather permitting, at least twice each calendar year. This frequency exceeds the DOT requirement of surveying Class 1 and Class 2 locations at least annually. See section 4.12.1 for additional discussion of Northwest's operation and maintenance procedures.

PM1-4

The methods for determining high consequence areas (HCAs) along Northwest's system are included in section 4.12.1. The purpose of the HCA rule was to provide a greater level of inspection of pipelines in certain areas with high population densities or occupied by people who are confined, are of impaired mobility, or would be difficult to evacuate. Locations that are not in defined HCAs would still be subject to the operation and maintenance requirements defined in Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 192 and described in section 4.12.1.

18523  
FIELD

12

PM1-4  
(cont'd)

1 With Natural Gas Pipelines." And if you look at this, I  
2 have a copy of a chart in here that I will leave with  
3 you. It shows that a 36-inch pipeline running at  
4 900-some pounds per square inch has a hazard area of  
5 700-some feet on both sides of the pipeline.

6 There's a lot of houses within 700 feet of  
7 this pipeline. According to this study which was done by  
8 the Gas Research Institute and I think funded by the  
9 Department of Transportation, there's a hazard to those  
10 people. So, that's why we're asking that the regulations  
11 that apply to high consequence areas also apply to this  
12 entire pipeline.

PM1-5

13 We don't think that would be out of the  
14 ordinary costs for Williams to go through with because  
15 for the most part when they put this pipeline in they are  
16 going to smart pig the entire section of pipe anyway and  
17 hydrostatic test it. And because of the way it's  
18 sectioned, it will all be done anyway. The only  
19 difference will be whether they are reporting any of that  
20 information to the government. So, that's one thing that  
21 we would ask happen.

PM1-6

22 The other ones are more minor. We have  
23 severe -- we have quite a concern about some of the wet  
24 open cuts that are proposed. We know they have done  
25 studies but they can't drill under like the Nisqually  
26

# Public Meetings

1

PM1-5 The OPS is responsible for regulating compliance with Title 49 CFR Part 192 regarding the operation and maintenance of natural gas pipelines. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) staff does not have the authority to ensure that pipeline companies comply with DOT regulations during operation of natural gas pipelines. As discussed in section 4.12.1, OPS and Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) inspectors would conduct audits of Northwest's facilities including review of operation and maintenance records, evaluation of emergency procedures, and conducting random field inspections. The FERC staff assumes that the OPS and the WUTC would submit a direct request to Northwest if they want copies of the results of the pig inspections.

PM1-6 Throughout the environmental impact statement (EIS) process, the FERC has worked extensively with Northwest; other federal, state, and local agencies; and Native American tribes to develop acceptable site-specific crossing and mitigation plans for the waterbodies that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project. Section 4.3.2.3 has been revised to provide the most current information regarding Northwest's proposed Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings. Appendix S contains the April 2005 draft of this plan. Section 4.3.2.3 also discusses Northwest's coordination with the Nisqually Tribe, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), and the Washington State Department of Ecology (WDOE) to finalize a mitigation plan that would address the tribe's concerns regarding the project, including the proposed wet open-cut crossing of the Nisqually River.

The revised section 4.3.2.3 includes the FERC staff's recommendation that Northwest continue consultations with the applicable agencies and Native American tribes and file the final site-specific waterbody crossing plans and final Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings with the Secretary of the Commission (Secretary) for the review and written approval of the Director of the Office of Energy Projects (OEP) before construction at each applicable waterbody (see also mitigation measure number 17 in section 5.4). These final plans may incorporate new information that may become available as Northwest continues consultations with the COE, the WDOE, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), various county agencies, and Native American tribes. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) may impose additional mitigation as well as part of their Biological Opinions (see section 4.7) that also should be included in Northwest's Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings. The FERC staff believes these continued consultations will result in the development of acceptable site-specific crossing plans and mitigation requirements for the waterbodies that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project. Section 4.3.2.3 also explains how the public and other agencies can view the final plans once they are filed.

6-14

18523  
FIELD

13

PM1-6  
(cont'd)

1 River. We just want to encourage FERC to make sure they  
2 work with State and local government to make sure that  
3 all concerns are addressed in there.

4 In other parts of the country we  
5 understood that sometimes FERC has trumped state and  
6 local permitting projects. We don't want to see that  
7 happen here because of the salmon that could be impacted,  
8 especially with the Nisqually River open cut.

PM1-7

9 And the other one is we have been  
10 contacted by a number of landowners who seem to have some  
11 confusion because a lot of the pipeline is not being  
12 removed. It's being left in the ground. Williams in  
13 some places has been asking for expansion of their  
14 right-of-way, the width of the right-of-way.

15 And I'm not real clear on the law. But it  
16 would seem since they already have an existing  
17 right-of-way with a pipe in there that they could remove  
18 and put the old pipeline in, that an expansion of their  
19 right-of-way is an option for the landowner. It  
20 shouldn't be a requirement.

21 Because some landowners think they are  
22 being threatened with eminent domain for the expansion  
23 of the right-of-way. It would seem that there isn't a  
24 need for that expansion since there's already room in the  
25 existing right-of-way. So, that's something a landowner

26

# Public Meetings

PM1-7

As discussed in section 2.7, Northwest's proposal to leave as much of the 26-inch-diameter pipeline intact as possible would allow the pipeline to be put back in service for future gas deliveries if new technology is developed to accurately detect stress corrosion cracking. Returning the existing pipeline to service to accommodate future gas deliveries would minimize environmental impact and disruption to landowners compared to constructing a new pipeline in the future. In its comments on the draft EIS, Northwest indicated that it does not currently plan on purchasing additional permanent right-of-way in residential areas where the current easements are less than 75 feet wide. Northwest may, however, require additional permanent right-of-way to accommodate non-standard parallel offsets or crossovers of the existing pipelines to avoid terrain features or structures on or near the existing permanent right-of-way. In general, if the new 36-inch-diameter loop is closer than 10 feet to the edge of the current permanent right-of-way, Northwest has indicated that it may need to acquire additional permanent right-of-way. Northwest would make every effort to negotiate in good faith with affected landowners but if an easement cannot be negotiated with a landowner and the project has been certificated by the FERC, Northwest may use the right of eminent domain as granted to it under section 7(h) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA). The use of eminent domain as it relates to this project is discussed in section 4.8.2.

18523  
FIELD

14

PM1-7  
(cont'd)

1 should have the option of joining in with Williams if  
2 they so choose. But imminent domain shouldn't be a  
3 threat to them.

4 Those are our three comments. We may be  
5 submitting more. Thank you.

6 MR. SIPE: Thank you. Are there  
7 anymore speakers?

8 MR. BEACH: Yes. I'm not a great  
9 public speaker. My name is Vernon Beach, V-E-R-N-O-N,  
10 B-E-A-C-H. Address 9111 Tweed Road. And the expansion  
11 of the right-of-way is one of the concerns that I've had  
12 as well because the EIS as I have read it says that they  
13 may expand to the 75 feet where it isn't 75. But they're  
14 asking to expand to 95 feet on my property. And I don't  
15 see that it's absolutely necessary that they do so. It's  
16 a desire that they have. I appreciate their desire.

PM1-8

PM1-9

17 And it is obvious to me that if the --  
18 unless technology changes, that in approximately 10 years  
19 Williams is going to be coming back again for the  
20 replacement of the other pipeline, unless, of course, we  
21 have some nice technology improvements, which I hope we  
22 do get.

PM1-10

23 The other one is involving a portion of my  
24 property in which when there were pipelines put in  
25 before, the subsurface drainage was cut and as a  
26

# Public Meetings

1

PM1-8 Northwest proposes to generally use a 95-foot-wide construction right-of-way, consisting of Northwest's existing 75-foot-wide permanent right-of-way and 20 feet of new temporary extra workspace. The 20 feet of temporary extra workspace would be allowed to revert to prior uses following construction with no restrictions and would not become part of the permanent easement. See also the responses to comments PM1-7 and PM2-3.

PM1-9 Section 2.7 has been revised to address the potential future need for Northwest to replace the existing 30-inch-diameter pipeline.

PM1-10 The alteration of drainage patterns on this property would potentially result in a loss of wetlands. As discussed in section 4.4.3, no expansion of underdrain systems in wetlands, including drain tiles, can be performed without specific permit approval from the appropriate regulatory agencies.

91-9

18523  
FIELD

15

PM1-10  
(cont'd)

1 consequence created a wetland on my property.  
2 I would like, and I've asked Williams and  
3 so far have not gotten any positive or negative response,  
4 just no response so far, about replacing the -- or  
5 placing piping across the pipes so that I can re-hook up  
6 subsurface drainage without ever having to be concerned  
7 about crossing their pipelines to do so. I think that's  
8 a reasonable request, and I haven't received a positive  
9 or negative response as yet. Otherwise, I'm going to ask  
10 them to replace all the drainage. Those are my two  
11 concerns.

12 MR. SIPE: Great. Thanks. Are there  
13 any other speakers? This is a comment session for  
14 everyone here to comment on the EIS. It would help if  
15 someone would like -- you don't have to be afraid of  
16 public speaking. No one likes it. I don't mind it. If  
17 anyone wants to speak, please.

18 So, this meeting here isn't near as  
19 informational as the scoping meetings. This is a comment  
20 meeting on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The  
21 scoping meeting was a little bit more informational where  
22 I opened it up to a question and answer session, but not  
23 during this meeting here.

24 MR. BLAKE: Yes. I'm going to sit.  
25 Bill Blake, City of Arlington. B-I-L-L, B-L-A-K-E. 238

26

# Public Meetings

18523  
FIELD

16

PM1-11 1 North Olympic. Just in reviewing the EIS, halfway  
2 through. To Arlington, one of the things, there is a  
3 main drinking water well for the City just downstream of  
4 where the cuts will be made under the north and south  
5 fork. So, to make sure that if there was any effect on  
6 our drinking water supply, that that would be mitigated  
7 for afterward. We hope by this effort it won't happen.  
8 But if it does, it is a large percentage of drinking  
9 water for a number of -- for a public municipal drinking  
10 water source. So, we need to make sure that that would  
11 be taken care of in case it somehow geologically impacted  
12 us if it broke some arsenic loose or something.

PM1-12 13 I just want to comment on mitigation  
14 sites. We have a lot of active restoration. Also I sit  
15 as chair of our watershed council for the Stillaguamish.  
16 We have what's called the SERC, and it has all the  
17 agencies and groups that work on watershed restoration  
18 that sit there. So if it comes to help you prioritize  
19 mitigation sites anyplace on the Stilliguamish, I'd offer  
20 that up as help to make sure that we helped you pick a  
21 prioritized list that was most beneficial, technically  
22 speaking.

PM1-13 23 I did notice during those horizontal  
24 drilling that they used bentonite in some of the mud  
25 applications and that it could frak out. It only listed  
26

# Public Meetings

1

PM1-11 As discussed in section 4.3.2.3, Northwest proposes to cross the North and South Fork Stillaguamish Rivers using the horizontal directional drill (HDD) method. The proposed crossing locations are about 1 mile from the City of Arlington well field. An HDD crossing would avoid disturbing the waterbodies and any associated contaminants at the crossing locations. It is highly unlikely that significant amounts of arsenic or other contaminants would be mobilized by the HDD process and travel through the aquifer to the wells. As a result, construction activities at the crossing locations are not expected to pose a threat to the City of Arlington well field. Nevertheless, as requested by the City of Arlington, Northwest would notify the city before construction, monitor the municipal wells, and provide the city with results obtained from any private well testing within the Stillaguamish Basin if permission is granted by the landowner. Section 4.3.1.3 has been revised to include this information. Northwest's adherence to its Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasures Plan (SPCC Plan) (see Appendix H) would also minimize the potential for contaminant releases due to spills.

PM1-12 Section 4.3.2.3 has been revised to provide the most current information regarding Northwest's proposed Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings. Appendix S contains the April 2005 draft of this plan. The revised section 4.3.2.3 discusses the City of Arlington's interest in assisting with the identification of prioritized habitat projects to utilize the large woody debris (LWD) Northwest would donate to Native American tribes and other organizations. Section 4.3.2.3 also discusses Northwest's coordination with the Nisqually Tribe, the COE, and the WDOE to finalize a mitigation plan that would address the tribe's concerns regarding the project, including the proposed wet open-cut crossing of the Nisqually River. This mitigation plan would also satisfy Northwest's compensatory wetland mitigation requirements for the Fort Lewis Loop.

Northwest is still in the process of consulting with other federal, state, and local agencies and applicable Native American tribes to finalize its waterbody crossing mitigation requirements. Section 4.3.2.3 has been revised to include the FERC staff's recommendation that Northwest continue consultations with the applicable agencies and Native American tribes and file the final site-specific waterbody crossing plans and final Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings with the Secretary for the review and written approval of the Director of OEP before construction at each applicable waterbody (see also mitigation measure number 17 in section 5.4). These final plans may incorporate new information that may become available as Northwest continues consultations with the COE, the WDOE, the WDFW, various county agencies, and Native American tribes. The FWS and NOAA Fisheries may impose additional mitigation as well as part of their Biological Opinions (see section 4.7) that also should be included in Northwest's Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings. The FERC staff believes these continued consultations will result in the development of acceptable site-specific crossing plans and mitigation requirements for the waterbodies that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project. Section 4.3.2.3 also explains how the public and other agencies can view the final plans once they are filed.

6-18

# Public Meetings

PM1-12 (cont'd) Section 4.4.4 has been revised to provide the most current information regarding Northwest's compensatory wetland mitigation plan. Northwest is still in the process of consulting with other federal, state, and local agencies and applicable Native American tribes to finalize this plan. Section 4.4.4 has been revised to include the FERC staff's recommendation that Northwest continue consultations with the applicable agencies and appropriate Native American tribes and file the final compensatory wetland mitigation plan with the Secretary before construction (see also mitigation measure number 18 in section 5.4). Section 4.4.4 also explains how the public and other agencies can view the final plan once it is filed.

PM1-13 As discussed in sections 4.3.2.3 and 4.6.2.3, the probability of an inadvertent release of drilling mud or fluid (also referred to as a frac-out) is greatest when the drill bit is working near the surface (i.e., near entry and exit points). Northwest has designed the proposed HDDs so that areas of greatest risk to a potential inadvertent release are in upland areas, away from the water's edge. The HDDs proposed as part of the Capacity Replacement Project are long, large diameter HDDs without a 100 percent certainty of success. A bentonite-based drilling mud is the only acceptable drilling fluid that can be used to maximize the probability of success of the HDDs. Given the length and configuration of the proposed HDDs, suitable substitutes for bentonite are not available. Northwest's Horizontal Directional Drill Contingency Plan (HDD Plan) (see Appendix I) describes how drilling operations would be conducted and monitored to minimize the potential for inadvertent drilling mud releases and also includes procedures for cleanup of drilling mud releases and for sealing the hole if a HDD cannot be completed.

In addition, section 4.6.2.3 has been revised to include additional information regarding the potential impacts of an inadvertent release of drilling mud on sensitive aquatic resources.

As discussed in sections 2.3.2 and 4.6.2.3, all impact evaluations and decisions associated with a frac-out would be made in consultation with the applicable agencies.

18523  
FIELD

17

PM1-13  
(cont'd)

1 the problem as it may plug up the olden fish but it also  
2 seals off spawning beds. It will imbed in the rock and  
3 it can either bury things if it's in there already and/or  
4 cement it so it can't be dug up easily for fish. So,  
5 depending on what they are doing in those streams,  
6 bentonite may not be the best choice because of that  
7 other negative impact that's not listed in the EIS.

PM1-14

8 And then another, as far as restoration,  
9 largely debris. It sounds like there's going to be a lot  
10 of logs. And, again, as far as any of that, it's going  
11 to be available in this area that we could help you find  
12 places to put those large debris pieces to good work.

13 And I will be following up with written  
14 documents in a lot of little details that I can't  
15 remember right now.

16 MR. SIPE: Thank you.

17 MR. BEACH: I'm sorry. I forgot two

PM1-15

18 minor items. Again, items that have been brought to  
19 Williams' attention is the fact that we are certified  
20 organic, and I've asked that we get a letter from them  
21 certifying that we will be able to maintain our organic  
22 status, for the farm portion of our property.

PM1-16

23 The upper portion is being rezoned and is  
24 in the process of being rezoned residential, moderate  
25 density, four to six units per acre. And in light of  
26

# Public Meetings

PM1-14 Section 4.3.2.3 has been revised to include additional discussion of Northwest's plan to install LWD at appropriate areas in waterbodies within the construction right-of-way to mitigate for potential short-term impacts on aquatic species. The revised section 4.3.2.3 discusses the City of Arlington's interest in assisting with the identification of prioritized habitat projects to utilize the LWD Northwest would donate to Native American tribes and other organizations. The effectiveness of LWD as a mitigation measure and additional details regarding Northwest's proposed placement of LWD in streams and on streambanks are discussed in section 4.6.2.3. The specific locations where Northwest would install LWD are included in the draft Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings that is provided in Appendix S.

PM1-15 Section 4.5.2 has been revised to state that Northwest is working directly with the landowner to address the concern about the organic status of the farm and has indicated that construction measures would be implemented to ensure that contaminated soils, seeding, and/or plants are not introduced on the property.

PM1-16 Section 4.8.3.2 has been revised to include a discussion of the planned rezoning and redevelopment of the property.

6-20

18523  
FIELD

18

PM1-16  
(cont'd)

1 what this gentleman pointed out in the report on gas  
2 research, I'm a little bit concerned about the impacts  
3 that may have on development of that property at this  
4 time and what mitigation measures Williams might propose.

5 MR. SIPE: Thank you. Anybody else  
6 like to speak?

7 MR. CLARK: What I want to know is on  
8 this piece of property down there on Machias the dateline  
9 for going through there hasn't been established yet, has  
10 it?

11 MR. SIPE: No, sir.

12 MR. CLARK: Then I am way off in left  
13 field here on that. But I want to know when it's going  
14 to be and what they are going do. With all the pipe and  
15 all the sections that they've got cut up down there.  
16 They were going to tear it out and then they haven't torn  
17 it out. So, now they are going to tear it out if they go  
18 through, if the State lets them go through there. Am I  
19 correct on that?

20 MR. SIPE: If that's part of this  
21 project, you're correct on that. I'm not sure.

22 MR. CLARK: But then you won't know  
23 this until after this meeting or the State gets through  
24 with you guys arguing back and forth with the State  
25 whether you're going to go through over the Pilchuck

26

# Public Meetings

18523  
FIELD

19

1 River?

2 MR. SIPE: This project has not been  
3 approved yet.

4 MR. CLARK: Then this is all  
5 premonition then up until that time. I'm having problems  
6 talking today. Anyways, that's what I wanted to know,  
7 whether they are still going through or whether the State  
8 was going -- to have to go through the State because  
9 that's a wildlife river. And whether they was or wasn't.  
10 So, that's what I wanted to know.

11 MR. SIPE: The Pilchuck is proposed  
12 to be crossed right now.

13 WILLIAMS REPRESENTATIVE: I think  
14 he's talking about the Pilchuck River and not Pilchuck  
15 Creek.

16 MR. CLARK: Well, Pilchuck Creek.  
17 26-incher down there. You've got three lines in there.

18 MR. SIPE: You guys can't have cross.  
19 We'll talk after the meeting. Anybody else like to speak  
20 tonight? Without anymore speakers, the formal part of  
21 this meeting will conclude. On behalf of the Federal  
22 Energy Regulatory Commission, I'd like to thank you all  
23 for coming tonight. Let the record show that the  
24 Northwest Capacity Replacement Project Public Comment  
25 Meeting concluded at 7:30 p.m. Thank you.

26

## Public Meetings

1

18523  
FIELD

20

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

CERTIFICATE

I, JoAnn Bowen, do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 13th day of April, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
JoAnn Bowen                      Commission Expiration

# Public Meetings

6-23

18524  
FIELD

1

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

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - X  
IN THE MATTER OF: : Docket No.  
CAPACITY REPLACEMENT PROJECT : CP05-32-000  
MEETING : CP05-32-001  
- - - - - X

PUBLIC MEETING  
MARRIOTT REDMOND TOWN CENTER  
7410 164th Avenue Northeast  
Redmond, Washington 98052

April 12, 2005

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to the Washington Rules of  
Civil Procedure, the Northwest Capacity Replacement  
Project public meeting was taken before Tia B. Reidt,  
#2798, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, and a Notary Public  
for the State of Washington, on April 12, 2005, commencing  
at the hour of 7:16 p.m.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

2

1 APPEARANCES

2

3 DOUGLAS SIPE

4 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

5 Project manager for proposed Northwest

6 Capacity Replacement Project

7 888 First Street Northeast

8 Washington, DC 20426

9 (202) 502-8771

10 (202) 206-0188 Fax

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# Public Meetings

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

3

1 Redmond, Washington;  
2 Tuesday, April 12, 2005  
3 7:16 p.m.

4

5 MR. SIPE: Sorry about the delay. They said  
6 traffic was pretty bad out there, so I decided to let it  
7 go 15 minutes. I hope nobody is upset with that. So if  
8 we could get started.

9 Good evening. On behalf of the Federal  
10 Energy Regulatory Commission, referred to as the FERC, I  
11 would like to welcome you all tonight. This is the public  
12 comment meeting on the draft Environmental Impact  
13 Statement for the Northwest Pipeline Corporation's  
14 proposed Capacity Replacement Project.

15 Let the record show that the public comment  
16 meeting began at 7:20 on April 12th, 2005. My name is  
17 Doug Sipe, and I am the FERC project manager for this  
18 project. Amy Davis, beside me, is with the National  
19 Resource Group. NRG is a consulting firm that assisted us  
20 in preparing the draft EIS.

21 The FERC is the lead federal agency for the  
22 National Environmental Policy Act review of the project  
23 and the lead agency in the preparation of the EIS. The  
24 Washington State Department of Ecology is the lead state  
25 agency with responsibility for complying with the State

18524  
FIELD

4

1 Environmental Policy Act, SEPA, and participated as a  
2 cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS. Tiffany  
3 Yelton from the Department of Ecology is here tonight and  
4 will expand on their role in the process in a few minutes.  
5 Sally is also here, but she's not going to speak.

6 The US Army Corps of Engineers also  
7 participated as cooperating agency in the preparation of  
8 the EIS to satisfy NEPA responsibilities under Section 404  
9 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and  
10 Harbors Act. We also have Kimbra Davis from the Office of  
11 Pipeline Safety Community Assistance/Technical Services  
12 Group, and she is here tonight and will take any questions  
13 you guys have about safety after the meeting.

14 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to  
15 provide each of you with the opportunity to give us your  
16 environmental comments on the draft EIS. We are here  
17 tonight to learn from you. It will help us the most if  
18 your comments are as specific as possible regarding draft  
19 EIS, and I'm going to expand on that little bit.

20 This meeting will not be like the first  
21 round of meetings we had as the scoping meetings, where  
22 they -- it was mainly for us to get your comments, and I  
23 opened it up to a question-and-answer session. This is  
24 basically to have you guys give us your comments on the  
25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

5

1 I probably won't field as many questions as  
2 I would in a scoping meeting. And this isn't a -- and I'm  
3 not going to sit up here and give, like, an informational  
4 speech on what is happening with the project. It's  
5 basically for you guys to give us your comments. People  
6 get a little bit confused on that sometimes, but we'll  
7 work through it.

8 If you wish to speak tonight, please be  
9 sure to sign the speakers list where you came in. If not,  
10 you can pick up one of the green handouts that provide  
11 instructions to make it easier for you to send in written  
12 comments to us. The speakers list and the handouts are  
13 both at the sign-in table at the back of the room where  
14 you guys came in.

15 We are in the midst of the 45-day comment  
16 period on the draft EIS. A Notice of Availability of the  
17 draft EIS was issued for this project on March 11th, 2005.  
18 The comment period will end on April 25th, 2005. It is  
19 during this period that we receive written comments on the  
20 draft EIS. All written comments received during this time  
21 period or verbally tonight will be addressed in a final  
22 EIS.

23 We ask that you provide comments as soon as  
24 possible in order to give us time to analyze and research  
25 the issues. I would like to add that FERC strongly

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

6

1 encourages electronic filing of any comments. The  
2 instructions for this can be located at our website at  
3 [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov), under the e-filing link. The green handouts  
4 at the sign-in table also tell you how to do basically  
5 everything that I'm going to tell you here on this sheet,  
6 so get a green handout.

7           If you received a copy of the draft EIS,  
8 you will automatically receive a copy of the final EIS.  
9 If you did not receive a copy of the draft and would like  
10 to get a copy of the final, please sign the attendance  
11 list at the back of the room and provide your name and  
12 address, and we'll make sure you get a copy of the final  
13 EIS.

14           During our review of the project, we  
15 assembled information from a variety of sources including  
16 Northwest; you, the public; other state, local and federal  
17 agencies; and our own independent analysis and fieldwork.  
18 We analyzed this information and prepared a draft EIS that  
19 was distributed to the public for comment.

20           Once we've addressed the public comments on  
21 the draft EIS and completed the final EIS and mailed it  
22 out, we forward it on to our commissioners. The  
23 commissioners at FERC will use the final EIS as one of the  
24 tools to determine whether to approve or deny a  
25 certificate, which would be the FERC's authorization for

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

7

1 the project. The Department of Ecology and US Army Corps  
2 of Engineers will use this final EIS in support of their  
3 permitting efforts.

4 Tiffany will now say a few words about the  
5 Department of Ecology's role in the process.

6 MS. YELTON: Hi. My name is Tiffany Yelton, and  
7 I'm one of two coordinators working on this project. My  
8 colleague, Sally Toteff, is also here. And at the end of  
9 the formal comment period, we will be in the back corner,  
10 and we will be happy to answer any questions about the  
11 permits that the Washington State Department of Ecology  
12 issues for a project like this.

13 I just want to say a few things. Ecology  
14 is the lead agency for this project under the state  
15 environmental policy, also known as SEPA. And what that  
16 means is that our responsibility is to make sure that this  
17 project complies with the State Environmental Policy Act.  
18 And we've been working with the Federal Energy Regulatory  
19 Commission since last fall to make sure that the needs of  
20 the State of Washington are recognized in the document.  
21 We do this because our mission is to protect the land,  
22 air, and water in the state of Washington.

23 And when the document is complete, when  
24 it's been finalized and all of your comments have been  
25 responded, incorporated, and listened to, Ecology will be

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

8

1 reviewing the EIS and making an independent determination  
2 as to whether we can adopt it. And if we adopt it, then  
3 we will start processing permits for the project. And  
4 again, we can talk a little bit more about those permits.  
5 But just to give you an idea, there are things like  
6 issuing permits to protect water quality in the rivers as  
7 they do the river crossing, or to protect, restore, and  
8 enhance the wetlands.

9                   So anyway, we'll be in the back of the room  
10 at the end of this meeting and will be happy to answer any  
11 questions. Thank you.

12                   MR. SIPE: Thank you, Tiffany. I would like to  
13 point out to the audience that along with the Department  
14 of Ecology and along with ODS, Northwest representatives  
15 are also in the room, and they'll be around at the end of  
16 the meeting if you have any specific questions about  
17 pipeline crossing your property or whatever the specific  
18 question would be. And we'll all be around to answer  
19 questions, too, after the meeting is over.

20                   We will now begin the important part of the  
21 meeting with your comments. When your name is called,  
22 please step up to the microphone, state your name for the  
23 record. Your comments will be transcribed by the court  
24 reporter to ensure that we get an accurate record of your  
25 comments. A transcript of this meeting will be placed in

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

9

1 the public record at FERC so that everyone has access to  
2 the information collected here tonight.

3 So Amy, if you would read off the first  
4 speaker.

5 MS. DAVIS: Gwendolyn Walsh.

6 MS. WALSH: I am Gwendolyn Walsh at 18000 Bear  
7 Creek Farm Road, Woodinville, 98077.

8 The pipeline -- I am the owner of -- or  
9 part owner of 60 acres which is in a permanent  
10 conservation easement north of the Woodinville/Duvall  
11 Road, and we've lived there since 1962. And I was present  
12 when they put in their last pipeline. And I don't have a  
13 problem at all with the project. I watched them put in  
14 the last one. There were some concerns with erosion and  
15 water runoff with the last pipeline project.

16 The reason why I'm here is I do have  
17 concerns about how they're managing their engineering of  
18 the pipeline that crosses my property. My track number is  
19 06620. And what they want to do is take, I think it's 75  
20 feet along the west side of their easement for  
21 construction purposes. This is a permanent conservation  
22 easement which is held by the Humane Society Wildlife Land  
23 Trust. It also has an easement with the King County Open

PM2-2 | 24 Space. And it has very important owl breeding habitat.

25 My request, which I've also put in writing

# Public Meetings

PM2-1 Section 4.8.4 has been revised to include a discussion of the conservation easement (referred to as the Walsh-Weber Sanctuary) that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project.

PM2-2 Although areas of potential spotted owl habitat may occur intermittently along the proposed loops, many of the areas would only be used by dispersing juveniles and are not suitable for nesting. According to the WDFW, no spotted owls have been recently observed near the Snohomish Loop and the nearest spotted owl critical habitat is about 21.2 miles from milepost (MP) 1386.0 along the loop. See also the response to comment PM2-1.

18524  
FIELD

10

PM2-3 1 to FERC and I've also put in writing to the Northwest  
2 Pipeline, is that they work on the east side of my  
3 property, not the west side. The east side does not have  
4 any particular habitat relevance compared to the west  
5 side. The west side has a row of trees that have kind of  
6 formed a hedge so that you have no understory, and it's  
7 prime owl breeding habitat as well as habitat for a number  
8 of other wildlife that are very endangered.

PM2-4 9 And they would also, if they work on the  
10 west side of the property, they'll have to take down a  
11 fence, which is a real pain to have to put back up. But  
12 if they take down as many trees as they said they want to  
13 take down, it will create a total change in the  
14 understory, and so the whole ecosystem will be affected.  
15 That's point one. And I want to make sure that you get  
16 the point that I'm fine with you using the east side of  
17 the property. I have no problem with that.

PM2-5 18 The second point I would like to make is  
19 that we have seven tributaries which feed into Bear Creek.  
20 Bear Creek is a major salmon spawning habitat in King  
21 County, which is one reason why our property is under so  
22 many conservation easements.  
23 These tributaries are all spring fed and  
24 they originate very close to the pipeline, a little bit  
25 east of the pipeline, so the tributaries essentially start

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-3 See the response to comment PM2-1.

The movement of workspace from one side of a property to another is not possible on a property-by-property basis due to overall construction requirements. A construction right-of-way is structured with a working side and a spoil side, separated by the pipeline trench. Once dug, the pipeline trench separates the two sides and equipment cannot pass over the open trench. The working side of the right-of-way is the wider of the two sides and is the area where the majority of the actual pipe installation activities take place. Construction equipment travels along and works on the working side of the right-of-way and pipe is strung and welded on this side as well. The width of the working side of the right-of-way determines how pipeline construction occurs. A working side that is wide enough to allow for passage of pipeline installation equipment around other equipment and that provides room for a travel lane for inspectors, dust control trucks, and other vehicles to pass up and down the right-of-way is the safest layout for construction.

The spoil side of the construction right-of-way is narrower than the working side. During the main construction activities (stringing, bending, welding, coating, and lowering in) for the Capacity Replacement Project, the spoil side would be used only to store topsoil. Equipment cannot cross the trench from the working side to the spoil side; therefore, this side would be essentially unusable by the construction crew for any other purpose before the loop is installed and the trench is backfilled. The spoil side is located near the trench because it allows minimal handling of topsoil. When removing topsoil from the trenchline, equipment can push or move the topsoil to the side. Equipment can then push or move the topsoil back to the trenchline, minimizing the distance the topsoil travels, handling of topsoil, and loss of topsoil.

Much of the larger main construction equipment used during the project would not be allowed over the existing pipelines without additional protection from excessive stresses. To minimize disturbance of areas outside the existing right-of-way, Northwest proposes to work over the existing 26-inch- and 30-inch-diameter pipelines. This configuration requires that the spoil excavated from the trench after topsoiling be spread over the existing pipelines to effectively increase the pipeline depth, which results in lower stresses on the pipelines when equipment travels over them during main construction activities. Once main construction activities are complete and the trench is backfilled, the additional cover provided by the trench spoil over the existing pipelines is no longer present. Because the additional pipeline depth is no longer present, equipment needed for tie-ins along the loop sections cannot travel on top of the existing pipelines along the right-of-way. The spoil side then becomes the travel lane for this equipment to move.

Conventional pipeline construction is very similar to a moving assembly line. Trenching, pipe stringing, welding, coating, and lowering in are completed by crews that move down the right-of-way following each other. To accommodate the typical pipeline installation process, the work corridor needs to be consistent. Construction within 75 feet is possible, but not desirable. Throughout years of pipeline construction experience, the industry has found that 95-foot- to 100-foot-wide construction rights-of-way are the safest and

PM2-3 (cont'd) most efficient work corridors. This allows the larger construction equipment required to install large diameter pipelines to travel along the side of the trench in a leap-frog type fashion, and still leave a travel lane for light vehicles to pass. By having continuous movement of equipment crews, the pipelines are installed faster, which reduces impacts on landowners and the environment. When the work corridor is reduced, it slows down equipment because there is not enough room for it to move around other equipment for continuous work progress.

Movement of workspace from one side of the right-of-way to another changes the width of the working and spoil sides. Changes in width, particularly to the working side, would have an impact on how the loop is installed. Narrowing the working side to the point where equipment and vehicles cannot pass one another safely would limit the way the loop could be handled and installed. Abruptly changing the working side from one side of the right-of-way to another does not allow conventional pipeline construction to be done in that area or between short distances. Therefore, a change in workspace that restricts the corridor to a point where the construction method must change would affect construction techniques in that area. Switching work sides would require a section of pipeline trench to be filled in or not dug until after the loop is installed. Restricted workspace may require a skipped section by the main pipeline installation crew. Isolated temporary extra workspaces in areas dominated by a restricted workspace corridor cannot replace the linear width of a work corridor. In cases where the corridor is greatly reduced or is not consistent in width or configuration, the work crews are reduced to small, individual task crews with smaller equipment. Work progress is slowed down and costs and impacts on the areas increase.

PM2-4 Section 4.8.4 has been revised to include a discussion of the conservation easement (referred to as the Walsh-Weber Sanctuary) that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project. See also the response to comment PM2-3.

PM2-5 Waterbodies crossed by the proposed project and identified by the appropriate resource agencies as containing salmonids are listed in table 4.6.2-2. Section 4.3.2.3 has been revised to provide the most current information regarding Northwest's proposed Mitigation Plan for Waterbody Crossings. Appendix S contains the April 2005 draft of this plan. Section 4.8.4 has been revised to include a discussion of the conservation easement (referred to as the Walsh-Weber Sanctuary) that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project. See also the response to comment PM2-3.

18524  
FIELD

11

PM2-5  
(cont'd)

1 at the pipeline. If they work to the east side of the  
2 pipeline, it will have less effect on the tributaries and  
3 the runoff than if they work on the west side.

PM2-6

4 So these two concerns I have are just  
5 simply go back to the drawing board, ask the engineers to  
6 move their construction needs to the east side of the  
7 easement, which is also my property, and I'm fine with  
8 that. It will be much less environmental impact, and this  
9 has been backed up by both King County and the Wildlife  
10 Land Trust.

11 Do you have anything you want to ask me?

12 (No response.)

13 MS. WALSH: Okay. Well, I hope you listened.

14 It's very important because I don't sell my trees for  
15 money.

16 MR. SIPE: Now, you say you talked to Northwest  
17 about this?

18 MS. WALSH: I've written to them, and I've  
19 talked to their John Lopez, their right-of-way  
20 representative.

21 MR. SIPE: Okay. That's who you'd want to talk  
22 to.

PM2-7

23 MS. WALSH: He didn't seem to be the slightest  
24 bit interested in even discussing it. He said, "My  
25 engineers have already said this is where we're going to

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-6 Section 4.8.4 has been revised to include a discussion of the conservation easement (referred to as the Walsh-Weber Sanctuary) that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project. See also the response to comment PM2-3.

PM2-7 The use of eminent domain as it relates to this project is discussed in section 4.8.2.

18524  
FIELD

12

PM2-7  
(cont'd)  
PM2-8

1 be, and we can use eminent domain," meaning to condemn it.

2                   And the other thing is they never got in  
3 touch -- I mean, legally, they should get in touch with  
4 both the Wildlife Land Trust, notifying them - they never  
5 did - and they never notified King County. And both of  
6 those have legal easements on this nature reserve.

7                   And so for the last 40 years, I've been  
8 protecting this property against whatever intruders might  
9 come, and this is just one more protection where I have to  
10 stand up and shake a stick. And I don't like to have to  
11 do that, but Northwest Pipeline should have notified the  
12 Wildlife Land Trust before they got farther on in their  
13 process, and they should have notified King County Open  
14 Space. So now I, as a property owner, am having to come  
15 down and shake a stick because they don't need to go into  
16 a conservation easement. There's plenty of room on the  
17 other side.

18                   So I'm hoping you'll work with them,  
19 because the right-of-way representative didn't sound the  
20 slightest bit interested in even listening to me. It was  
21 frustrating.

22                   MR. SIPE: Thank you for your comment.

23                   MS. DAVIS: Okay. The next speaker is James  
24 Stiger.

25                   MR. STIGER: Amen, Gwendolyn.

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-8 Northwest has indicated that it made its initial contact with Ms. Walsh on February 1, 2005 to discuss the project and was informed about The Humane Society of the United States Wildlife Land Trust (Humane Society). On March 18, 2005, a Northwest representative contacted Mr. Michael Swartz of the Humane Society to discuss the project. Since March 18, Northwest has had ongoing discussions with Ms. Walsh regarding the project. Several representatives from King County are on the environmental mailing list for the Capacity Replacement Project and have received project-related notices and information since June 2004 as described in section 1.3 (see also Appendix A). Section 4.8.4 has been revised to include a discussion of the conservation easement (referred to as the Walsh-Weber Sanctuary) that would be crossed by the Capacity Replacement Project. See also the responses to comments PM1-8, PM2-1, and PM2-3.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

13

1 I'm James Stiger. I live at 4402 228th  
2 Avenue Northeast in Redmond. The development is in  
3 Canterbury Woods. The pipeline runs through our  
4 development, and they do not have an easement onto my  
5 property, but they want to use 20 feet of my property.

6 I noticed in the Environmental Impact  
7 Statement, ES-12 they talk about the width of their work  
8 and their disturbance of vegetation. And we are very  
9 concerned on the east side about our trees. And as  
10 Gwendolyn said, there seems to be no consideration about  
11 the cutting down of the trees.

PM2-9

12 Behind my property, there's county area for  
13 ground -- surface water management, and there's five acres  
14 next to my property that's King County that is not  
15 developed, and for some reason -- I think that area could  
16 be used without disturbing the environment on my property,  
17 and leaving me with some privacy.

PM2-10

18 But my discussions with Northwest Pipeline,  
19 they don't -- they seem to give me an answer like they  
20 gave Gwendolyn, that that's what they're going to do, this  
21 is the way they're going to do it, and they don't want to  
22 work on the other side, they want to work on my side.

23 MR. SIPE: Thank you for your comment.

24 MS. DAVIS: Scott Ballantine.

25 MR. BALLANTINE: Hi. I'm Scott Ballantine. I

PM2-9 Avoidance of forest or slow-to-recover habitat is a consideration when routing a pipeline; however, it is generally addressed on a large scale (i.e., over the length of the pipeline route). Northwest has located its proposed loops within or adjacent to its existing right-of-way for about 99 percent of the route and would work over the top of its existing pipelines to limit the amount of new right-of-way clearing. While temporary extra workspace is located in open areas where possible, existing features (e.g., steep slopes and road, waterbody, wetland, and utility crossings) and requirements such as topsoil segregation also factor into the locations of workspace. To avoid trees on a parcel-by-parcel basis would require frequently alternating the sides of the right-of-way where temporary extra workspace is located. It is not technically or practicably feasible for equipment to frequently switch sides of the right-of-way after the trench has been excavated to access temporary extra workspaces. See also the responses to comments PM2-1, PM2-3, and PM2-6.

PM2-10 See the response to comment PM2-3.

18524  
FIELD

14

1 live at 23260 Northeast 20th Place in Sammamish, Zip Code  
2 98074. I live in the Deer Park community. And first I  
3 want to say thank you for conducting another FERC meeting.  
4 I think it is helpful to have these.

5 My first question is in regards to -- at  
6 your initial meeting, several of us filed submissions that  
7 went to the FERC with questions. And I know my wife and  
8 I, we sent some in and categorized them around concern for  
9 the environment, property safety, et cetera. And I just  
10 want to understand now when that was filed, do we need to  
11 refile that same information again as of now or will that  
12 be included in your final document?

13 MR. SIPE: That information should be in this  
14 EIS, the answers to your questions. You do not need to  
15 refile it. Once you file something, it's in the record  
16 and it stays on the record throughout the project, okay?

17 MR. BALLANTINE: I just wanted to clarify that  
18 as far as time, the questions on that.

PM2-11

19 Another unique thing from an environmental  
20 perspective at my house is that there is a drain, a storm  
21 sewer drain that comes from the house, from the street,  
22 and it goes through the side of our house and intersects  
23 the pipeline. And they did have the Williams people come  
24 out, and we looked at that and we talked about how we need  
25 to make sure that when the pipe is being replaced in that

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-11 Section 4.9.3 has been revised to include additional information on measures Northwest would implement to locate and protect storm sewers and other utilities. Northwest has indicated that it is in the process of negotiating construction stipulations with each affected landowner that legally bind both Northwest and the landowner to those stipulations. Unforeseen damages would be resolved pursuant to the mitigating circumstances. Before the end of construction, Northwest would contact the landowners to discuss the project and secure damage releases. In the event of undetectable damages, Northwest's easement agreement would be binding upon Northwest to resolve demonstrated issues or problems.

18524  
FIELD

15

PM2-11  
(cont'd)

1 area, when it's initially removed and going through the  
2 phases, that there's not an issue with, you know, that  
3 flooding and impacting our house and our neighbors.

PM2-12

4 The other concern around that is in reading  
5 the documentation that they provided, several people have  
6 noticed that it seems that some of the wording in there is  
7 worded in a manner that removes any sense of liability  
8 that if something was to happen, you know, something like  
9 this flooding or if a tree fell when they were cutting it  
10 down or something, that there wouldn't be liability on  
11 their part. And maybe there's some clarification on that  
12 that needs to be stated just because it is a little  
13 confusing and people may be reading more into that than  
14 they need to. But I want to make sure from an  
15 environmental standpoint, you know, if something was to  
16 happen, there's not just a "Well, sorry about that."

PM2-13

17 I was going to say also that maybe an  
18 understanding of how the FERC and Williams are going to  
19 communicate with the City of Sammamish and then the other  
20 city areas that are impacted. One suggestion that a lot  
21 of people have said is that group meetings like this are  
22 quite beneficial, as opposed to just individual one-on-one  
23 meetings. What we're finding is in the one-on-one  
24 meetings, is that information gets passed on and the story  
25 changes along the way, for good or for bad, and that

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-12 See the response to comment PM2-11. In addition, section 4.5.2 has been revised to address the issue of unforeseen impacts on trees located along the edge of the construction right-of-way and to include the FERC staff's recommendation that Northwest retain an arborist/forester to inspect trees within 10 days after construction on a property to identify potential safety hazards. Northwest would file a report of the tree safety assessment and a description of any corrective actions implemented with the Secretary no later than 60 days after placing the facilities in service (see also mitigation measure number 19 in section 5.4). Section 4.5.2 also explains how the public can view the report once it is filed.

PM2-13 Several representatives from the City of Sammamish are on the environmental mailing list for the Capacity Replacement Project and were sent project-related notices and the draft and final EISs (see Appendix A). Table 1.5-1 lists the major federal, state, and local codes, ordinances, statutes, rules, regulations, and permits that would apply to the Capacity Replacement Project, including those for the City of Sammamish. A transcript of the public meetings, summaries of the interagency scoping meetings, and all written comments are part of the public record for the Capacity Replacement Project and are available for viewing on the FERC Internet website (<http://www.ferc.gov>). To access the website, use the "eLibrary" link, select "General Search" from the eLibrary menu, and enter the docket number excluding the last three digits in the "Docket Number" field (i.e., PF04-10 and CP05-32). Be sure to select an appropriate date range.

18524  
FIELD

16

PM2-13  
(cont'd)

1 really adds complexity to the project. So some  
2 suggestions around -- this was very nice (indicating).  
3 Maybe have an electronic version of this that is readily  
4 available and things.

PM2-14

5 And then I guess also from an environmental  
6 standpoint, we have been seeing different home estimates  
7 for the values of property, trees and shrubs and things,  
8 and clarifying timelines around when maybe things could be  
9 moved and salvaged and things like that. So as you nail  
10 down your project timelines, perhaps you can help  
11 communicate that out, or the Williams organization can, so  
12 that people know when it's good, because they want to time  
13 their plant removals and replantings around the timing for  
14 nature purposes too. So we appreciate anything on that  
15 that you could address.

PM2-15

16 And the last thing is just making sure that  
17 the nonstandard pipeline, the 20-foot easement that was  
18 mentioned earlier, if there are any easements to that that  
19 could be made, a lot of people have stressed that would  
20 be -- it might save a couple trees and things and tearing  
21 up certain people's desks and things if it could be  
22 slightly tweaked in some areas, understanding that  
23 construction requirements are necessary. So thank you.  
24 MR. SIPE: I appreciate it. I appreciate your  
25 comments.

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-14 Northwest is responsible for ensuring successful revegetation of property crossed by the project unless the landowner has agreed to be compensated as an alternative to the restoration of turf, ornamental shrubs, and/or specialized landscaping by Northwest. Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to state that Northwest has retained an arborist to survey the right-of-way and provide a report on the trees that would be removed during construction of the Capacity Replacement Project. The report would contain the quantity, type, and size of the trees that would be removed. Northwest has also retained landscaping specialists to review properties and provide estimates to replace landscaping features that would be affected during construction. Northwest would meet with each landowner to discuss any special features on their property, including landscaping, fencing, and retaining walls. The treatment of these features would be included as stipulations in the easement agreements. As discussed in section 4.8.2, the easement agreement between the company and a landowner typically specifies compensation for losses resulting from construction, including losses of non-renewable and other resources, damages to property during construction, and restrictions on existing uses that would not be permitted on the permanent right-of-way after construction. Northwest has stated that it is attempting to negotiate fair construction stipulations and settlements with all landowners affected by the Capacity Replacement Project. However, the acquisition of an easement is a negotiable process that would be carried out between Northwest and the landowner and is beyond the scope of this EIS. General impacts on property values associated with the Capacity Replacement Project are discussed in section 4.9.5.

Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to state that Northwest would notify landowners in writing at least 30 days before the start of construction and would follow up with a personal contact within 7 days before construction. Northwest would keep landowners informed of the ongoing construction schedule by mailing periodic project updates to all landowners. During construction, Northwest would maintain a minimum of two land representatives for each loop. The land representatives would be in regular communication with landowners along the route. Northwest has also set up a project "hotline" to provide landowners with a way to contact Northwest to ask questions about the project.

PM2-15 See the response to comment PM2-9.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

17

1 MS. DAVIS: Michelle Ballantine.  
2 MR. BALLANTINE: She decided not to.  
3 MS. DAVIS: Okay.  
4 MS. BALLANTINE: No. He covered what I wanted  
5 to say.  
6 MS. DAVIS: Greg Misenaar.  
7 MR. MISENAR: Greg Misenaar at 8019 -- excuse me,  
8 18019 214th Avenue Northeast in Woodinville. And I  
9 provided some comments at one of the previous meetings,  
10 and I did see some reference to a few of them, although  
11 one of them is Page 4-197, you didn't quite get the  
12 comments correct.  
13 In other words, we were very concerned that  
14 214th would be used for pipeline maintenance past our  
15 house where the correct route, if you will, would be on a  
16 more paved route. Ours is a dirt road, fairly fragile,  
17 and it seems like every couple of months we have to go  
18 out and fill in a pothole. So we're concerned that heavy  
19 equipment would just decimate the road or make it  
20 extremely dusty, depending on whether there's rain or no  
21 rain.  
22 And in the comment here, it says that it  
23 can't be avoided because the pipeline actually goes on the  
24 road and the road was built over it, which is true at the  
25 beginning part of the road down by Woodinville/Duvall

PM2-16

PM2-16 Section 4.9.4 has been revised to include additional information on 214<sup>th</sup> Avenue and mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts on the road. Section 2.2.1 has been revised to state that Northwest would conduct repairs that are necessary to ensure that access roads would support the load of heavy equipment during construction and would repair any roads or culverts it damages during construction.

# Public Meetings

6-42

18524  
FIELD

18

PM2-16  
(cont'd)

1 Road, but I guess our comments are they really shouldn't  
2 be using that road more than about a half mile up.  
3 At one point in the past, somebody made  
4 that road so that it could be used as a through road, but  
5 there's a gate up now and we're really concerned that  
6 people don't use that through road in the future, that  
7 they should go on a route that includes 175th and back and  
8 around. And so while this does allude to comments  
9 received about 214th, it really doesn't really address it.

10 I don't know if I should send something in  
11 or if just saying something about it clarifies that.  
12 Should I send an additional note in?

13 MS. DAVIS: I think the more detail you can  
14 provide so we understand the exact issue would be helpful.  
15 Just speaking tonight, we'll look into it as well, but if  
16 you misunderstood before, the -- you know, the more  
17 specific your comments are, the more helpful they can be.

18 MR. MISENAR: Okay. Great.

PM2-17

19 We're also one of those households that has  
20 a well, and at least one or two streams 200 feet of the  
21 pipeline, and are fairly concerned about the water  
22 quality. I was pleased to see the water management plan  
23 in here, although in the event that the well did not  
24 produce potable water or a quantity of potable water that  
25 it does now, all it really states is that they will do

PM2-17 As discussed in section 4.3.1.3, if a water supply well or spring were adversely affected by the project, Northwest would work with the landowner to ensure the water supply is replaced. Under a worst-case scenario (i.e., if the well or spring were permanently affected), Northwest would permanently replace a water supply. The source of the water supply would depend on the particular situation and the landowner's specific needs, but would most likely consist of providing potable water until a new well can be drilled.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

19

PM2-17  
(cont'd)

1 something, and there really wasn't -- I hate to use the  
2 word "disaster recovery," but assuming they can't fix it,  
3 I don't know what that means, whether they provide us  
4 water for the rest of our lives or whether they bring  
5 water in. I guess it would be helpful to see an actual  
6 plan of what is going to happen in a worse-case scenario.  
7 Thank you.

8 MR. SIPE: Thank you for your comment. I can't  
9 stress enough for everyone to work -- this project is not  
10 approved, by any stretch of the imagination, until  
11 whenever that happens, until the commissioners bid on it.  
12 But I can't stress enough that people with individual  
13 lands needs to work with Northwest in preparation of this  
14 project being approved. It may or may not happen, but  
15 working with the land agents and telling them your  
16 specific concerns really helps out the process because  
17 what it comes down to, if you don't work with the land  
18 agents, you will -- until the project is approved and then  
19 construction starts happening too quickly, then sometimes  
20 the specifics that you want to have happen on your  
21 property don't happen because the construction plans are  
22 already set in stone.

23 The construction plans themselves, after  
24 the project is approved, they'll send in an implementation  
25 plan. We will review those. So the specific trees and

# Public Meetings

6-44

18524  
FIELD

20

1 the specific right-of-way and the specific items that you  
2 may have that you want addressed, if we know that, then we  
3 can help you with that. If we don't know it, then we  
4 can't.

5 In other words, we need detailed comments  
6 on exactly what you want to have happen on your property.  
7 I'm not saying we can make that all happen, but we can  
8 help that situation out. So as detailed as you can be  
9 helps everyone out.

10 MS. DAVIS: Next on the list is Hope Swdzik.

11 MS. SWDZIK: Hi. My name is Hope Swdzik. I  
12 live at 1910 234th Court Northeast, Sammamish, 98074.  
13 Since this forum is a little bit different than the last  
14 meeting, I only have a couple of quick comments as far as  
15 the environmental side once the construction project  
16 actually starts.

PM2-18

17 When they start removing trees - and  
18 there's several clusters of trees, very large, 40 feet or  
19 higher trees that are coming down - my concern is if they  
20 only have to take one or two and there's three or more  
21 that are left after it is completed, they're going to dig  
22 up the root systems of several of these other trees as  
23 well. And if they die and fall, they fall on somebody's

PM2-19

24 house, they fall on property, what have you. Do we then  
25 contact Williams or FERC to get damage repaired? Can we

PM2-18 Section 4.5.2 has been revised to address the issue of unforeseen impacts on trees located along the edge of the construction right-of-way and to include the FERC staff's recommendation that Northwest retain an arborist/forester to inspect trees within 10 days after construction on a property to identify potential safety hazards. Northwest would file a report of the tree safety assessment and a description of any corrective actions implemented with the Secretary no later than 60 days after placing the facilities in service (see also mitigation measure number 19 in section 5.4). Section 4.5.2 also explains how the public can view the report once it is filed.

PM2-19 See the responses to comments PM2-14 and PM2-18.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

21

PM2-19  
(cont'd)

1 then also replace those trees in the same locations as  
2 they were deemed okay during the original process?

3 I have several other specific safety  
4 concerns in regards to the pipeline project itself, which  
5 I've already spoken with several members of Williams, and  
6 I'll address those at the end of the meeting privately.

7 That's pretty much it. Thanks.

8 MR. SIPE: Great. Thank you for your comments.

9 MS. DAVIS: The last one that signed up on the  
10 list is Sue Austin.

11 MS. AUSTIN: Thank you. My name is Sue Austin.  
12 I live at 1712 233rd Place Northeast in Sammamish. I'm a  
13 resident of the Deer Park community. I would like to read  
14 off a letter that I wrote today and will be submitting:

15 "I'm a resident of the Deer Park  
16 neighborhood who lives on the Northwest Pipeline  
17 Corporation's proposed pipeline capacity project and will  
18 be directly affected by the project. I have read the  
19 materials provided by Williams, FERC, the Washington  
20 Utilities and Transportation Commission, and the Special  
21 Report 281. I attended the public scoping meeting held in  
22 Redmond, Washington on August 3rd, 2004, and gave  
23 comments. I also went to tour Williams' latest pipeline  
24 project in Everett to see its restoration.

25 "At the public scoping meeting, numerous

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

22

1 homeowners voiced concern over the close proximity of  
2 homes adjacent to the pipeline. In response to this  
3 concern, Mr. Sipe asked Williams to speak to this concern.  
4 I believe it was Mr. Gregory, the land lead, who spoke  
5 about real risks that Williams would work with the  
6 homeowners to minimize the impact and that no one would be  
7 losing any land. Mr. Sipe stated this: 'We're here  
8 tonight to get your comments, and things can be changed.'

9 "It was my understanding that the purpose  
10 of the meeting was for homeowners and community members to  
11 find out how the project would affect them and then to be  
12 able to comment about various concerns we have on the  
13 effect. But at the scoping meeting, Williams did not  
14 reveal that many homeowners would be affected by permanent  
15 loss of land use. In February, Williams land  
16 representatives began meeting with homeowners with  
17 compensation offers.

18 It was revealed to myself and many other  
19 homeowners that Williams would set back our existing fence  
20 lines from a few inches up to many feet so that they would  
21 be five feet off the pipe's centerline. No compensation  
22 was offered for this loss.

23 "The draft Environmental Impact Statement  
24 referenced the scoping process to comments received.  
25 Section 4.8.3.1, under 'Existing Residents' discusses the

PM2-20

PM2-20

In general, Northwest owns a 60-foot-wide permanent easement through the Sammamish area. In many locations the 60-foot-wide easement has been encroached upon with landscaping, fences, and retaining walls. Northwest's easement agreements prohibit the building, constructing, and/or creation of buildings, engineering works, or other structures over or that would interfere with its pipelines, including fences and retaining walls. The encroachment has reduced the amount of maintained right-of-way for the pipelines in this area. During construction, Northwest would need the entire 60-foot-wide right-of-way in order to remove the existing 26-inch-diameter pipeline and install the Snohomish Loop. After construction, fences and retaining walls that had encroached upon Northwest's existing permanent easement would be set back from their original location to a distance of 5 feet off the centerline of the new 36-inch-diameter loop to allow Northwest to partially re-establish its easement. Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to discuss the setback of fences and retaining walls. Section 2.6 includes additional information on Northwest's operation and maintenance requirements for its easement.

Northwest has stated that it is attempting to negotiate fair construction stipulations and settlements with all landowners affected by the Capacity Replacement Project. However, the amount of compensation paid to a landowner is a negotiable process that is carried out between Northwest and the landowner and is beyond the scope of this EIS.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

23

1 temporary removal of fences.

2 "Page 4-165, Paragraph 3, states that  
3 temporary construction impact would include the removal of  
4 the above-ground structures such as fences from within the  
5 right-of-way.

6 "Page 4-166, Paragraph 5, discusses that  
7 several fences would have to be temporarily removed during  
8 pipeline construction.

9 "Page 4-168, Paragraph 3, discusses the  
10 restoration of fences after topsoil is replaced.

11 "Section 4-4.8.6, 'Visual Resources'  
12 discusses the visual effects after construction in the  
13 Deer Park subdivision.

14 "Page 4-184, Paragraph 1, states that  
15 Northwest would replace fences so that they would not be  
16 located over the pipe and would negotiate appropriate  
17 compensation with affected homeowners. My fence and many  
18 neighbors' fences are not located on the pipe.

19 "All of the effected homeowners understand  
20 the need for pipeline safety. Deer Park has over 14 years  
21 of history that our established fence lines are safe.  
22 Williams has been able to operate and maintain the  
23 pipeline. Aerial and ground patrol has been ongoing.

24 "Williams will be able to replace the  
25 pipeline. We understand that the new pipe will be laid a

PM2-21

PM2-21 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to clarify that Northwest would replace fences so that they are set back from their original location to a distance of 5 feet off the centerline of the new 36-inch-diameter loop to allow Northwest to partially re-establish its easement. See also the response to comment PM2-20.

6-47

18524  
FIELD

24

PM2-22

1 foot deeper and be made of stronger metal than the  
 2 previous pipe. The new pipe width will only be increased  
 3 by five inches on each side. We still don't know why  
 4 there is a need to set back fences over the five inches.  
 5 I want Williams to work with us to lessen the size of the  
 6 setback and to offer compensation for any setback  
 7 resulting in permanent loss of land use.

PM2-23

8 "Special Report 281 recommends new  
 9 pipelines be routed in low density population areas and  
 10 new home setbacks be 50 feet to keep people safe from a  
 11 pipeline incident. We are just the opposite: high density  
 12 population with 25-foot setbacks on average. Williams is  
 13 educating the public regarding excavation close to the  
 14 pipeline and tree encroachment. We now have guidelines  
 15 what to look for normal operation. We have the numbers to  
 16 call if we notice something amiss. This awareness to the  
 17 pipeline is a new marker so will make for greater safety.

18 "I know that Williams takes pride in its  
 19 building and operation of pipelines. I saw that when I  
 20 toured the Everett project. I was impressed by the  
 21 restoration, but we too take pride in our home and our  
 22 neighborhood. Williams and the Sammamish residences along  
 23 the pipeline must have ongoing positive relations to  
 24 ensure the safe operation of the pipeline and the safety  
 25 of the residents.

# Public Meetings

PM2-22 See the response to comment PM2-20.

PM2-23 Thank you for your comment. Alternatives to the proposed project are described in section 3.0.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

25

PM2-24

1 "Williams can show its commitment of being  
2 a good neighbor by working with us to ensure that our  
3 properties remain whole or that there is fair compensation  
4 for land use loss. We would like FERC support in reducing  
5 the fence setback or establishing compensation for land  
6 use loss."

7 Thank you for your cooperation in listening  
8 to this.

9  
10 MR. SIPE: Thank you for your comment.

11 That's all of the speakers we have on the  
12 list. I know a lot of people don't like to get up in  
13 crowds and speak, but this is your opportunity to say what  
14 you want to say to us concerning the EIS and concerning  
15 the project that may be affecting you, so you can say  
16 anything else or write it down and send it into us, and be  
17 as detailed as possible. We would appreciate it. So --

18 Sure. If you could just get up and state  
19 your name, and then you don't have to -- you don't have to  
20 be on this list. This list is just a benefit to us so we  
21 can keep it. But if anyone else wants to speak, have at  
22 it.

23 MR. GREY: My name is Tim Grey. I live at 867  
24 238th Avenue Northeast in Sammamish. My home is located  
25 on four and three-quarters acres. I live on a private

PM2-24 See the response to comment PM2-20.

18524  
FIELD

26

1 road that is shared by ten families. My water source is a  
2 private group B community well, and it is shared by four  
3 families. Northwest has an 87-and-a-half-foot pipeline  
4 easement with me. There is a valve station that is  
5 located within the easement, and it is contained with a  
6 20-by-30- foot fence in the area.

7 Just four weeks ago I was approached by a  
8 representative from Northwest to inform me of their plans  
9 for using my property. This was not a good day. I asked  
10 many questions and received few answers. For example,  
11 they have still not been able to tell me how the now pipe  
12 will connect to the valve station, whether it will be  
13 above ground or below ground. I have to wonder, do they  
14 really not know or do they just not want to tell me?

15 In summary, their plans for my property  
16 include accessing the pipeline from our community private  
17 road, then proceeding to the west all the way across my  
18 neighbor's property. This access passes directly across  
19 our community well. It is explained to me the intent of  
20 this access is to bring large volumes of the heavy  
21 equipment, supplies, and workers in. It simply does not  
22 seem wise to be doing this type of activity directly over  
23 a well, and I wonder how this possibly meets regulations.

24 They also want me to provide them with use  
25 of additional land for purposes of storing vehicles,

PM2-25

PM2-26

PM2-27

# Public Meetings

PM2-25 The connection between the loop and the valve station would be underground; however, additional structures associated with the proposed pig receiver and mainline valve (MLV) at this location would be constructed aboveground adjacent to the existing valve station.

PM2-26 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision, including impacts associated with use of the proposed temporary extra workspaces on well number 752102.

PM2-27 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision and use of the proposed temporary extra workspaces.

18524  
FIELD

27

PM2-27  
(cont'd)

1 equipment, and supplies overnight. The additional land  
2 they want measures approximately 500 feet by 45 feet.  
3 This area completely surrounds our community well. It is  
4 heavily treed with lots of old timber. It simply destroys  
5 my property and puts the safety of the four families on  
6 the well at risk.

PM2-28

7 As far as the trees go, they're proposing  
8 to move 87 old trees. It is my opinion that Northwest has  
9 not done their homework. I seriously hope that they did  
10 not realize this well was located in this area for these  
11 types of plans. I'm also having a real hard time losing  
12 these 87 trees for the purposes of a temporary parking  
13 lot. It would be easier for me to accept if there were no  
14 other less-impacting options available, but in this case  
15 there are. To the west there are no trees. It seems to  
16 me that the purpose of use should be considered here.

PM2-29

17 I also feel it's been inconsiderate that  
18 none of any other neighbors in my private community have  
19 been informed of these intents. These people are also  
20 impacted by these decisions. These are people that are on  
21 this private well and live on this private road.

22 I've lived in my home for seven years.  
23 During this time I've had the opportunity to meet many of  
24 the Northwest representatives, as they come out on  
25 occasion to discuss about compensation. I've always

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-28 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision, including impacts associated with the loss of trees and alternatives to the proposed access road and temporary extra workspaces.

PM2-29 Northwest began meeting with individual landowners directly affected by the proposed permanent and temporary land requirements associated with the Capacity Replacement Project in January 2005. The landowners affected by the use of access roads or otherwise indirectly affected are not typically notified until the negotiations with the directly affected landowner(s) reach a point where access issues have been discussed. Once the uses of the proposed access roads have been determined, Northwest attempts to discuss the effects of its construction activities with other landowners. Even though Northwest did not begin meeting with individual landowners until January 2005, extensive efforts to notify the public and give them opportunities to comment on the project have been ongoing since June 2004 as described in section 1.3.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

28

1 enjoyed the chats we've had. They're great people.  
2 Unfortunately, I've become very sour at how this project  
3 has been handled. To me, it feels like essentially  
4 railroading this project through without a lot of concerns  
5 of the lives and investments of those it impacts.

PM2-30

6 As for a detailed comment of what I want to  
7 see happen is I want to see Northwest look at other  
8 options that are less impact. I want to see them avoid  
9 this well, and I want to see them find a way to limit the  
10 number of trees that are being taken down for the purposes  
11 of a temporary parking lot.

12 That's all I have. Thank you.

13 MR. SIPE: I appreciate it.

14 MR. COX: Can I add to his comments?

15 MR. SIPE: Sure. Just come up to -- yeah. Just  
16 come up to the microphone and state your name.

17 MR. COX: Doug Cox, 822 238th Avenue Northeast.  
18 I'm a neighbor right across the street.

PM2-31

19 Number one, to reiterate what Tim said,  
20 those of us on the other side of the street where the well  
21 is, even though they're planning on using our private  
22 driveway -- private road and driveway as an egress and  
23 entrance method, none of us have even been notified of  
24 this project. We found out about it by accident last week  
25 when Tim and his neighbor were walking up and down the

PM2-30 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision and alternatives to the proposed access road and temporary extra workspaces.

PM2-31 See the response to comment PM2-29.

18524  
FIELD

29

PM2-31  
(cont'd)

1 street with the pipeline people. I don't like it. I  
2 don't like somebody coming in and using my property and  
3 not even saying, "Hi, how are you?"

PM2-32

4 But number two, Tim was talking about the  
5 parking lot that they're going to try to make in his yard.  
6 If the pipeline directly across Northeast 8th, less than a  
7 half a mile from his location, has got an area that is  
8 cleared as big as four football fields, it's level, it's  
9 flat, and it's already cleared, why can't they use that?  
10 Why do they do they have to take down 87 trees? I don't  
11 understand.

12 That's it.

13 MR. SIPE: I appreciate it. Thank you.

14 THE PUBLIC: I'm Sajin [phonetic]  
15 [indecipherable], 21845 Northeast 294th Place, Zip 98053.  
16 Williams said something like 50 feet by approximately 200  
17 feet of permanent right-of-way on my property, and they're  
18 asking 20 feet by around 400 feet more as temporary road  
19 space.

PM2-33

20 Now, this particular road space has a huge  
21 number of old trees, something around 60 to maybe 90  
22 trees, depending upon how wide you call the trees. I  
23 mean, I don't have a clear definition from them, that's  
24 why I'm asking them: How big is the tree? Is it going to  
25 be like this big (indicating)? Now, some of the trees are

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-32 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision and alternatives to the proposed access road and temporary extra workspaces.

PM2-33 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to state that Northwest has retained an arborist to survey the right-of-way and provide a report on the trees that would be removed during construction of the Capacity Replacement Project. The report would contain the quantity, type, and size of the trees that would be removed. Northwest has also retained landscaping specialists to review properties and provide estimates to replace landscaping features that would be affected during construction. Northwest would meet with each landowner to discuss any special features on their property, including landscaping, fencing, and retaining walls. The treatment of these features would be included as stipulations in the easement agreements. As discussed in section 4.8.2, the easement agreement between the company and a landowner typically specifies compensation for losses resulting from construction, including losses of non-renewable and other resources, damages to property during construction, and restrictions on existing uses that would not be permitted on the permanent right-of-way after construction. Northwest has stated that it is attempting to negotiate fair construction stipulations and settlements with all landowners affected by the Capacity Replacement Project. However, the acquisition of an easement is a negotiable process that would be carried out between Northwest and the landowner and is beyond the scope of this EIS.

18524  
FIELD

30

PM2-33  
(cont'd)

1 like 100 to maybe like 1,500 [sic] feet tall and there is  
2 a lot of undergrowth there. They are going to clear a  
3 lot of this, and they told me they want to keep it level.

PM2-34

4 My question is how am I going to arrive at  
5 a compensation to restore this area back to its, you know,  
6 to what it is? I like my property because there are these  
7 woods in the backyard. If these woods are not going to be  
8 there, my property is -- the value is very much affected.

PM2-35

9 The second point I have is, as someone else  
10 mentioned earlier, when they take all of these trees, there  
11 are some other trees which are going to lose, you know,  
12 the support of the other trees. And as a result, they  
13 might become weaker and they might fall or something like  
14 that. So what are they going to do about that?

PM2-36

15 And the third point is like when they use  
16 that as a temporary road space, they are valuing that in  
17 the compensation package based on the value of timber.  
18 And the value of timber, the way it seems to me, is highly  
19 incomparable [sic] with what impact it has on my property.  
20 And I'm not in the timber sale business, so I really don't  
21 know why I would be taking that as timber. To me, it is  
22 the value of, you know, my backyard and having those  
23 woods, so I want some compensation based on what it is.

24 That's all I have.

25 MR. SIPE: Thank you.

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-34 See the response to comment PM2-14.

PM2-35 Section 4.5.2 has been revised to address the issue of unforeseen impacts on trees located along the edge of the construction right-of-way and to include the FERC staff's recommendation that Northwest retain an arborist/forester to inspect trees within 10 days after construction on a property to identify potential safety hazards. Northwest would file a report of the tree safety assessment and a description of any corrective actions implemented with the Secretary no later than 60 days after placing the facilities in service (see also mitigation measure number 19 in section 5.4). Section 4.5.2 also explains how the public can view the report once it is filed.

PM2-36 See the response to comment PM2-14.

18524  
FIELD

31

1                   MR. GILE: My name is Lee Gile. I live at 810  
2 238th Avenue Northeast in Sammamish. I'm a neighbor of  
3 Mr. Grey and Mr. Cox, and I share the same views as they  
4 do about this project and not being informed. We just  
5 learned last week that they were planning on using -- or  
6 asking for a temporary work area on Mr. Grey's property  
7 and use our private road, which is owned by the ten  
8 residents in our neighborhood, without even consulting us.  
9 I think that's very unfair. I would like to go on the  
10 record and say that.

PM2-37

11                   If the project does proceed, I would expect  
12 that the EIS would call for a resident work plan for our  
13 neighborhood that would explain what the mitigations are  
14 for any damage to the road. It is an asphalt road, and it  
15 was designed specifically for light traffic for residents  
16 only, and they're talking about 80-ton trucks coming down  
17 that asphalt road. So I expect that detailed plan to  
18 explain what the mitigations would be for any damage to  
19 that road before the project is even approved. I don't  
20 want to have to deal with this after the construction and  
21 after the damage occurs. There should be a detailed plan  
22 before the construction proceeds explaining how they're  
23 going to mitigate this.

PM2-38

24                   And I would also like to echo the fact that  
25 it seems like there was no research done on this

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-37 See the response to comment PM2-29.

PM2-38 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision, including the FERC staff's recommendation that Northwest file a Residential Area Work Plan for the Saddleback Subdivision that includes proposed construction and mitigation measures to minimize impacts on this area (see also mitigation measure number 22 in section 5.4). Section 4.8.3.1 also explains how the public can view the plan once it is filed. Section 2.2.1 has been revised to state that Northwest would conduct repairs that are necessary to ensure that access roads would support the load of heavy equipment during construction and would repair any roads or culverts it damages during construction.

18524  
FIELD

32

PM2-39 1 particular work area. It's three-quarters of an acre, and  
2 right in the middle is a well that serves four residents  
3 in our neighborhood, and it seems like there was no  
4 planning at all, no research at all to discover this well.

PM2-40 5 In addition, just on Saturday I drove  
6 around the neighborhood. And within a quarter of a mile,  
7 besides the area easement that the pipeline already has  
8 and the other side of Northeast 8th, which is at least  
9 three football fields long and 90 feet wide, there is at  
10 least 200 viable -- it seems to me a viable alternative to  
11 this work area to direct it to the west of Mr. Grey's  
12 property and also to the north of Mr. Grey's property.  
13 And it seems like before the EIS approval, those sites  
14 should be investigated and should be determined whether  
15 they are alternatives to the plan that's been presented.

16 MR. SIPE: I appreciate it. Thank you.

17 MR. MART: I'm Julien Mart. I live at 809 128th  
18 Avenue Northeast in Sammamish 98074. I attended an open  
19 house last year, probably in March or April, with  
20 Northwest, and I was informed that actually I will not be  
21 disturbed in any way, or I will never [indecipherable]  
22 disturbance on my property because I will be the last one  
23 south -- from Canada south, going south, and they will not  
24 place the pipeline on my property.

25 And for this, I didn't -- I mean, I

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-39 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision, including impacts associated with use of the proposed temporary extra workspaces on well number 752102.

PM2-40 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision and alternatives to the proposed access road and temporary extra workspaces.

18524  
FIELD

33

- PM2-41 1 received all of the mailings from Northwest but nothing  
2 else until a month ago. A month ago I received a folder  
3 with an offer for compensation, and I'm not happy at all.  
4 I'm not happy because Northwest does not have a good work  
5 ethic. They told me a year ago that if something -- if  
6 they would need to work on my property, they would contact  
7 me. They didn't for one year. Now they came after one  
8 year and they want to use my property for a temporary work  
9 area, which is more than half an acre.
- PM2-42 10 I live on a five-and-a-half-acre property.  
11 I depend very much on a well, which is 500 feet from the  
12 house. My house is 500 feet from the well. So if they  
13 are going to use the property to use the area temporary  
14 over there, they will probably destroy the waterlines to  
15 my house.
- 16 So in conclusion, I want to say that the  
17 work ethic that Northwest, specifically in my case, is not  
18 up to the standards that they think or they want to show.
- PM2-43 19 A month ago I was contacted by Northwest. I talked with  
20 the supervisor for -- the right-of-way supervisor. She  
21 couldn't respond to most of my questions. She directed  
22 some of the questions to a construction manager. The  
23 construction manager came, and he couldn't respond at all.  
24 He directed -- that I should talk with the people in  
25 engineering.

## Public Meetings

2

- PM2-41 See the response to comment PM2-29. Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision and alternatives to the proposed access road and temporary extra workspaces. In addition, Northwest has stated that it is attempting to negotiate fair construction stipulations and settlements with all landowners affected by the Capacity Replacement Project. However, the acquisition of an easement is a negotiable process that would be carried out between Northwest and the landowner and is beyond the scope of this EIS.
- PM2-42 Section 4.8.3.1 has been revised to include a discussion of the Saddleback Subdivision, including impacts associated with use of the proposed temporary extra workspaces on well number 752102 and its associated water lines.
- PM2-43 The FERC staff understands that it may be frustrating to be directed to several different Northwest representatives to receive responses to questions about the project but believes overall that Northwest has attempted to establish good communications with its landowners. Northwest has sponsored open houses and attended the FERC's scoping and public comment meetings. After the conclusion of the formal portion of each public meeting, Northwest representatives have stayed to talk with individual landowners. In addition, Northwest has stated that it has mailed project updates routinely and met with each directly affected landowner at least twice. During construction, Northwest would maintain a minimum of two land representatives for each loop who would be in regular communication with landowners along the route. Northwest has also set up a project "hotline" to provide landowners with a way to contact Northwest to ask questions about the project. Landowners not satisfied with Northwest's response would be provided with the telephone number of the FERC's Enforcement Hotline.
- Section 2.5 has been revised to describe the third-party compliance monitoring program that would be implemented by the FERC during construction of the project. Under this program, full-time third-party compliance monitors would be present on the construction spreads to monitor and document compliance with project mitigation measures and requirements. The FERC staff would also conduct periodic inspections of the project. The FERC staff and third-party compliance monitors would be available to answer questions from individual landowners and assist with resolution of issues.

18524  
FIELD

34

PM2-43  
(cont'd)

1                   So it's very difficult for us as land  
2 owners to work with Northwest. We cannot find a way all  
3 the time when we have specific question. All the time we  
4 are sent to another department or to another supervision  
5 of Northwest, which we cannot contact, and it's really  
6 very, very difficult. Thank you so much.

7                   MR. SIPE: I appreciate it. Thank you.

8                   Would anybody else like to speak?

9                   MR. KUPREWICZ: My name is Richard Kuprewicz. I  
10 live at 4643 192nd Drive Northeast in the city of  
11 Sammamish. I'm well-known in the pipeline industry. I  
12 was technical representative for the City of Bellingham  
13 following that tragedy. I'm a voting member of the  
14 Technical Hazardous Pipeline Safety Standards Committee.  
15 I'm a voting member of the Citizens' Committee on Pipeline  
16 Safety for the state of Washington.

17                   I'm well aware of the need of this project.  
18 We understand that. I'm very troubled by some of the  
19 comments I hear tonight about communication problems  
20 between the homeowners and Northwest Pipeline.

21                   As a member of the Citizens' Committee on  
22 Pipeline Safety, I'm going to speak on the public record,  
23 but I'm going to speak as an individual citizen and a  
24 member of the city of Sammamish.

25                   When this project was discussed some months

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

35

1 ago in the public forum for the safety committee,  
2 Citizens' Safety Committee, there was a serious concern  
3 about the width for this pipeline, this additional  
4 pipeline, which we recognize is a real need, but more  
5 specifically in the Sammamish loop area, the high density  
6 area specifically in the plateau areas of some of the  
7 commenters here this evening.

PM2-44

8 It was our understanding that consideration  
9 was going to be given to the sensitive factor that the  
10 right-of-way was fairly narrow, 60 feet. And it was  
11 fairly clear, from my perspective, that the pipe could be  
12 replaced. And it actually shows up in the EIS that a  
13 60-foot right-of-way is more than adequate to cover the  
14 pipe replacement.

15 Now, we understand that that's a rather  
16 unique situation, replacing a 26-inch with a 36-inch and  
17 the 60-foot right-of-way. But I've got to give you my  
18 feedback. On Page 211 here, when I read this EIS, I know  
19 a lot of good work has gone into this. I'm not  
20 criticizing all of that effort. But when I read this, if  
21 I'm a homeowner asking about what the right-of-way  
22 requirement is in the sensitive area, this high population  
23 area, which a lot of it is Class III. I have a diagram  
24 saying that this pipe replacement can occur on a 60-foot  
25 right-of-way. But then I read this document, and it

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-44

Northwest proposes to generally use a 95-foot-wide construction right-of-way, consisting of Northwest's existing 75-foot-wide permanent right-of-way and 20 feet of new temporary extra workspace. Throughout years of pipeline construction experience, the industry has found that 95-foot- to 100-foot-wide construction rights-of-way are the safest and most efficient work corridors. This allows the larger construction equipment required to install large diameter pipelines to travel along the side of the trench in a leap-frog type fashion, and still leave a travel lane for light vehicles to pass. By having continuous movement of equipment crews, the pipelines are installed faster, which reduces impacts on landowners and the environment. When the work corridor is reduced, it slows down equipment because there is not enough room for it to move around other equipment for continuous work progress.

On the Snohomish Loop, Northwest's existing right-of-way is only 60 feet wide in several locations. Because encroachment, development, or other limitations confine available workspace on the Snohomish Loop, Northwest would be forced to limit its construction activities to the existing 60-foot-wide right-of-way. The only feasible method for installing the proposed 36-inch-diameter loop using a 60-foot-wide construction right-of-way is to remove the existing 26-inch-diameter pipeline and place the new loop in the same trench. As discussed in section 2.7, Northwest proposes to leave as much of the 26-inch-diameter pipeline intact as possible to allow the pipeline to be put back in service for future gas deliveries if new technology is developed to accurately detect stress corrosion cracking. Returning the existing pipeline to service to accommodate future gas deliveries would minimize environmental impact and disruption to landowners compared to constructing a new pipeline in the future.

18524  
FIELD

36

PM2-44  
(cont'd)

1 leaves a very strong impression that they require a  
 2 75-foot right-of-way. So I'm very confused here, and I  
 3 think FERC needs to -- I think it's going to be a  
 4 sensitive problem for a lot of players here. And I hope  
 5 it isn't because, again, I do support the need -- the  
 6 important need for the 26-inch to be replaced with the new  
 7 36-inch. I'm well aware of the risks associated with the  
 8 stress corrosion and cracking issue evolution, and we  
 9 think it's an important infrastructure.

PM2-45

10 The other point I want to make here is, and  
 11 I want to stress my earlier comment, I'm very concerned  
 12 that landowners are not getting single pointed contacts  
 13 who carry authority. We understand that this project is a  
 14 work in progress, but when I hear that landowners don't  
 15 know who to talk to, we've got a problem that is going to  
 16 get spun out of control here. I don't think FERC deserves  
 17 that. I know our regulators in this state don't deserve  
 18 this and OPS doesn't deserve this. And we sure as hell in  
 19 the citizens' committee don't want to hear about this  
 20 later on.

21 Anyway, that's my formal comments to what  
 22 I've seen here tonight. Again, I appreciate the  
 23 opportunity here, and I think it's important that you have  
 24 these follow-up meetings, and it's good -- that's  
 25 progress, a very good sign.

## Public Meetings

2

PM2-45 See the response to comment PM2-43.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

37

1 MR. SIPE: Thank you. Would anybody else like  
2 to speak tonight?

3 MR. CHEN: My name is Hui Chen. I live at 1638  
4 233rd Place Northeast, Sammamish, which is in the Airfield  
5 Subdivision. So by reading the draft EIS prepared by  
6 Williams, I noticed it stated everywhere that after  
7 construction, the land will be restored to its original  
8 condition and that no land elevation and land contour will  
9 be changed. But by talking to Williams, they request that  
10 for homeowners which have back -- which have a retaining  
11 wall in their backyard, the retaining wall has to be ten  
12 feet away from the pipeline; although just last night, I  
13 noticed that they changed it to five feet. But still  
14 constantly like -- my neighbor and I have a retaining wall  
15 in my backyard outside of the fence which is very close to  
16 the pipeline.

17 So if it's -- if it has to be ten feet or  
18 five feet away from the pipeline, on the one hand we are  
19 going to lose that five feet or ten feet of land. On the  
20 other hand, this -- this conflicts with their promise in  
21 the draft EIS that no land contour will be changed after  
22 construction.

23 So I just wish FERC would work with  
24 Williams so that they can keep their promise that after  
25 construction, the land will be restored to the original

PM2-46

PM2-46 See the response to comment PM2-20.

# Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

38

PM2-46 |  
(cont'd)

1 condition. Thanks.  
2 MR. SIPE: Thank you.  
3 MR. NSHOM: My name is Ngabuen Nshom, and I live

PM2-47

4 at 1632 233rd Place, Sammamish, 98074. I am the neighbor  
5 of [indecipherable] that spoke about the retaining walls  
6 and the returning the land to the original level when  
7 everything is done, and I think that is very important.

8 We are the people that have the retainer  
9 walls. The previous statement [indecipherable] that the  
10 fences be put back in the places where they were before,  
11 and I just wanted to say that there are other structures  
12 above the ground other than fences that are impacted by  
13 this, and that should get on the record. Thank you.  
14 That's all.

15 MR. SIPE: Thank you.  
16 If I could just address some of the  
17 concerns that I heard tonight in brief, and I'm not going  
18 to go into them in detail, but a lot of the concerns -- I  
19 mean, I'm glad you came and addressed these concerns  
20 tonight because now they are on the record.

21 Like temporary work space, engineers  
22 designed these projects in the phase they're in right now,  
23 and they can be changed. They can be -- you know, work  
24 spaces can be moved to one side of the right-of-way or the  
25 other side of the right-of-way. And they may not be able

PM2-47 See the response to comment PM2-20.

18524  
FIELD

39

1 to. That just needs to be looked into.

2                   So if we get these concerns and we find out  
3 that you guys are -- don't want your trees moved or don't  
4 want this removed or would like it somewhere different,  
5 you know, we can work with you on that, but we have to  
6 know your concerns. And we hope that you go and tell your  
7 neighbors the same thing.

8                   If we don't know about it, we're going to  
9 assume that Williams and the land agents and everyone  
10 involved has worked out a deal with you and everything is  
11 good. But I mean, we appreciate you guys coming here  
12 tonight and addressing some of these concerns. And we do  
13 realize that the residential concerns in Snohomish is a  
14 main concern. And what we're dealing with there is a high  
15 level of encroachment on the Williams' pipeline right-of-  
16 way. I mean, that's something we're working with in DC  
17 right now, is encroachment on these pipeline right-of-ways  
18 and how we can deal with it in the future.

19                   But it's something that everyone has to  
20 understand that a lot of the encroachment on the Williams'  
21 right-of-way, they can actually come in and ask you guys  
22 to remove that stuff without any of our -- and FERC can't  
23 say a word or anybody can't say a word because they have  
24 an easement on that property. And a lot of the  
25 encroachment and a lot of the trees and a lot of the

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

40

1 fences and everything that encroaches up on the  
2 right-of-way, it could be stopped, but it's basically a  
3 handshake deal to work with the people that live alongside  
4 the right-of-way to -- you know, to help them out.

5 I don't know how we're going to deal with  
6 that in the future and I don't know how we're going to  
7 deal with it exactly on this on this pipeline. I mean,  
8 I've walked a good bit of the areas where I know that the  
9 main concerns come, and we're going to work with you guys  
10 in trying to maintain your trees and trying to maintain  
11 your fence lines, but there is going to be some  
12 disturbance with some trees removed and some things are  
13 going to happen that no one likes, but that's what happens  
14 when you replace the pipeline project.

15 And if we can get more detailed comments  
16 like this from your neighbors or from whoever, because the  
17 information's out there, and we provide it and hopefully  
18 Williams has provided it for you guys to be able to know  
19 how to contact us and send us your comments and so forth.

20 So some of the comments we're hearing are  
21 disturbing, that Williams isn't contacting you and such,  
22 but we work with this project, and the mailing list on  
23 this project is ridiculous. It's constantly changing. We  
24 sent out like 2,000 EISs. We sent out approximately 2,000  
25 Notices of Availability of the EIS, which basically had

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

41

1 the executive summary attached. And we've tried with the  
2 whole project to try to make this mailing list as clear as  
3 possible, but it's a work in progress. So we apologize  
4 for it, and I'm sure Williams does also, because there's  
5 constantly people moving here and there. And they're  
6 getting list changes as well.

7                   But I appreciate all of the comments, and I  
8 hope I cleared up some of the mud. But again, this is --  
9 a lot of -- a lot of the issues that you guys brought up  
10 tonight are going to be filed with our implementation plan  
11 on how, at that point once they have their certificate to  
12 build, how they propose to build, and then we just review  
13 that and with the comments we have and the issues that we  
14 know are out there, we can change it here and there, and  
15 they will change it since they know that now they will  
16 change that with their implementation plan, if possible.

17                   So I mean, if there isn't an area where  
18 they have an extra large work space with a lot of trees to  
19 be removed, visual impact, I know, is a big thing for  
20 everybody, so hopefully we can try to avoid some of it.  
21 But some things are unavoidable.

22                   I appreciate everyone coming tonight. Is  
23 there any more speakers?

24                   THE PUBLIC: I just had a question. Is there  
25 someplace else we should be giving this info to besides to

## Public Meetings

18524  
FIELD

42

1 you? Is there another avenue of communication that we  
2 ought to be putting our input in regarding the nature of  
3 how they're going to be doing the work?

4 MR. SIPE: You want to be definitely letting us  
5 know about all of your concerns through filing comments,  
6 through coming to these meetings, and through phone calls.  
7 I mean, there's phone calls you can make to FERC. And --  
8 but you definitely want to work with the land agents. The  
9 land agents are basically your point of contact with what  
10 is going to happen on your project. So I mean, if there's  
11 a problem with the land agents, you need to let FERC know  
12 that also.

13 Anything else?

14 THE PUBLIC: (No response.)

15 MR. SIPE: Okay. That's the end of our list.  
16 So without anymore speakers, the formal part of this  
17 meeting will conclude.

18 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
19 Commission, I would like to thank you all for coming  
20 tonight. Let the record show that the Northwest Capacity  
21 Replacement Project comment meeting concluded at a quarter  
22 after eight.

23 (Whereupon, the Northwest Capacity Replacement  
24 Project public meeting was concluded at 8:15 p.m.)

25

## Public Meetings

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

CERTIFICATE

I, Tia B. Reidt, do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 19th day of April, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tia B. Reidt                      Commission Expiration

# Public Meetings



18525  
FIELD

2

1 APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

2 Amy Davis - Natural Resource Group, Inc.

3 Sally Toteff - Washington State Department of  
4 Ecology

5

6 BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to the Washington Rules of  
7 Civil Procedure, the Northwest Capacity Replacement Project  
8 public comment meeting was taken before David A. Hart,  
9 #2007, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, Registered  
10 Professional Reporter, and a Notary Public for the State of  
11 Washington.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

3

1		EXHIBIT INDEX	
2		Northwest Capacity Replacement Project	
3		Public Comment Meeting	
4			
5	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
6		(No exhibits marked for identification.)	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

4

1 Yelm, Washington;

2 Wednesday, April 13, 2005;

3 7:05 p.m.

4 MR. SIPE: I'm glad you guys all turned out for  
5 the meeting tonight.

6 Can everyone hear me? because we don't have a  
7 mike for this.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can hear you.

9 MR. SIPE: Great. Thank you.

10 Good evening. On behalf of the Federal Energy  
11 Regulatory Commission, I'd like to welcome you all here  
12 tonight.

13 This is a public comment meeting on the draft  
14 environmental impact statement for Northwest Pipeline  
15 Corporation's proposed Capacity Replacement Project.

16 Let the record show that the public comment  
17 meeting began at 7:05 on April 13, 2005.

18 My name is Doug Sipe, and I am the FERC project  
19 manager for the project, Amy Davis beside me with Natural  
20 Resource Group. NRG is a consulting firm that assists us in  
21 preparing the draft EIS, which is -- everyone has one of  
22 these or received one of these -- we have extra copies here  
23 tonight. I'd love to not take them back to Washington, if  
24 you guys want some more.

25 The FERC is the lead federal agency for the

## Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

5

1 National Environmental Policy Act, review of the project,  
2 and lead agency for the preparation of the EIS.

3 The Washington State Department of Ecology is the  
4 lead state agency with responsibility for complying with the  
5 State Environmental Policy Act, SEPA, and participate as a  
6 cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS.

7 Sally Toteff from the Department of Ecology is  
8 here tonight, and we'll expand on her role in -- in the  
9 process in a few minutes.

10 The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers also participate  
11 as a cooperating agency in the preparation of the EIS to  
12 satisfy its needs and responsibilities under Section 404 of  
13 the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors  
14 Act.

15 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide  
16 each of you with the opportunity to give us your  
17 environmental comments on the draft EIS. We are here  
18 tonight to learn from you. It would help us the most if  
19 your comments are as specific as possible regarding EIS.

20 We have four speakers on the list, and it's --  
21 this is your opportunity to tell us what you thought about  
22 the EIS and about the project. So you don't have to be on  
23 the list, but we're going to call these four first. But I'd  
24 appreciate -- the more speakers, the more we learn from you.

25 If you wish to speak tonight, please be sure to

## Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

6

1 sign in like you did, or you can just call your name and  
2 we'll get you.

3 If not, you can pick up one of the green handouts  
4 that provide instructions to make it easy for you to send  
5 written comments to us. The speakers' list and the handouts  
6 are both at the sign-in table over here where you came in.

7 We are in the midst of a 45-day comment period on  
8 the draft EIS. A notice of availability of the draft EIS  
9 was issued for this project on March 11, 2005. The comment  
10 period will end on April 25, 2005. It is during this period  
11 that we receive written comments on the draft EIS. All  
12 written comments received during this time period or  
13 verbally tonight will be addressed in the final EIS.

14 We ask that you provide comments as soon as  
15 possible in order to give us time to analyze and research  
16 the issues.

17 I would like to add that FERC strongly encourages  
18 electronic filing of any comments. The instructions for  
19 this can be located on our Web site at [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov) under  
20 the "E-filing" link, or the green handouts have all the  
21 information you need to do that.

22 If you received a copy of the draft EIS, you will  
23 automatically receive a copy of the final EIS. If you did  
24 not get a copy of the draft and would like to get a copy of  
25 the final, please sign the attendance list at the back of

## Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

7

1 the room and provide your name and address, and we'll make  
2 sure you get a copy of the EIS.

3 During our review of the project, we assembled  
4 information from a variety of sources, including Northwest;  
5 you the public; other state, local, and federal agencies;  
6 and our own independent analysis of fieldwork.

7 We analyzed this information and prepared the  
8 draft EIS that was distributed for public -- to the public  
9 for comment.

10 Once we have addressed the public comments on the  
11 draft EIS and completed the final EIS and mailed it out, we  
12 forward that on to our commissioners.

13 The commissioners at FERC will use the final EIS  
14 as one of the tools to determine whether to approve or deny  
15 a certificate, which would be FERC's authorization for the  
16 project.

17 The Department of Ecology and the U.S. Army Corps  
18 of Engineers will use the final EIS in support of their  
19 permitting efforts.

20 Sally will now say a few words about the  
21 Department of Ecology's role in the process.

22 Sally?

23 MS. TOTEFF: Good evening. My name is  
24 Sally Toteff. I represent the Washington Department of  
25 Ecology. Thank you for being here tonight.

## Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

8

1           The Department of Ecology will be involved in  
2           issuing a lot of the different environmental permits related  
3           to this type of a project.

4           And in relation to tonight's meeting, having to  
5           do with the environmental impact statement, the Department  
6           of Ecology is the lead agency for the State Environmental  
7           Policy Act.

8           So what we'll be doing is looking to see if the  
9           final environmental impact statement that's produced for  
10          this project meets the state's law.

11          The Department of Ecology began last fall  
12          providing comments, feedback, and input to different  
13          technical documents, environmental documents that would lead  
14          to the preparation of this environmental impact statement  
15          that you have -- that you have before you tonight.

16          We're here tonight to listen to your comments on  
17          the environmental impact statement, what other -- whatever  
18          comments you might share on other aspects of the project.

19          And once the comments are all in and considered  
20          by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, adopted into a  
21          final environmental impact statement, that document will  
22          come to the Department of Ecology for review.

23          If under our review we find that it meets the  
24          State Environmental Policy Act, we can use that document as  
25          the document that the state would adopt. And it's only

## Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

9

1 after the state would make that action of adoption that  
2 environmental permits could begin to be issued.

3 So again, thank you for being here tonight, and  
4 we look forward to your comments.

5 MR. SIPE: Thank you, Sally.

6 I'd like to point out to the audience that  
7 Northwest is here, and they will be present now and after  
8 the meeting, so if you have specific questions for the  
9 company or Department of Ecology or FERC, you can see us  
10 after the meeting.

11 We'll now begin the important part of the meeting  
12 with your comments. When your name is called, please stand  
13 up and state your name for the record.

14 Your comments will be transcribed by a court  
15 reporter to ensure that we get an accurate record of your  
16 comments.

17 A transcript of this meeting will be placed in  
18 the public record at FERC so everyone has access to this  
19 information collected here tonight.

20 Amy, if you would read the first speaker.

21 Yeah. Please stand up, because he has to be able  
22 to hear your comments and take them down for the record.

23 MS. DAVIS: Our first speaker is Bill Van Hoesen.

24 MR. VAN HOESEN: My name is Bill Van Hoesen. I  
25 am the NEPA program manager for Fort Lewis.

## Public Meetings

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

10

1                   We have about five pages of comments that we will  
2 be submitting, and we will, of course, meet the deadline for  
3 those comments.

4                   We have nothing of controversy in our comments,  
5 so I'm -- I don't feel that it's appropriate for Fort Lewis  
6 to go down each and every comment here tonight.

PM3-1

7                   All I want to do is say for the record that we  
8 will be submitting comments on this proposal by the  
9 deadline.

10                   This is the second pipeline project that has  
11 crossed Fort Lewis in about the last, oh, five to ten years,  
12 so we're familiar with the procedures and the process.

13                   We have been interacting with the preparers of  
14 the document since the inception of this proposal, and we  
15 have been satisfied that our -- most of our needs have been  
16 met. And we remain neutral on this project.

17                   Thank you.

18                   MR. SIPE: I appreciate your comments. Thanks.

19                   MS. DAVIS: Bob Cumlander.

20                   MR. CUMLANDER: My name is Bob Cumlander, and I  
21 live in Spanaway, Washington, 22720 32nd Avenue East,  
22 Spanaway, 98387.

PM3-2

23                   And I've been checking into this, and we -- like  
24 I said last time I was here at this hearing, that we would  
25 like to see that you stay within your own 75-foot

PM3-1      Comment noted. See the responses to comments FA2-1 through FA2-33.

PM3-2      See the response to comment PM2-3.

18525  
FIELD

11

PM3-2  
(cont'd)

1 right-of-way that you have now.  
 2 You can -- I pulled up some records, and up  
 3 north, you're going to stay in a 40-foot section, 60-foot  
 4 section, and 75-foot section. And instead of having  
 5 people's property that have not been affected by the  
 6 pipeline before, leave them alone.  
 7 And I wonder what I can do -- what I -- from what  
 8 I can guess at, the reason you want the twenty -- the extra  
 9 temporary work stay is -- is you can work a little bit  
 10 faster. Well, we don't need to work a little bit faster.  
 11 We're working by a hot line.

PM3-3

12 And another thing is, this here loops -- all they  
 13 are is storage tanks. They -- it's all one line. When you  
 14 get done, you've got one line going through the state of  
 15 Washington.  
 16 With those four loops that you're proposing to  
 17 put in, it ends up being storage tanks. Well, why build  
 18 storage tanks in a populated area? Why don't we take and  
 19 find an unpopulated area and build storage tanks.

20 MS. BROWN: Good point.

PM3-4

21 MR. CUMLANDER: And not only that, but you've  
 22 got -- you're told to -- in 2006 to abandon the 26-inch  
 23 line. It says the entire line. But in that book right  
 24 there, you're not going to abandon the entire line. They're  
 25 going to use part of that 26-inch line. It says so right in

## Public Meetings

3

PM3-3

A pipeline loop is not equivalent to a storage tank. A pipeline loop is a pipeline section that is installed parallel to an existing pipeline segment or system. The pipeline loop is connected to the existing pipeline system at both the beginning and ending of the loop. These connections allow gas to flow into the beginning of the loop, down the pipeline loop, and out of the end of the loop into the existing adjacent pipeline. Gas also flows along the existing adjacent pipeline at the same time. The addition of a pipeline loop provides a parallel path for gas to flow along, essentially increasing the cross-sectional area.

In all pipeline systems, as gas flows down the pipeline, it loses pressure due to friction along the pipeline wall. The increased cross-sectional area in the looped sections results in a decreased pressure drop along that section when compared to an unlooped section. For the Capacity Replacement Project, this reduction in pressure drop through the looped sections, coupled with the proposed compression changes, would allow the pipeline system to maintain required gas deliveries after abandonment of the 26-inch-diameter pipeline.

Pipeline loop placement is dependent on gas flow and pressure requirements as well as delivery patterns. Pipeline loops must be located in areas between specific compressor stations to meet these requirements. Loops are also located as required to ensure that specific delivery points along the system receive enough gas to meet contractual obligations. Because the purpose of a pipeline loop is to increase the flow of gas through an existing system, the loop must be located adjacent to the existing system.

PM3-4

See the response to comment PM1-7. Alternatives to the proposed project are described in section 3.0.

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

12

PM3-4  
(cont'd)

1 black and white.  
2 Now, the government says that you have to do  
3 this. The government says you have to abandon the 26- --  
4 the entire 26-inch line.

5 Well, where do we get off saying we're going to  
6 use part of the 26-inch line? It's supposed to be  
7 abandoned. It's not supposed to be used.

8 And they say, "Well, we're going to keep the  
9 26-inch line, leave it there for -- maybe in the future,  
10 we'll be able to go in and weld those spots."

11 What do you -- it's already been abandoned,  
12 told -- you have to replace it, get rid of it, so let's dig  
13 up the old and put in the new. If we're stuck with those  
14 loops, dig up the old and put in the new.

PM3-5

15 But personally, being just it's a storage tank,  
16 find a deserted area and store it. We've -- we've already  
17 had eruptions here in this state. Took some lives. So  
18 we're going through all this populated area. They can find  
19 some other place for storage.

20 I guess it's necessary to have lines running  
21 through the state to service the other states, but not for  
22 storage. You can find a deserted spot for storage.

23 And I have neighbors that feel the same way. And  
24 we have tried to get our representatives in this -- in  
25 Washington to look into this further with us.

PM3-5 See the response to comment PM3-3.

18525  
FIELD

13

PM3-5  
(cont'd)

1                   But accidents do happen. But let's have an  
2 accident off in Timbuktu, where there's no population.  
3                   I realize that you have to have lines going  
4 through to service to get it to -- to Point A and Point B.  
5 But you don't have to store it in between where there's  
6 population. And that's what it amounts to. Those loops are  
7 nothing but storage tanks.

PM3-6

8                   And we would like -- and why deface the value of  
9 people's property when you don't need to? They've already  
10 put two lines in 75 feet. Let them put -- stay within their  
11 75 feet to do whatever work they have to do.

12                   And when they come around and appraise property,  
13 they come around and they say, "Well, in our area, the  
14 appraised area, they have 80" -- at the same price. Well,  
15 it's not the same price because some people don't have that  
16 pipeline going through their property.

17                   And you take -- any realtor will tell you, "Well,  
18 you've got a piece of pipeline going through your property  
19 with so many restrictions on it. It's not worth as much as  
20 the piece that don't."

PM3-7

21                   Well, that's the way I feel about it and the way  
22 a lot of my neighbors feel about it. Our state should find  
23 a deserted spot and require the storage tanks to be zipped  
24 in an unpopulated area. And that's what these things are,  
25 nothing but a storage tank.

## Public Meetings

3

PM3-6    See the response to comment PM2-3. General impacts on property values associated with the Capacity Replacement Project are discussed in section 4.9.5.

PM3-7    See the response to comment PM3-3.

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

14

1 Thank you.

2 MR. SIPE: I appreciate it. Thank you.

3 MS. DAVIS: The next speaker, B. Brown.

4 MS. BROWN: Good evening. My name is Barbara

5 Brown.

PM3-8

6 For the record, the correct title to the property  
7 which is filed into your case is "Reanna Family Trust," not  
8 "Barbara Joyce Brown, et al." "Et al." means another  
9 person.

10 So here's my complaint, that my filing has been  
11 given improper party. That needs to be corrected.

12 I'd like to respond for a minute, too, to the  
13 last gentleman's comments.

14 In the dictionary, the word "replacement" does  
15 not mean to leave it in place in case they want to use it  
16 again. "Replacement" means permanent, forever, gone, zippo.

PM3-9

17 And the whole term "Capacity Replacement  
18 Project" -- actually, it's a little bit of a misnomer  
19 because what they're replacing is the capacity, not the  
20 pipeline. So you're being deceived.

21 Also, what is actually happening -- you're right.  
22 We're getting storage tanks to live with, which I feel is  
23 very, very evil.

24 Also, what they're actually doing is making the  
25 pipeline two-way instead of the gas flowing only from the

PM3-8 The environmental mailing list and the distribution list in Appendix A have been corrected.

PM3-9 Several sections of the EIS clearly state that the purpose of the proposed action is to replace the majority of the delivery capacity of Northwest's existing 268-mile-long, 26-inch-diameter pipeline between Sumas and Washougal, Washington in response to an amended Corrective Action Order (CAO) issued by the DOT.

# Public Meetings

6-82

18525  
FIELD

15

PM3-9  
(cont'd)

1 north to the south. What the rearrangement will do is,  
2 whenever the demand for -- for gas products are such that  
3 it's lower, they can get less money from it going in one  
4 direction. They're going to turn it around and ship it in  
5 the other direction. So that's actually what's happening.  
6 It is not a -- it's not a replacement of anything. It's  
7 totally deceitful to be using that terminology. So I just  
8 wanted to add to what you were saying.

9 Also, I have a number. This is a public meeting,  
10 and as --

11 Most people here are property owners? Yes? No?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Yes.

13 MS. BROWN: So are property owners the only  
14 public? Question.

15 MR. SIPE: No.

16 MS. BROWN: Okay. So when did the public notice  
17 go out?

18 MR. SIPE: This is a public comment meeting on  
19 the draft environmental impact statement.

PM3-10

20 MS. BROWN: When did the public notice go out?  
21 It went out last night in the Olympia newspaper in the week  
22 of spring break. There are lots of public that want to be  
23 here. 24-hour notice is not notice. I find it in bad  
24 faith, and I'd like to recommend another meeting, with  
25 proper notice to the public be made in the appropriate

PM3-10 Section 1.3 describes in detail the opportunities for public participation during the environmental review process for the Capacity Replacement Project both in the form of public meetings and opportunities to submit written comments.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

16

PM3-10  
(cont'd)

1 manner -- in other words, in the local newspapers -- and  
2 appropriate time for people to organize their lives, their  
3 homes, their work, and their children.

4           So I would like -- this is a protest. I would  
5 like another meeting scheduled so the rest of our community  
6 can participate in what is definitely a community project.

7           So I'd like feedback on that, please, active  
8 listening.

9           MR. SIPE: I'm not going to answer questions  
10 tonight --

11           MS. BROWN: So you're not going to --

12           MR. SIPE: -- regarding -- regarding that.

13           I mean, the public -- this EIS was sent out to  
14 2,000 people --

15           MS. BROWN: Homeowners.

16           MR. SIPE: -- 2,000 people adjacent to the  
17 pipeline, and notice of availability was sent out to another  
18 2,000 people, and it had the meeting locations and times in  
19 them.

20           MS. BROWN: In what?

21           MR. SIPE: Ma'am, I'm not going to argue about  
22 it.

23           MS. BROWN: I'm asking you a question. I'm not  
24 arguing.

25           MR. SIPE: Can I -- can I say if there's going to

683

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

17

1 be another public meeting? No, I cannot.

2 MS. BROWN: Can you recommend it?

3 MR. SIPE: I can recommend it but --

4 MS. BROWN: Thank you. This needs to be fair.

PM3-11 5 This pipeline project affects the whole community, not just  
6 us, that are going to be living next to these storage tanks  
7 and the new 36-inch line.

8 So I have some other things to say to you too.

9 I've been doing some research, and while this is just --

PM3-12 10 By the way, was a copy of that to go to the  
11 library? to the public?

12 MR. SIPE: Copies --

13 MS. DAVIS: Yes. They must have sent most to the  
14 library.

15 MS. BROWN: I didn't see it in the Yelm library.

16 There is a copy of the 25-pound part -- booklets that are  
17 put in there by Williams that says things are going to the  
18 library, but I did not see that in the library.

19 MS. DAVIS: It's also on the Department of  
20 Ecology's Web site.

21 MS. BROWN: Would that be public notice?

22 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, specific questions like this,  
23 if you could ask after the meeting, I would --

24 MS. BROWN: No. I want the people to hear. I  
25 want -- I want these people to hear what I have to say.

PM3-11 See the responses to comments PM3-3 and PM3-10.

PM3-12 The Timberland Community Library in Yelm is on the environmental mailing list and was sent a copy of the draft EIS. The library was also sent a copy of the final EIS (see Appendix A).

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

18

1 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, this is a -- this is a public  
2 comment meeting on the EIS.

3 MS. BROWN: That's -- that's what I'm doing. I'm  
4 asking about the EIS book for the public.

5 MR. SIPE: This is a public comment meeting.

6 MS. BROWN: Yes. That's what I'm doing. I'm  
7 commenting. You may not care for my comments, but some  
8 people may.

PM3-13

9 I have something else to say to you too.  
10 Williams is claiming right under eminent domain for this,  
11 what they call "capacity replacement," which isn't really.  
12 And they're claiming right -- first, eminent domain is  
13 granted by the constitution. It's granted by the federal  
14 constitution, and it's granted by the state constitution.

15 Williams are claiming right of eminent domain  
16 under railroads. I don't have the number of the statute,  
17 the RCW, wherein they're claiming eminent domain. And it  
18 does state in that RCW that pipelines do have a right to  
19 claim eminent domain under railroads.

20 However -- and I have a copy of our constitution.  
21 This is a state constitution that I picked up. I'd like to  
22 file this in.

23 There -- our constitution and rights under the  
24 constitution can be changed only by constitutional  
25 convention. There has never been a constitutional

PM3-13 Northwest would make every effort to negotiate in good faith with affected landowners, but if an easement cannot be negotiated with a landowner and the project has been certificated by the FERC, Northwest may use the right of eminent domain as granted to it under section 7(h) of the NGA. The use of eminent domain as it relates to this project is discussed in section 4.8.2. The legality of eminent domain is beyond the scope of this EIS.

PM3-13  
(cont'd)

18525  
FIELD

19

1 convention to give pipelines our rights to eminent domain --  
2 our pipelines a right to eminent domain under railroads.  
3 Therefore, their claim is unconstitutional.

4 So my question is whether all of this is relevant  
5 or not, because if they have no constitutional right to  
6 eminent domain, then we're spending an awful lot of money on  
7 you guys.

8 So this is something that we need to consider.  
9 Do we have a constitution or don't we?

10 So I have one more comment as soon as I think of  
11 it.

12 Oh, yeah. The constitution grants eminent  
13 domain. How many of you had Williams Telecommunications  
14 come through? None of you?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We did.

16 MS. BROWN: Claiming right under eminent domain  
17 of telephone and telegraph? Telephone and telegraph is not  
18 fiber optics. The constitution must be strictly construed.  
19 There is no constitutional right for -- for fiber optics to  
20 claim eminent domain. Their claim to eminent domain is  
21 unconstitutional. The entire taking was unconstitutional.  
22 It extended even then beyond the bounds of eminent domain.

23 Number one, Williams is asking for workspace.  
24 Under eminent domain, you are not required to give  
25 workspace. You are only required to give the minimum of

## Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

20

PM3-13  
(cont'd)

1 what is absolutely necessary, and it must be stated with  
2 specificity. The law must be strictly construed.  
3 Also, their claim of eminent domain, where they  
4 took fee simple, the constitution does not provide for fee  
5 simple. They are claiming eminent domain with the right  
6 easement. The constitution does not provide for easement.  
7 The constitution must be strictly construed. They have a  
8 right of a way, and that is all. They have no claim to your  
9 property whatsoever.  
10 So that entire -- how many of you went to court?  
11 How many of you paid some lawyer? None of you? Some of  
12 you. Well, your lawyer's first oath is to uphold the  
13 constitution. The lawyer could have filed into court a  
14 short one-paragraph document and -- under court rules, it's  
15 called 12(b), "Fails to state a claim under which relief can  
16 be granted, this claim is unconstitutional." What's that?  
17 Two sentences -- is all you should have paid a lawyer for.  
18 And if your lawyer didn't file in the claim for  
19 the constitution, then you can sue him for being -- for not  
20 upholding his oath to the constitution, because that is his  
21 first oath. And you can get your money back.  
22 And if you signed your document because you were  
23 told by Williams that they had eminent domain, then your  
24 signature was obtained by fraud, and you have a right to  
25 keep the money that they paid you, and you've got a right to

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

21

PM3-13  
(cont'd)

1 sue them, because the whole telecommunications taking is  
2 fraudulent. There is no constitution that upholds it.  
3 So the question is, do we have a constitution or  
4 don't we? When our constitution was formed, one of the  
5 biggest arguments going on and one of the biggest delays  
6 when they were preparing our constitution was the fight over  
7 railroads. And you know the phrase, "You've been  
8 railroaded"? That's kind of why.  
9 So Williams claiming eminent domain -- excuse  
10 me -- under railroads is unconstitutional. And you've got a  
11 right to defend yourself on constitutional grounds.  
12 Workspace. There is nothing -- if you go to the  
13 law library, main floor, the law librarians are lovely.  
14 They'll help you. Go down to Nichols, N-i-c-h-o-l-s, on  
15 eminent domain. He's got shelves of volumes. Excuse me.  
16 There is no workspace for eminent domain. Absolutely none.  
17 You're not obliged to give it.  
18 MR. BRUGLIA: Would that mean that they're  
19 harassing us voluntarily to -- to --  
20 MR. SIPE: Wait a second.  
21 MS. BROWN: Well, they're --  
22 MR. SIPE: This meeting is being recorded by a  
23 court reporter, so we can't have the interaction back and  
24 forth.  
25 MS. BROWN: Point of information. He can give

688

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

22

PM3-13  
(cont'd)

1 point of information at this meeting.  
2 Stand, give your name, and give point of  
3 information.  
4 MR. BRUGLIA: My name is William Bruglia. I live  
5 in Spanaway.  
6 My question was, is this voluntary if they don't  
7 have a right to eminent domain? Then --  
8 MR. SIPE: Wait. If I can clear this up, eminent  
9 domain -- Williams has eminent domain under FERC. This is a  
10 federal action. This is a federal action project. When  
11 they have a federal action, they're granted eminent domain  
12 through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.  
13 MS. BROWN: So that would be federal?  
14 MR. SIPE: It is federal. It's a federal act.  
15 MS. BROWN: They're claiming eminent domain under  
16 state. They're claiming it under RCW 88-something.  
17 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, what you're talking about is  
18 telecommunications.  
19 MS. BROWN: I'm talking about pipelines.  
20 MR. SIPE: Okay. I just stated what -- what the  
21 facts are, so if we could go off this subject --  
22 MS. BROWN: No. I want to stay on the subject  
23 until people are educated about what's really happening in  
24 their town.  
25 You need to be -- you need to know what's

68-9

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

23

PM3-13  
(cont'd)

1       happening. Yes, FERC is federal. And the -- and the  
2       federal constitution does state that it cannot deny the  
3       right of eminent domain. And I haven't looked into the  
4       specific conditions under which a company can claim eminent  
5       domain federally.

6                But Williams are claiming eminent domain under  
7       the RCWs, the state. So that has to be cleared up. And we  
8       have a representative here of our elected government, so we  
9       have somebody that we can talk to about getting a lot of  
10      this cleared up.

11               Thank you for listening. There are a lot of  
12      things that are not up front, that are being done behind our  
13      backs, that are unclear, and we have a right to know what is  
14      really happening. And we have a right to demand that our  
15      constitution be upheld.

16               Thank you.

17               MR. SIPE: If I could maybe clear a couple things  
18      up before the next commenter.

19               This project is -- is the Capacity Replacement  
20      Project -- and clear up some of your concerns. They have  
21      two -- 268-mile pipelines, from top to bottom of the state,  
22      268 miles.

23               What this project is doing is taking -- the  
24      30-inch line is going to remain in service. The 26-inch  
25      line is going to be abandoned. Now, there's different --

18525  
FIELD

24

1 you know, different definitions for "abandonment." They can  
2 abandon in place or they ask abandon by removal.

3 A lot of agencies would like abandonment in place  
4 because it's less harm on the environment. In some  
5 situations, they are going to remove the abandonment. You  
6 know, certain situations on the right-of-way, they are going  
7 to take out the 26-inch pipe. So it's different up and down  
8 the right-of-way.

9 A loop -- what they're doing with this looping  
10 is -- is, when they remove the 26-inch to regain that  
11 capacity for the project as a whole, instead of building 268  
12 miles of pipe, they're building 79-point-whatever, 80 miles  
13 of pipe. So --

16-9  
PM3-14 14 MR. CUMLANDER: Storage tanks. Storage tanks is  
15 what they're building.

16 MR. SIPE: This is a pipeline project.

17 MR. CUMLANDER: I know.

18 MR. SIPE: If you could just wait a second, sir.

19 So that a loop -- the placement of the loop is  
20 generally placed below a compressor station. If they -- if  
21 they replace -- if they place the loop further away from the  
22 compressor station, what that causes is a longer length of  
23 pipeline that needs to be built.

24 So generally, when they loop a pipeline, they  
25 will stick it close to the compressor station so that less

PM3-14 Northwest proposes to maintain as much of the existing 26-inch-diameter pipeline in place as possible for future use. The 26-inch-diameter pipeline would be filled with nitrogen after it is taken out of service, which would inhibit internal corrosion. Northwest would maintain cathodic protection on the 26-inch-diameter pipeline after it is taken out of service so that it could be eventually put back in service for future gas deliveries if approved by the DOT and other agencies. Maintaining cathodic protection on the pipeline would ensure that the pipeline would not rust and fail; therefore, ground subsidence or groundwater would not be able to penetrate into the pipeline. Because the 26-inch-diameter pipeline is collocated with the active pipeline(s) along Northwest's system, it would be monitored for potential problems at the same time as the in-service pipeline(s). Alternatives to the proposed project are described in section 3.0. See also the responses to comments PM2-3 and PM3-3.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

25

PM3-14  
(cont'd)

1 pipe needs to be built, the less money spent, and the less  
2 it costs the taxpayer -- or it costs -- the fees, the people  
3 who are really using the gas.

4 MR. CUMLANDER: Well, in your proposal --

5 MR. SIPE: Just one second, sir. I can't go back  
6 and forth with the court reporter.

7 So what this project is doing, instead  
8 of building -- what they could do, under DF -- PSIA is the  
9 Pipeline Safety Improvement Act -- have them test this line,  
10 and they need to replace, repair as needed. They could  
11 replace the whole 268-mile line if need be.

12 But what they're doing is, instead of doing that,  
13 they're abandoning it in place, abandoning it by removal, in  
14 certain situations, and looping the 30-inch line.

15 So as a whole, as an -- impact to residential  
16 areas, impact to the environment is a lot less than what it  
17 could be. So this is -- is a good thing.

18 MS. BROWN: And it's a lot more than it could be.

19 MR. SIPE: This is a replacement project.  
20 There's no expansion here. And they're required, under the  
21 Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2002, to do so, which I  
22 think is up in three years.

23 MR. CUMLANDER: But there you go again. They can  
24 go out in a deserted spot and do the same thing. They can  
25 put a compressor in a deserted area. Those loops are

6-92

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

26

PM3-14  
(cont'd)

1 nothing but storage tanks. And they don't need to be put in  
2 a populated area. They can go somewhere where it's  
3 unpopulated and put compressors out there, close to those  
4 loops or whatever storage tanks they build.

5 They don't need -- the storage tanks don't  
6 need -- need to be built in a populated area. All we've got  
7 is -- if you've got one line going through a populated area,  
8 you've only got one problem. But now if you've got 20 miles  
9 of a loop, you've got two problems.

10 And if they leave the pipe -- the 26-inch in --  
11 in these -- on these -- acreage, then when it rusts out,  
12 then you've got a horse that's going to break a leg or  
13 something. Sooner or later that ground is going to cave in.  
14 To do it right -- it's been found at fault, dig it up, get  
15 it out of there, scrap it, and reuse it.

16 MS. BROWN: Could you respond to him, please?

17 MR. SIPE: I can't respond to the -- to concerns  
18 of that nature, because this pipeline has to be built  
19 somewhere.

20 MR. CUMLANDER: I'm not saying it can't be built.

21 MR. SIPE: The pipe --

22 Sir, just wait a second. Just let me --

23 The pipeline has to be built somewhere, and it  
24 can't be moved every time a residential area encroaches on  
25 the pipe- -- encroachment is a major concern with pipeline

6-93

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

27

PM3-14  
(cont'd)

1 projects.

2 And every time -- up north, the Sno- -- the  
3 Snohomish loop is encroached on terribly bad. I mean, they  
4 have literally no space to build the pipeline. But -- they  
5 used to have a lot of space.

6 But encroachment -- every time encroachment  
7 happens on a pipeline, they can't just up and move the  
8 project. It would be astronomical in cost.

9 So what we have to do is, we have to work with  
10 this project. And there is going to be impact. We're just  
11 trying to mini- -- mitigate the impact.

12 MS. BROWN: All right. Could you respond  
13 specifically to his claim of storage tanks?

14 MR. SIPE: I explained the project. It's just --  
15 it's just misunderstood. This -- these are not storage  
16 tanks. These are pipelines. They are designed to move gas.

17 MR. CUMLANDER: They're designed to move gas, but  
18 you can only move so much in a 30-inch line. These are  
19 36-inch lines. What --

20 MR. SIPE: If I -- if I can explain this after  
21 the public forum is complete, I would appreciate that,  
22 because this -- this is not what this meeting is meant for.

23 MR. CUMLANDER: And getting back to domain,  
24 you're working in 40-, 60-, and 75-foot areas up there  
25 north. You're going to stay within them boundaries. If you

6-94

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

28

PM3-14  
(cont'd)

1 can stay within them boundaries up there for that mileage,  
2 you could stay within boundaries --

3 MR. SIPE: Sir, we appreciate that com- -- we  
4 appreciate that comment, and we will look at staying within  
5 the 75 feet.

6 MR. CUMLANDER: Well, I still want to go on the  
7 record.

8 MR. SIPE: That's -- that's great. That's what  
9 these -- that's what these meetings are for.

10 MR. CUMLANDER: These -- it's a storage tank, and  
11 they can go in an unpopulated area. You've got the chance  
12 now to --

13 MS. BROWN: Let's have a show of hands. Who  
14 thinks that the storage tanks should go in --

15 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, this is my meeting.

16 MS. BROWN: -- an unpopulated area?

17 MR. SIPE: Ma'am -- ma'am, excuse me. This is my  
18 meeting, and I'm not going to allow you to run it. So if  
19 you could please let me run it.

20 MS. BROWN: I'm just interjecting to get a fair  
21 hearing.

22 MR. SIPE: Every time you interject, you must  
23 stand up and state your name, please.

24 Could you call the next speaker.

25 MS. DAVIS: William -- Bruglia?

6-95

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

29

1 MR. BRUGLIA: Yes.  
2 My name is William Bruglia. I live in Spanaway,  
3 off of 32nd Avenue.  
4 I have a lot of questions. I'm not -- at this  
5 time have Williams' rail on my property, as far as easement  
6 goes. I'm affected by requests for temporary workspace.  
7 And not having any experience with Williams, I  
8 don't have -- I'm a little -- not up to speed, I should say.  
9 And I do have some questions for you.  
10 Getting back to what you were saying, that there  
11 would be less harm to the environment if you are -- go  
12 forward with this project versus taking out the old pipe and  
13 replacing it within -- with -- in that area -- have you done  
14 a study on that to determine whether there's -- this would  
15 be a less environmental impact than digging out the old  
16 and -- and putting in the new one in its place?  
17 MR. SIPE: There's been plenty of studies done.  
18 MR. BRUGLIA: So what you're saying to us is that  
19 this -- environmentally, this is the best way to go?  
20 MR. SIPE: The best way to go by --  
21 MR. BRUGLIA: Yes. Your -- the comment was --  
22 MR. SIPE: In general, it is the best way to go.  
23 MR. BRUGLIA: In general. Okay.  
24 MR. SIPE: In general --  
25 MR. BRUGLIA: As -- as a whole for, like, the

PM3-15

PM3-15 See the response to comment PM1-7. The use of temporary extra workspace during construction would not permanently encumber the property. Temporary extra workspace would be allowed to revert to prior uses following construction with no restrictions and would not become part of the permanent easement. See also the response to comment PM2-3.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

30

PM3-15  
(cont'd)

1 whole state project?  
2 MR. SIPE: As in the whole project, in general,  
3 it's better to leave a pipe in the ground than pull it out.  
4 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay. So in affecting me, in  
5 general, this is better off to -- to involve other  
6 homeowners that haven't been affected?  
7 As a -- as a homeowner, it's important to me that  
8 my property stays unencumbered as much as possible; okay?  
9 So what I hear you saying is, as a whole, that you've done a  
10 study that says that -- that the best thing for you to do is  
11 involve more landowners and ask for just temporary  
12 workspace?  
13 MR. SIPE: I can explain to you that if they  
14 removed the 26-inch pipe by abandonment by removal, it will  
15 require more space than they're asking for now, because it  
16 requires more equipment, and this requires more work.  
17 MR. BRUGLIA: So the question that I was asking  
18 this young lady was -- is, your temporary workspace, which  
19 I'm affected by, is this a voluntary asking of temporary  
20 workspace? Are you asking me to volunteer my workspace, or  
21 are you saying that you need my workspace?  
22 MR. SIPE: If they -- if the land agents came to  
23 you and asked you for workspace, they're saying that they  
24 need that workspace in order to do the project.  
25 MR. BRUGLIA: Well, I've had that proposal

6-97

18525  
FIELD

31

PM3-15  
(cont'd)

1 mailed -- or handed to me. So I can assume that you -- that  
2 you need my temporary workspace?

3 MR. SIPE: Correct.

4 MR. CUMLANDER: He needs your space and not up  
5 north.

6 MR. BRUGLIA: Why can't -- my point exactly.  
7 What is the criteria why you need my workspace when you're  
8 able to work this project up north? What's the dynamics of  
9 that? Why is up north you're able to stay within your 75  
10 feet, 40 feet in some places, and down here in Fort Lewis,  
11 you're requiring an additional 20 feet of workspace?

12 MR. SIPE: They're -- the right-of-ways for the  
13 whole project -- there's temporary extra workspaces all  
14 over -- over the entire project.

15 Just because they remain within their 60-foot  
16 right-of-way or 75-foot right-of-way or 150-foot  
17 right-of-way, they may still require temporary extra  
18 workspace. Temporary extra workspace is what it is. It's  
19 temporary extra workspace needed to complete the  
20 construction.

21 MR. BRUGLIA: So you need temporary workspace up  
22 and down the whole line?

23 MR. SIPE: Yes.

24 MR. BRUGLIA: My question is, you're staying  
25 within 40 feet and 60 feet and -- and 75 feet in some areas.

# Public Meetings

6-9-9

18525  
FIELD

32

PM3-15  
(cont'd)

1                   What changes at my house? What's the dynamics  
2 that changes the need for that?  
3                   MR. SIPE: I don't know the specifics of your  
4 house, but usually temporary extra workspaces are -- are  
5 used for areas where they may have to go across the stream  
6 or they may have to narrow down in one area to avoid  
7 something and they need to expand out in another.  
8 There's multiple reasons why temporary extra workspace is --  
9                   MS. BROWN: Could it be because they put  
10 the fiber optics --  
11                   MR. SIPE: And you guys can talk to Northwest  
12 specifically about these concerns after the meeting is  
13 complete.  
14                   MR. BRUGLIA: Okay. So -- we've got -- okay.

PM3-16

15                   Another question I have, when I read your book --  
16 and understanding that Williams' Northwest Pipeline strives  
17 to be a good neighbor -- now, I've had to -- dealt with  
18 Williams guys like some of my neighbors have, in dealing  
19 with optic fiber, with WilTel.  
20                   MR. SIPE: I explained that in the last meeting.  
21                   MR. BRUGLIA: Well, actually, you didn't. So  
22 obviously, I'm still unclear about it. So maybe you  
23 can make the point that -- what do you mean?  
24                   MR. SIPE: Telecommunications was a subset of  
25 Williams. It was owned by Williams as the company, not

PM3-16

WilTel is a separate and distinct company from Northwest and its parent company, The Williams Companies. WilTel owns and operates its own facilities and has a separate easement with landowners along the Fort Lewis Loop. WilTel is not under the jurisdiction of the FERC. Northwest's proposed temporary extra workspace for the Capacity Replacement Project is needed for equipment, materials, spoil storage, and terrain features such as water and road crossings, steep slopes, and encroachments on the right-of-way. The location of the fiber optic cable does not affect the layout of the temporary extra workspace.

Section 2.5 discusses the Landowner Complaint Resolution Procedure that would be followed for the Capacity Replacement Project. This procedure includes a project "hotline" to provide landowners with a way to contact Northwest to ask questions about the project. Landowners not satisfied with Northwest's response would be provided with the telephone number of the FERC's Enforcement Hotline. Section 2.5 has been revised to describe the third-party compliance monitoring program that would be implemented by the FERC during construction of the project. Under this program, full-time third-party compliance monitors would be present on the construction spreads to monitor and document compliance with project mitigation measures and requirements. The FERC staff would also conduct periodic inspections of the project. The FERC staff and third-party compliance monitors would be available to answer questions from individual landowners and assist with resolution of issues.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

33

PM3-16  
(cont'd)

1 Northwest Pipeline Corporation.  
2 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay.  
3 MR. SIPE: They were not federally regulated. I  
4 don't even know how they were regulated. But they were  
5 using the right-of-way to build the telecommunications line.  
6 I have no answers for you.  
7 MS. BROWN: I can tell you how they did it.  
8 Point of information.  
9 MR. SIPE: I have no answers for you about the  
10 telecommunications line, because we didn't regulate that.  
11 This pipeline is regulated by us, so ...  
12 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay. Okay. I understand that.  
13 MR. SIPE: I'm sorry. I'm sorry you guys had  
14 problems with that. And that's not only here. It's the  
15 complete right-of-way. And Williams themselves as a company  
16 have had problems with that. And it's no longer part of  
17 Williams.  
18 MR. BRUGLIA: Well, I --  
19 MR. SIPE: I'm just done explaining to you.  
20 MS. BROWN: Point of information.  
21 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay. Explain -- my concern is --  
22 I'm undereducated as far as -- I haven't dealt with you  
23 folks, with Williams people; okay? And I have -- one of my  
24 good neighbors let -- shared some information that after  
25 work was done on his property, that he had a lien filed on

6-100

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

34

PM3-16  
(cont'd)

1 his property, from a subcontractor; okay? I have the lien  
2 right here. It's public record, if you'd like to look at  
3 it.

4 My question is -- is, what protects us homeowners  
5 from having something like this occur to us where we have  
6 the expense of -- of clearing up the books of -- of a major  
7 corporation?

8 MR. SIPE: I can't answer that one, sir.

9 That's -- ask your next question.

10 MS. BROWN: Point of information --

11 MR. SIPE: Please state your name.

12 MS. BROWN: -- responding to his question --

13 MR. SIPE: Please state your name.

14 MS. BROWN: My name is Barbara Brown.

15 Point of information, where he asked about  
16 Williams Telecommunications and their fiber optic line and  
17 the -- before, he talked about the liens, and I believe --

18 MR. SIPE: I'm going to have to stop you because  
19 this meeting is not on the telecommunications line.

20 MS. BROWN: It's the telecommunications --

21 MR. SIPE: This is the pipeline project, ma'am.

22 MS. BROWN: It's not on the pipeline project?

23 MR. SIPE: This -- that has nothing to do with

24 Williams.

25 MR. CUMLANDER: Point of interest: Yes, it does

6-101

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

35

PM3-16  
(cont'd)

1 have something to do with this pipeline because now we have  
2 got notice that the pipe -- some of that communications is  
3 in the wrong spot. It's going to have to be moved. So it  
4 does have something to do with this pipeline.

5 MS. BROWN: You know, what I would like to say  
6 is, Williams Telecommunications -- I just got a letter from  
7 Williams's lawyer. I wrote to them and said, "Who is this  
8 WilTel that is claiming rights to my property?" I looked  
9 through all my records, and I can't find "WilTel" anyway --  
10 anywhere.

11 So Williams's lawyer sent a letter back to me  
12 stating, "Oh, that's Williams Communications. They just  
13 changed their name," not as you just said, that they have  
14 nothing to do with Williams --

15 MR. SIPE: This meeting has nothing to do with  
16 the telecommunications, ma'am.

17 MS. BROWN: We have a telecommunication  
18 easement going through our pipeline easement and --

19 MR. SIPE: I'm sorry that you have  
20 telecommunications problems.

21 MS. BROWN: And two people have told you that  
22 they do. We're living it.

23 MR. BRUGLIA: Well, the way I understand it, the  
24 telecommunications company was owned by Williams.

25 MS. BROWN: It still is, according to Williams's

6-102

18525  
FIELD

36

PM3-16  
(cont'd)

1 lawyer. They just changed their name.  
2 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay.  
3 MS. BROWN: I have a letter in my truck.  
4 MR. BRUGLIA: That's -- that's my concern as a  
5 homeowner.  
6 MR. SIPE: But, see, you're --  
7 MR. BRUGLIA: So what you're saying is -- is --  
8 okay. Chevy. Chevy.  
9 MR. SIPE: What I'm saying is --  
10 MR. BRUGLIA: GM over here and --  
11 MR. SIPE: I'm the Federal Energy Regulatory  
12 Commission. I have no jurisdiction over that company at  
13 all. I cannot do one single thing about that  
14 telecommunications line. I can offer you guys assistance,  
15 after the meeting is over, on maybe what you could do. But  
16 this is not what this meeting is about. I'm sorry. I'm  
17 sorry that you had trouble with that, but that's --  
18 MR. BRUGLIA: Very well.  
19 MR. SIPE: I'm sorry.  
20 MR. BRUGLIA: We'll move on. I do have some --  
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, if we're talking --  
22 what's to tell us that we're not going to have trouble with  
23 you, cleaning up, fixing up, all the -- the liens, all that  
24 stuff? What tells us we're not going to have trouble with  
25 that again?

## Public Meetings

# Public Meetings

6-104

18525  
FIELD

37

PM3-16  
(cont'd)

1 MR. SIPE: There's pipeline projects happening  
2 all over this state from this company, and they're regulated  
3 by us. And there's -- there's plenty of examples out there  
4 on how they conduct business now. So if you would like --

5 MR. BRUGLIA: Well, correct. And we have  
6 a legitimate concern.

7 MR. SIPE: You do.

8 MR. BRUGLIA: And you as the regulatory  
9 committee -- or agency -- that's what we're here voicing to  
10 you.

11 MR. SIPE: I understand that.

12 MR. BRUGLIA: You regulate them. This is the way  
13 they do business; okay? This is what they're -- this is the  
14 way they do business.

15 What you're saying is it's a subsidiary, yadda  
16 yadda. That's -- it's --

17 MR. SIPE: Sir, I cannot answer --

18 MR. BRUGLIA: Somebody told a friend somewhere.  
19 Okay. Very well. I'll give you that.

20 MR. SIPE: I just can't speak for them.

PM3-17

21 MR. BRUGLIA: Moving along, I do have other  
22 concerns, because it sounded like, to me, that -- because I  
23 received a notice in the mail that they want my property,  
24 it's not voluntary, that I'm going to be forced to have the  
25 temporary workspace on -- on my home.

PM3-17 The use of temporary extra workspace during construction would not permanently encumber the property. Temporary extra workspace would be allowed to revert to prior uses following construction with no restrictions and would not become part of the permanent easement. Impacts on property values associated with the Capacity Replacement Project are discussed in section 4.9.5.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

38

PM3-17  
(cont'd)

1                   And my question is -- when I read the proposal,  
2 asking for a portion of my property and giving me an amount  
3 that -- supposedly a fair market amount of what that portion  
4 of the property is valued -- my question is, is -- I don't  
5 remember ever giving up my property as a whole property.

6                   20 feet of workspace does not just affect 20  
7 feet. It affects 100 percent of my property; okay? If I go  
8 to sell my home, that would affect 100 percent of my  
9 property; okay? I'm not selling my house as 80 percent and  
10 20 percent workspace; okay? We -- we didn't have the  
11 opportunity that -- Bob Cumlander here discussed about the  
12 values, basically, like a mass appraisal.

13                   My house was valued for this fair market, as my  
14 neighbors', with 75 foot of Williams' pipeline easement --  
15 or excuse me -- right-of-way -- so -- and I never had the  
16 opportunity to be with the appraiser when he came by and  
17 came up with the value of what my home was worth; okay?

18                   So I -- I'm -- as you're the regulatory  
19 commission, I have real hard problems with the way that  
20 Williams is going about doing business; okay?

21                   I also feel that Williams has not been a good  
22 neighbor and that they have not been up front; okay?

23                   I -- I guess another thing that I wanted to talk  
24 about was, the contract that they proposed to me was vague  
25 and ambiguous; okay? It says "temporary workspace." Define

6-105

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

39

PM3-17  
(cont'd)

1 "temporary." Life is temporary; okay? I don't have  
2 anything in my paperwork that says when they're coming  
3 through, what they're going to do, how they're going to  
4 affect my 100 percent of my property -- because that's what  
5 they're going to affect -- and when they're going to be out.  
6 Is there any penalties when they're not out?

7 If -- if you're not gone and do what you say  
8 you're going to do, they say that they'll return the -- the  
9 property to me when it's over with. When is it going to be  
10 over with? Do you regulate the timeline?

11 MR. SIPE: The timeline?

12 MR. BRUGLIA: Well, do you regulate when the  
13 project starts --

14 MR. SIPE: There's an inspection program that's  
15 done completely throughout the entire part of construction  
16 of the project.

17 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay.

18 MR. SIPE: Can I regulate the timeline that they  
19 use to come through there? No. I mean, to a point. I  
20 mean, they're not going to take forever. It's not  
21 businesslike.

22 MR. BRUGLIA: Who is -- who is an educated person  
23 who might be able to tell me what the -- the definition of  
24 "temporary workspace" is?

25 MR. SIPE: "Temporary workspace" -- just -- it

6-106

# Public Meetings

6-107

18525  
FIELD

40

PM3-17  
(cont'd)

1 seems there's confusion on it. All it is is -- that's what  
2 it -- temporary. They're going to use that land to either  
3 store some materials on or park a truck on, or they may just  
4 need that space to move a piece of machinery around one time  
5 and move it back. And that's it. They just need an area --

PM3-18

6 MR. BRUGLIA: I wish that was the case in my  
7 case, because it looks like they want a whole row of my  
8 trees, which is going to affect environmentally --

9 MR. SIPE: Right. That would be a long-term  
10 visual impact, and you should be compensated for that.

11 MS. BROWN: More than visual.

12 MR. BRUGLIA: I should be compensated. Okay. I  
13 understand that. I'm voicing my environmental concerns.  
14 When you're -- when you're going to be cutting down 40- and  
15 60-foot trees, how it's going to affect the drainage of my  
16 property, my resell of my property, my privacy of my  
17 property, not to say that the -- the family of squirrels  
18 living in them. Okay?

PM3-19

19 Do we have gray squirrels in the area?

20 MR. SIPE: Do you have gray squirrels in the  
21 area? You're asking me that question?

22 MR. BRUGLIA: I'm asking, whoever did the  
23 environmental impact study, do we have gray squirrels in the  
24 area?

25 Who's done the environmental impact study?

PM3-18 See the response to comment PM2-14.

PM3-19 Section 4.7.3 includes a discussion of the state-threatened western gray squirrel and the potential for this species to occur in the project area. The species has been documented in the vicinity of the Fort Lewis Loop. In order to account for potential impacts on this species, Northwest has proposed avoidance and minimization measures, including leaving existing oak trees in place when practicable and replacing trees that must be removed due to construction at either a 5:1 ratio with oak trees in 15-gallon containers or by transplanting trees to a restoration area on the Fort Lewis Military Reservation (Fort Lewis).

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

41

PM3-19  
(cont'd)

1 MR. SIPE: Sir, I can answer those questions, but  
2 this is a comment meeting, so I'll take that in  
3 consideration.

4 MS. BROWN: Well, why don't you answer it now?

5 MR. BRUGLIA: Well, okay.

6 MR. SIPE: It's not --

7 MR. BRUGLIA: Would somebody from Williams be  
8 able to answer that or --

9 MS. BROWN: This is an environmental question.

10 MR. BRUGLIA: You'll have to -- you'll have to  
11 excuse me. I'm at a loss. I don't have the -- the  
12 information -- this is the first time I've ever dealt with a  
13 situation like this; okay? And -- and if you would humor me  
14 and educate me, I would appreciate it.

15 All's I'm asking, has anybody done an  
16 environmental impact statement or -- to find out what's  
17 going to be happening with the squirrels?

18 Are there gray squirrels in the area?

19 MR. SIPE: Sir, a squirrel is not a threatened  
20 and endangered species.

21 MR. BRUGLIA: I'm sorry?

22 MR. SIPE: A squirrel is not a threatened and  
23 endangered species. So -- I mean, it's a common animal.

24 MR. BRUGLIA: I'm sorry. I heard on the news  
25 that they were having a problem with the (inaudible) because

801-9

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

42

PM3-19  
(cont'd)

1 of the gray squirrel. And I live very close to the --  
2 the -- that project. And -- and I know I have squirrels on  
3 my -- on my property. And --

4 MR. SIPE: Sir, you have a lot of questions,  
5 and -- and I can talk to you after this meeting is complete,  
6 and maybe I can help you out with your specific situation.

7 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay. Okay. Okay. Well, I  
8 would -- you're not able to answer some of these questions  
9 while somebody else might have the same concern, then?

10 Is anybody concerned about the squirrels in the  
11 area? Is anybody --

12 MS. BROWN: The environment.

13 MR. BRUGLIA: You're from -- who is from the  
14 environment?

15 MS. DAVIS: I am. There have been some sightings  
16 of gray squirrels in the area.

17 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay. Okay. There have been --  
18 there have been?

19 MS. BROWN: I have a question about that when  
20 you're finished, sir.

21 MR. BRUGLIA: What was so hard about answering  
22 the question? is my concern. I guess it -- you would have  
23 to tell me what -- some of these suspicions -- people are  
24 not being forthright, up front.

25 MR. SIPE: Sir, if you're asking me specifics --

601-9

6-110

18525  
FIELD

43

PM3-19  
(cont'd)

1       specifics of that nature on this document, I have the  
2       professionals who wrote this for me, and I can ask them, but  
3       I just didn't feel that this question was relevant at this  
4       time. I'm not asking --

5               MR. BRUGLIA: Not relevant to you, but it is  
6       relevant to me.

7               MR. SIPE: I understand that. I understand that.

8               MR. BRUGLIA: That's why I came out here tonight,  
9       to get answers. I have -- I have not the capacity for --

10              MR. SIPE: This is a comment meeting, sir.

11              MR. BRUGLIA: There's my comment.

12              MR. SIPE: That's exactly right.

13              MR. BRUGLIA: I guess, getting back to -- the  
14       freedom of information that we're getting doesn't -- seems  
15       to be kind of sketchy. Are you saying I'm done?

16              MR. SIPE: No, I'm not saying you're done. If  
17       you have some more comments, I'm glad to hear them.

PM3-20

18              MR. BRUGLIA: My -- getting back to the -- the --  
19       determining what the value of our land is -- and I had the  
20       opportunity to -- to have some of my neighbors show me --  
21       show me some of their information. There -- I'm in total  
22       disagreement of how they came to -- to that and would -- I'd  
23       like to be able to talk to somebody about where they came up  
24       with that -- that figure, where my property is the same  
25       amount, worth the same amount as my neighbors', give a

PM3-20    As discussed in section 4.8.2, the easement agreement between the company and a landowner typically specifies compensation for losses resulting from construction, including losses of non-renewable and other resources, damages to property during construction, and restrictions on existing uses that would not be permitted on the permanent right-of-way after construction. Northwest has stated that it is attempting to negotiate fair construction stipulations and settlements with all landowners affected by the Capacity Replacement Project. However, the acquisition of an easement is a negotiable process that would be carried out between Northwest and the landowner and is beyond the scope of this EIS. General impacts on property values associated with the Capacity Replacement Project are discussed in section 4.9.5.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

44

PM3-20  
(cont'd)

1 75-foot easement.  
2 MR. SIPE: I recommend that everyone here who is  
3 concerned with that get a separate appraisal on their  
4 property from an appraisal company. We do not regulate the  
5 negotiations of money for the lease of your property or the  
6 buy of your property.

7 MR. BRUGLIA: Right.

8 MR. SIPE: We can't do -- we cannot do that.

9 MR. BRUGLIA: Well, I'm try- -- I'm trying to --  
10 I'm trying to get myself informed.

11 MR. SIPE: Okay. I'm -- that's what I'm --

12 MR. BRUGLIA: So obviously, there's a problem  
13 with information. Okay. I'll go ahead and let everybody  
14 else take the floor that might have some comments.

15 MR. CUMLANDER: My name is Bob Cumlander, again.  
16 I live in Spanaway, Washington.

PM3-21

17 Getting back to what -- the comment that you  
18 made. You said that if they dug up the old pipeline, it  
19 would take a lot more equipment. It wouldn't take that much  
20 more equipment.

21 The trucks that bring in the pipe can take out  
22 the old pipe. You're going to dig a hole over here, as  
23 they're proposing right now. You're digging a trench on the  
24 right. Well, you can dig the trench on the left, lift out  
25 the old pipe, put in the new. You're having a truck come in

PM3-21 See the responses to comments PM1-7 and PM2-3.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

45

PM3-21  
(cont'd)

1 with new pipe. You can have that truck take out the old  
2 pipe.

3 So as far as extra equipment, there is not that  
4 much more involved. And they can work within that 75 foot  
5 if they can do it up north.

6 And Linda Anderson, I would like you to ask  
7 Marilyn tomorrow.

8 MS. ANDERSON: Actually, it's Lynn.

9 MR. CUMLANDER: Lynn. One thing I'd like you to  
10 ask Marilyn is about this storage. All it is is storage  
11 tanks, and those storage tanks can be in an unpopulated  
12 area.

13 MS. ANDERSON: I've got it.

14 MR. CUMLANDER: Thank you.

15 MR. BRUGLIA: My name is William Bruglia, again.

PM3-22

16 I just -- I didn't get an answer -- I kind of let  
17 it go -- as far as the gray squirrel is concerned. You said  
18 that there are spotted -- have been some spottings of gray  
19 squirrel. How are you going to address that?

20 MS. DAVIS: We'll address it in more detail in  
21 the final environmental impact statement so it's clearer  
22 than it was in the draft.

23 MR. BRUGLIA: Okay.

24 MS. CUMLANDER: I have a question --

25 MR. SIPE: State your name.

PM3-22 See the response to comment PM3-19.

6-112

18525  
FIELD

46

1 MS. CUMLANDER: -- or a statement. My name is  
2 Marsha Cumlander.

PM3-23

3 I want to know if they need the extra space  
4 because the telecommunications was put in the wrong spot in  
5 a lot of areas. And also, Williams and the rest of them had  
6 inspectors out there to keep them right on line, supposedly.  
7 How in the world did they get off? And as a homeowner, we  
8 had to run them down to get gravel delivered to our road  
9 from their trucks tearing it up. And we want to know, as a  
10 population, who do we go to? My husband had to run them  
11 down to get them to deliver gravel for what they had messed  
12 up on our road.

13 Now, on our little 32nd Avenue, this last summer,  
14 we really worked on that road to give all of us a better way  
15 to come and go from our home. Now, we want to know who we  
16 go to besides the "grumpy" at the front desk who doesn't  
17 give us any answers, to get it, if it's not done to our  
18 satisfaction, as it was not last time in several areas. Who  
19 do we go to to get this fixed just right?

20 We all put a bunch of money into this road.  
21 Williams is telling us, "No. Anybody whose land this  
22 pipeline is not on, it does not affect."

23 And I said, "That's baloney. Everybody on this  
24 street who put their hard-earned money into that road has a  
25 part of this," because it needs to be put back the way they

## Public Meetings

3

PM3-23 WiTel is a separate and distinct company from Northwest and Northwest's parent company, The Williams Companies. WiTel owns and operates its own facilities and has a separate easement with landowners along the Fort Lewis Loop. Northwest's proposed workspace is required for equipment, materials, spoil storage, and terrain features such as waterbody and road crossings and steep slopes. The location of WiTel's fiber optic line does not affect the layout of Northwest's proposed workspace for the Capacity Replacement Project. Section 2.5 describes the environmental compliance inspection and mitigation monitoring program that would be implemented to ensure that activities associated with the Capacity Replacement Project are conducted in compliance with permit requirements and landowner specifications. Northwest's Landowner Complaint Resolution Procedure is also described in section 2.5.

18525  
FIELD

47

PM3-23  
(cont'd)

1 found it.  
2 And what I want to know, this extra space -- is  
3 it because of the blunders that they made when the  
4 telecommunications went through? Is that the reason -- not  
5 only the equipment -- because I think 75 feet is plenty of  
6 room for them to work within. Is that the reason, is  
7 because they put it in the wrong place in some areas and  
8 part of it is on our -- that crosses our property?

PM3-24

9 I'm having a real hard time with them not taking  
10 out the old and putting in the new, because I do not believe  
11 that they will not use that in the future if it benefits the  
12 company.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. BROWN: Barbara Brown.

PM3-25

15 I have a procedural question. You said earlier,  
16 if I heard you correctly, that when this environmental study  
17 is complete and approved by FERC, that they will be issuing  
18 a certificate of public use and necessity. Did you say --

19 MR. SIPE: Public convenience and necessity.

20 MS. BROWN: Public convenience. You will be  
21 issuing that; is that correct?

22 MR. SIPE: The Federal Energy Regulatory

23 Commission will be issuing that, ma'am.

24 MS. BROWN: Yeah. That's FERC, isn't it?

25 MR. SIPE: Uh-huh.

## Public Meetings

3

PM3-24 As discussed in section 2.7, Northwest proposes to leave as much of the 26-inch-diameter pipeline intact as possible to allow the pipeline to be put back in service for future gas deliveries if new technology is developed to accurately detect stress corrosion cracking. Returning the existing pipeline to service to accommodate future gas deliveries would minimize environmental impact and disruption to landowners compared to constructing a new pipeline in the future.

PM3-25 See the response to comment PM3-13.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

48

PM3-25  
(cont'd)

1 MS. BROWN: So my understanding is that this  
2 certificate would be the "go ahead" for Williams with their  
3 claim to eminent domain. Is that correct? Yes?

4 MR. SIPE: Yes.

5 MS. BROWN: So eminent domain comes under --

6 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, I cannot sit here and answer  
7 questions about eminent domain. I am not an attorney.

8 Eminent domain is handled through the Office of General  
9 Counsel.

10 MS. BROWN: Is this a public comment period?

11 MR. SIPE: This --

12 MS. BROWN: I wish to make this public comment.

13 MR. SIPE: I explained what eminent domain is --

14 MS. BROWN: I haven't asked my question, so you  
15 possibly couldn't have explained this one.

16 Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure --  
17 eminent domain comes under the Federal Rules of Civil  
18 Procedure. Those are court rules. Under the Federal Rules  
19 of Civil Procedure, an eminent domain proceeding commences  
20 with a notice and petition sent to the affected landowners.  
21 Will we be receiving a notice and petition for this  
22 proceeding?

23 MR. SIPE: I can't answer questions about that.

24 MS. BROWN: Are you a FERC employee?

25 MR. SIPE: Ma'am --

6-115

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

49

PM3-25  
(cont'd)

1 MS. BROWN: Are you a FERC employee? Then it is  
2 your duty to find out and respond.  
3 MR. SIPE: Your comment is taken.  
4 MS. BROWN: Notice to the agent, notice to the  
5 agent --  
6 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, your comment is taken and will  
7 be answered in the final environmental impact statement.  
8 I'm sorry. I can't answer questions about eminent domain.  
9 I can't do it.  
10 MS. BROWN: You just said that it is your -- your  
11 department that issues the certification for eminent domain,  
12 and you can't answer questions about it? Is that what you  
13 just said? Really?  
14 Are you a FERC employee?  
15 MS. DAVIS: No, I'm not.  
16 MS. BROWN: Any other FERC employees in here?  
17 Well, it's your duty to provide us with an  
18 answer.  
19 MR. SIPE: You will be provided with an answer in  
20 the final environmental impact statement. I just explained  
21 to you that I cannot answer questions about eminent domain.  
22 I can't explain and make you understand that any further. I  
23 will not and cannot explain to you any further --  
24 MS. BROWN: Your FERC procedure for eminent  
25 domain, you cannot explain?

911-9

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

50

1 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, I'm not going to argue. I'm  
2 going to ask you to sit down, please.

3 MS. BROWN: I was going to do it without your  
4 asking.

5 MR. SIPE: Thank you. Thank you.

6 Are there going to be any more speakers?

7 MR. CUMLANDER: Bob Cumlander, Spanaway,  
8 Washington.

PM3-26

9 Getting back to my staying within the 75 feet,  
10 you mean, unless it's proven to be a necessity to cut down a  
11 lot of these hundred-year-old trees, that you're going to --  
12 this temporary property -- temporary workspace -- to me,  
13 when your program shows that you're working within the  
14 limits up there north, it is not a necessity to cut down the  
15 trees. They're working within 75 feet up north. They can  
16 work within 75 feet down here by Fort Lewis.

17 MR. SIPE: Sir, you're not understanding.  
18 Temporary extra workspace will be used throughout the  
19 project. Temporary extra workspace.

20 And let me explain. Temporary extra workspace is  
21 proposed by the company, as it stands now. They will --  
22 once they have a certificate to build, they will send in an  
23 implementation plan, which -- once they have a certificate,  
24 they have to send an implementation plan to FERC, that we  
25 approve, after their certificate, how they're going to

PM3-26 See the response to comment PM2-3. In order for Northwest to submit an application to the FERC, the application must include certain minimum filing requirements, including the configuration of the proposed permanent and construction rights-of-way needed to construct and operate the project. This information then becomes the proposed action and is the subject of the environmental review the FERC conducts to satisfy its National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) responsibilities. It is common for companies to try and obtain easements based on the proposed right-of-way configurations before final approval is received due to constraints in the project schedule; however, companies do so at their own risk. Northwest cannot begin project-related activities using any of the proposed workspace until it receives final approval from the FERC and other applicable agencies even if it has obtained easements for the workspace. The acquisition of easements is not taken into consideration by the FERC when analyzing the environmental aspects of the project and in preparing an EIS.

PM3-26  
(cont'd)18525  
FIELD

51

1 construct the project.

2 We look at all these temporary extra workspaces.

3 And they're proposed the way they are now, but they may or  
4 may not change. Nothing is set in stone. So we have your  
5 concerns on that, and they will be taken into consideration  
6 when those temporary extra workspaces are granted for  
7 construction approval. So we have your concerns on that.  
8 We appreciate it.

9 MR. CUMLANDER: But why -- why is Williams going  
10 ahead and contacting and buying their way through or paying  
11 money to go through, giving them money for temporary  
12 workspace when they don't even know if they're going to get  
13 it? How can they go ahead and meet the cust- -- the  
14 property owners in advance, then?

15 MR. SIPE: This is a big project, and they  
16 can't just -- they can't do everything after they have a  
17 certificate to build. They have to do it --

18 MR. CUMLANDER: No. But there you go again.  
19 You're -- people -- the property owners are saying, "Well, I  
20 have to give in to them."

21 Well, you're just telling me "No, you don't have  
22 to give in because they don't know they're going to get  
23 the" -- "the temporary workspace."

24 But they're going out in advance, writing out  
25 checks, saying, "We need this space." Well, they have no

## Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

52

PM3-26  
(cont'd)

1 right saying, "We need this space," because they don't even  
2 know they can get it yet. Am I right or wrong?

3 MR. SIPE: You're right.

4 MR. CUMLANDER: Yes.

5 MR. SIPE: It's your negotiation, sir. I can't  
6 help you in negotiation. I can give you suggestions after  
7 the meeting is complete.

8 MR. CUMLANDER: All right.

9 MR. BRUGLIA: My name is William Bruglia.

PM3-27

10 You would -- you would have to say, as a  
11 reasonable person, that if they're already -- your -- your  
12 statement was, "It's a big project; they have to" -- "they  
13 have to do this now." Okay? Says who? Okay? Says -- says  
14 who? Okay?

15 So as a reasonable person, if this big oil  
16 company is going by right now and signing checks out and  
17 they don't give it -- approval to these people that already  
18 went to Wal-Mart, do they have to give them their money  
19 back? Okay?

20 As a reasonable person, if they're already doing  
21 this, does it not appear that -- that maybe Williams is  
22 assuming that they're going to get it that -- okay.  
23 That's -- that's -- that's my point. Again, it's  
24 perception; okay?

25 All the things that I discussed about -- and

## Public Meetings

3

PM3-27 The use of temporary extra workspace during construction would not permanently encumber the property. Temporary extra workspace would be allowed to revert to prior uses following construction with no restrictions and would not become part of the permanent easement. See also the response to comment PM2-3.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

53

PM3-27  
(cont'd)

1 these other folks, with -- dealing with the  
2 telecommunications situation, you're saying this has nothing  
3 to do with that. Yes, it does. They came by through this  
4 right-of-way -- it doesn't matter who it is -- and they  
5 wreak havoc; okay?

6 Now, you're regulating this project; okay? Now  
7 they're coming through, and they want to -- in my case,  
8 temporary workspace. I have a problem with that. You would  
9 have to define "temporary" to me, again. There's no  
10 definition of "temporary." In my mind, temporary is  
11 temporary, not permanently affecting my property, which they  
12 will do.

13 MR. SIPE: So, sir --

14 MR. BRUGLIA: It's actually not temporary  
15 workspace. You're not asking for temporary workspace. It's  
16 not temporary because it's --

17 MR. SIPE: Sir, if you have an additional comment  
18 that we haven't heard before, I would appreciate it, because  
19 you're just going back to what we've already -- you've  
20 already talked about.

21 MR. BRUGLIA: No. I -- I didn't -- I didn't -- I  
22 didn't tell you that my feeling was --

23 MR. SIPE: Well, I have other people that need to  
24 speak and keep raising their hands.

25 MR. BRUGLIA: Great. Okay. I don't have to be

6-120

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

54

PM3-27  
(cont'd)

1 home for quite some time. I'd like -- I'd like -- I'd like  
2 to -- to be able to bring this point to you, is, this is not  
3 a temporary situation. You're not asking for temporary  
4 workspace. The workspace that you're asking for in my case  
5 is going to permanently affect my property. How is that  
6 temporary?

7 MR. SIPE: Sir, that -- that -- we have your  
8 comment, and it will be considered in the final  
9 environmental impact statement. Thank you.

10 MR. BRUGLIA: Excuse me. William Bruglia, again.

11 You know, unfortunately -- I'm going to say for  
12 the record -- I -- the -- the -- I -- I'm not really getting  
13 the answers that I came here to get, and there seems to be a  
14 lot of "We'll get back to you." I'm -- I'm -- you guys are  
15 the experts. And I -- I'm not -- I'm not getting answers;  
16 okay? You -- you do this for a living. I don't. I'm a  
17 concerned homeowner. And I -- I --

18 MR. SIPE: Sir, I -- sir, I -- sir, please. I  
19 have given you answers. You're just not understanding them.  
20 And I will explain myself after the meeting is complete.

21 MS. BROWN: Why don't you explain yourself now?  
22 This is what the meeting is for.

23 MR. HOESEN: No, it isn't.

24 MS. BROWN: Yes, it is. It's for comments.

25 MR. HOESEN: It's a comment period, not a

6-121

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

55

1 question-and-answer period. Whether it's federal, state,  
2 county, or municipal, a public comment period is designed to  
3 allow the public to comment on the proposal. They take your  
4 comments, they record them, and they revise the document  
5 accordingly. That's the purpose of the meeting.

6 And a bunch of people here, other folks already  
7 understand this. And there are people that are raising  
8 their hand that should have the opportunity to go ahead and  
9 comment. They came here. They've been waiting a long time  
10 to comment. And other people are just jumping up whenever  
11 they feel like it.

12 MS. BROWN: I don't feel guilty.

13 MR. HOESEN: Okay. That's -- that's -- the  
14 purpose of a comment meeting is to just accept comments.

15 MR. SIPE: Thank you.

16 Ma'am?

17 MS. FOSTER: My name is Lil (phonetic) Foster. I  
18 live off of Vail Loop in Rainier at the intersection of  
19 (inaudible). It's a place where the pipeline runs along in  
20 line with the high-tension power lines.

21 I understand that the main purpose for this  
22 project is to improve the safety of the existing pipeline.  
23 And I'm certainly all for that. We live very close to it.

24 So it's not that I'm being negative. At the same  
25 time, there are several elements that I would like to

6-122

18525  
FIELD

56

PM3-28

1 further understand. And I wonder, as a comment, whether  
2 they have been considered, such as, number one: The  
3 pipeline size is increasing from 26 inches to 30 inches. I  
4 understand 36 --

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 36 inches.

6 MS. FOSTER: I understand that it doesn't  
7 necessarily mean an increase in volume of --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Flow.

9 MS. FOSTER: -- gas that is going to be moved  
10 or --

11 MR. SIPE: I understand what you mean. I  
12 understand what you mean.

13 MS. FOSTER: But what I am wondering about is --  
14 because oftentimes, I find that things may initially start  
15 out one way and then they increase, particularly when I see  
16 an increase in pipe size.

17 What I am wondering about and I would like  
18 addressed in -- in the final (inaudible) would be the design  
19 capacities of the 26-inch line versus the 36-inch line,  
20 because that will tell me what is potentially possibly down  
21 the road. So that's one element.

22 The other is -- I understand that these pipelines  
23 are designed with very high safety standards. I know about  
24 x-ray (inaudible) and all of that.

PM3-29

25 However, we live in earthquake country. And I

## Public Meetings

3

PM3-28 As technology continues to improve, advanced inspection tools could potentially allow Northwest to identify and repair anomalies on its 26-inch-diameter pipeline and return the line to service. These advanced inspection tools would also extend the life of the 30-inch-diameter pipeline. However, if the 30-inch-diameter pipeline were no longer viable for service and the 26-inch-diameter pipeline could not be returned to service, a continuous pipeline would have to be installed that could service Northwest's customers along the Sumas to Washougal corridor. One option would be to extend the existing 36-inch-diameter loops that were constructed as part of the Evergreen Expansion Project and the 36-inch-diameter loops proposed to be constructed as part of the Capacity Replacement Project into a continuous pipeline. This would involve the installation of approximately 160 miles of 36-inch-diameter pipeline. Preliminary hydraulic modeling shows that the capacity of a 36-inch-diameter pipeline running from Sumas to Washougal would roughly replace the current capacity of the existing pipeline system with some upgrades at existing compressor stations.

PM3-29 Northwest's geohazards assessment report titled *Capacity Replacement Project Geohazards, Whatcom, Skagit, Snohomish, Pierce, and Thurston Counties, Washington* (Golder, 2004b)<sup>1</sup> did not identify any landslide-prone areas, active surface faults, or any other geologic hazards that could threaten the integrity of the pipeline within 0.5 mile of the town of Rainier. In addition, it is common practice to collocate natural gas pipelines with electric transmission lines to minimize the amount of new right-of-way created for these types of facilities. Regulatory agencies have not identified any safety concerns regarding this practice. The overall potential for a geologic event to cause a natural gas release that would then be ignited by the nearby electric lines is considered extremely low.

<sup>1</sup> This report is too voluminous to include in this EIS. It is available for public inspection at the FERC's Public Reference Room in Washington, DC (call (202) 502-8317 for instructions) and at the WDOE's regional offices. If you reside in Whatcom, Skagit, Snohomish, or King Counties, you can access this document at the WDOE's Northwest Regional Office in Bellevue by calling the Public Disclosure Coordinator at (425) 649-7190 or (425) 649-7239. If you reside in Pierce, Thurston, Lewis, Cowlitz, or Clark Counties, you can access this document at the WDOE's Southwest Regional Office in Lacey by calling the Public Disclosure Coordinator at (360) 407-6365.

18525  
FIELD

57

PM3-29  
(cont'd)

1 know there is even safety factors for that. But we have had  
2 some accidents and things that maybe we didn't foresee, like  
3 tsunamis in another part of the world; okay? Big  
4 earthquakes can happen here.

5           And particularly where I am, it's a relatively  
6 flat area. And we already did speak with Williams pipeline  
7 people about what would happen if there was a pipeline  
8 break. He explained to us that the pipe would freeze,  
9 getting pretty well solid, and nothing would happen unless  
10 there was a spark. Well, that's where -- the concern,  
11 because we are right next to a high-tension power line.  
12 That could provide the spark.

13           And considering that on one hand, the pipe --  
14 we're on kind of a portion of the road where on one end, we  
15 have the pipeline and the high-tension power line. At the  
16 other end is the river. So should there be a -- or for that  
17 matter, we're on the bottom of a hillside.

18           Should the pipeline break on the upper part of  
19 the hill and if it's big enough -- I mean, this whole thing  
20 could theoretically travel through our level and go down to  
21 the river, cutting off, even if we were -- and it might not  
22 happen. I mean, I don't -- I'd like to know a worst-case  
23 scenario.

24           What can happen if -- it's not likely. And I  
25 know it's not likely to happen on my section of the line.

# Public Meetings

6-125

18525  
FIELD

58

PM3-29  
(cont'd)

1 I'm not looking for it. But I would still like to  
2 understand what can happen, because if -- you know, we could  
3 be right in the path of where the pipeline goes with no  
4 place to go, just in our particular location. So that's  
5 something I'd like addressed.

6 MR. SIPE: Thank you.

7 MS. FOSTER: Thank you very much for your time.

8 MR. SIPE: Thank you.

9 Sir?

10 MR. ROBERTS: Yes. My name is Duane Roberts.

11 And they do have 75-foot right-of-way across  
12 the (inaudible) property. Any comment that's going to be --  
13 also, we're going to have a question with it.

14 MR. SIPE: Sure.

PM3-30

15 MR. ROBERTS: The 26-inch line across the back of  
16 my property will be in the ground, as I  
17 understand (inaudible). As I understand it, they're also  
18 going to pressurize that with some kind of an inert gas  
19 that's not explosive.

20 My question is, for environmental purposes, how  
21 long will that thing retain -- remain pressurized?

PM3-31

22 Also, my document says at some time, it may be  
23 used, if the technology becomes available, to inspect the  
24 line.

25 My question -- that goes along with this --

PM3-30 The 26-inch-diameter pipeline would be filled with nitrogen at a very low pressure of 100 pounds per square inch gauge, which would inhibit internal corrosion. It would remain at this low pressure for an indefinite period of time. See also the response to comment PM3-14.

PM3-31 Both the DOT and the FERC would be involved with authorizing Northwest to return the 26-inch-diameter pipeline to service. Permits would also be required from other federal, state, and local agencies depending on the activities that would be required to reactivate the pipeline.

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

59

PM3-31  
(cont'd)

1 environmentally is, who is going to be responsible for the  
2 environmental checking and filling up with gas at some  
3 future date?

4 That's all I have.

5 MR. SIPE: That's an engineering question, sir,  
6 which will be addressed in the FEIS. I cannot answer that  
7 specifically, and I'm not going to ask somebody to stand up  
8 and do that.

9 If you would like to talk to Northwest engineers  
10 after the meeting, they'll be able to answer that for you.

11 MR. CUMLANDER: I have one more comment, and then  
12 I'll leave you alone.

13 My name is Bob Cumlander, from Spanaway,  
14 Washington.

PM3-32

15 As far as upkeep, Williams hasn't showed me good  
16 upkeep. You can go two blocks -- or a block and a half from  
17 my house, and you see 15-year-old trees growing on the top  
18 of that pipeline. And this might be part of their troubles,  
19 because I understand it's like current going through that  
20 line. But these roots of these trees could be breaking that  
21 line.

22 And as far as replacing this 26-inch, back when  
23 they was putting the fiber optical in, one of Williams's  
24 people told me it was coming because he seen the pipeline  
25 exposed down south. But Williams is not keeping the

PM3-32 During construction, Northwest would maintain a minimum of two land representatives for each loop who would be in regular communication with landowners along the route. Northwest has also set up a project "hotline" to provide landowners with a way to contact Northwest to ask questions about the project. The FERC staff assumes that landowners with issues concerning maintenance of the existing pipelines would have their concerns addressed by contacting Northwest's hotline. Landowners not satisfied with Northwest's response would be provided with the telephone number of the FERC's Enforcement Hotline and could report maintenance issues to the FERC.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

60

PM3-32  
(cont'd)

1 pipe- -- pipeline -- the 75-foot right-of-way that they've  
2 got, they do not maintain it like they should.

3 And I'll -- if you want pictures, I'll be glad to  
4 take pictures tomorrow for you.

5 MR. SIPE: Thank you.

6 Anybody else like to speak? I know you guys are  
7 all looking at me like I'm the bad guy from D.C., but I'm  
8 here to help, and I'm here to take your comments.

9 So -- I mean, I'm sorry you're upset with a lot  
10 of different issues, but hopefully we can resolve them in  
11 the FEIS. So ...

12 MR. CUMLANDER: Now, I've got one question for  
13 you, and I'd appreciate a straight answer.

PM3-33

14 Will you recon- -- will you reconsider -- or  
15 consider making them put these storage tanks in an isolated  
16 spot, an unpopulated spot?

17 MR. SIPE: I cannot change the proposal that's  
18 put in front of me, sir.

19 MR. CUMLANDER: So it has to be our elected  
20 officials to step in and help us fight this is what you're  
21 saying?

22 MR. SIPE: I explained why the -- the -- that the  
23 pipe is put in the locations that they're put earlier and  
24 in --

25 MR. CUMLANDER: I know. It has to go --

PM3-33 See the response to comment PM3-3.

6-127

# Public Meetings

6-128

18525  
FIELD

61

PM3-33  
(cont'd)

1 MS. DAVIS: We can expand later. We can expand  
2 the analysis in the final EIS.

3 MR. SIPE: We can expand the analysis.

4 MR. CUMLANDER: But there don't have to be  
5 storage tanks in that area. They can be put somewhere else.

6 That 30-inch line -- yes, it has to go through  
7 there because it's serving its purpose. But it don't have  
8 to have four storage tanks 22 miles long or whatever they're  
9 going to be, approximately 20 miles long each. So they can  
10 go someplace else.

11 MR. SIPE: Sir, you're misunderstanding. They're  
12 not storage tanks.

13 MR. CUMLANDER: That's what it boils down to.  
14 They're storage tanks.

15 MR. SIPE: I'll explain after the meeting. Nice  
16 talking to you. Okay.

17 Ma'am?

18 MS. FLICK: My name is Catherine Flick.

PM3-34

19 And is there going to be an informational meeting  
20 where we can have exchange and have questions answered? I  
21 just tonight -- last week I was able to get my hands on one  
22 of these, and I'm affected because my property is very close  
23 to the end of the Fort Lewis line or whatever it is -- I'm  
24 really uncertain what it is now -- and the lane that I use  
25 to access my property.

PM3-34 Section 1.3 describes in detail the opportunities for public participation during the environmental review process for the Capacity Replacement Project both in the form of public meetings and opportunities to submit written comments.

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

62

PM3-34  
(cont'd)

1 I was never contacted about any of this. This is  
2 just recent upon me, recent for me. So I haven't had a  
3 chance to really go through this and look at this. And I  
4 already have questions, so -- that need to be answered and  
5 clarified.

6 So where -- will there be a meeting in the near  
7 future when we can have a conversation back and forth?

8 MR. SIPE: Yeah, after the meeting.

9 MS. FLICK: Other than -- well, I mean, other  
10 than that where --

11 MR. SIPE: What you need to do is, you need to  
12 send your comments in. You can write them or you can put  
13 them in the record that way, or you can e-file your  
14 comments, and then your comments are on the record. And I  
15 can talk with you about them.

16 But I'm not going to go back and forth with you  
17 tonight. I mean right now in this forum.

18 MS. FLICK: Not in the -- not in a meeting in the  
19 future where we would have more notice (inaudible) where the  
20 public could come in and have some clarification about this?

21 MR. SIPE: I'm not saying there isn't going to be  
22 a meeting, but there's not one scheduled at this time.

23 MS. FLICK: Okay. Then -- when will you schedule  
24 one, then?

25 MR. SIPE: You can ask for it now, and I can

6-129

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

63

PM3-34  
(cont'd)

1 consider it. But I can't tell you there's going to be one  
2 again.

3 MS. FLICK: Okay. So I write it on a piece of  
4 paper and turn it in? Is that what you want me to do?

5 MR. SIPE: Uh-huh. Or you can go to [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov)  
6 if you have a computer and go to "e-file" link. You can do  
7 it all online. It goes right through our secretary. And  
8 instructions are all on the green handout.

9 MS. ANDERSON: I'm Lynn Anderson. Could you  
10 repeat that for me, how to contact you online or --

11 MR. SIPE: It's -- it's -- it's on the green --  
12 it's on the green handout sheet there. I don't want to  
13 misstate something. I mean, I don't want to say something  
14 because I can't --

15 MS. ANDERSON: So I need to --

16 MR. SIPE: That's why I write things down when I  
17 give speeches and such, because I don't want to --

18 MS. ANDERSON: Because I'm sure that's something  
19 that -- there's a lot of people that are going to ask.

20 MR. SIPE: Yeah. And it's all in the -- it's all  
21 in the draft environmental impact statement, all in the  
22 beginning, on how you've got comments and whom you contact  
23 and -- and everything. It's in this document.

24 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks very much.

25 MR. SIPE: Thank you.

6-130

# Public Meetings

3

18525  
FIELD

64

PM3-34  
(cont'd)

1 MR. BRUGLIA: My name is William Bruglia, again.  
2 I would second the request for another meeting.  
3 I have, as well, a lot of questions that are not answered,  
4 and I think this is a perfect forum to be able to do that.  
5 I may miss something that somebody else has thought of, and  
6 I think it's real important that we do have a forum like  
7 that. And I understand that we put you guys on the spot,  
8 and I would like to have another meeting so we could get  
9 some answers to -- to our questions.  
10 MR. SIPE: Any other speakers?  
11 MS. BROWN: If there's nobody else, can I ask  
12 another question?  
13 MR. SIPE: Yeah. But don't make me ask you to  
14 sit down again, please.  
15 MS. BROWN: Well, if you mind your manners, you  
16 won't have to.  
17 So -- I spoke a little bit about eminent domain  
18 and the laws of this nation and the laws of the state --  
19 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, if you're going to talk about  
20 eminent domain, I am going to ask you to sit down.  
21 MS. BROWN: Are you not saying that you're going  
22 to issue a certificate that is federal eminent domain? Did  
23 you not say that earlier?  
24 MR. SIPE: Can I talk with you after the meeting  
25 about eminent domain, please?

6-131

18525  
FIELD

65

1 MS. BROWN: I want to talk to these people.  
2 You're the ones.  
3 MR. SIPE: You can but not in this forum.  
4 MS. BROWN: Is there anybody willing to stay  
5 later to talk --  
6 MR. SIPE: Ma'am, this is my meeting. This is  
7 not yours.  
8 MS. BROWN: Does anybody want to hear this later?  
9 Okay.  
10 MR. SIPE: Okay. Without any more speakers, the  
11 formal part of this meeting will conclude.  
12 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory  
13 Commission, I'd like to thank you all for coming tonight.  
14 Let the record show that the Northwest Capacity  
15 Replacement Project public comment meeting concluded at 8:25  
16 p.m.  
17 (Whereupon, the public comment meeting concluded  
18 at 8:25 p.m.)  
19 (Whereupon, Stephanie Hornick ordered the  
20 original and a copy.)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

# Public Meetings

18525  
FIELD

66

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

CERTIFICATE

I, David A. Hart, do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral proceeding had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 18th day of April, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature                      Expiration Date

# Public Meetings