October 14, 2013

Andrew Stamp, Hearings Officer
Coos County Planning Department
225 N. Adams St.
Coquille OR 97423

Re: Rebuttal Comments on Coos County Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline application file number HBCU-13-04

Dear Hearings Officer Stamp:

In addition to comments that were submitted on September 20 and October 7, 2013, please accept the following Rebuttal comments into the record of the Coos County Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline (PCGP) land use application HBCU-13-04.

1. Responding to Pipeline Alternative Route Impacts on Waterbodies:

As we have previously stated, the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline has failed to make a finding that the public need for their proposed project “outweighs” the detriment their project would cause to the use and impacts of multiple waterbodies and conservation aquatic zoning districts in Coos County.

The Coos Bay Estuary is the sixth largest estuary on the Pacific coast of the contiguous United States and the largest estuary completely within Oregon state lines. The Coos estuary is one of only 27 National Estuarine Research Reserves in the United States. The process for federal designation of a National Estuarine Research Reserve has many steps and involves many individuals and organizations. Established by the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, the reserve system is a partnership program between the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the coastal states. The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as Amended, is clear:

§ 1452. Congressional declaration of policy (Section 303) states:

The Congress finds and declares that it is the national policy--

1) to preserve, protect, develop, and where possible, to restore or enhance, the resources of the Nation’s coastal zone for this and succeeding generations;

1 http://www.caex.org/directory/organizations/national-estuarine-research-reserve-system
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2) to encourage and assist the states to exercise effectively their responsibilities in the coastal zone through the development and implementation of management programs to achieve wise use of the land and water resources of the coastal zone, giving full consideration to ecological, cultural, historic, and esthetic values as well as the needs for compatible economic development, which programs should at least provide for—

2(A) the protection of natural resources, including wetlands, floodplains, estuaries, beaches, dunes, barrier islands, coral reefs, and fish and wildlife and their habitat, within the coastal zone,

2(B) the management of coastal development to minimize the loss of life and property caused by improper development in flood-prone, storm surge, geological hazard, and erosion-prone areas and in areas likely to be affected by or vulnerable to sea level rise, land subsidence, and saltwater intrusion, and by the destruction of natural protective features such as beaches, dunes, wetlands, and barrier islands,

2(C) the management of coastal development to improve, safeguard, and restore the quality of coastal waters, and to protect natural resources and existing uses of those waters.

Estuaries are the most important and dynamic habitat type known on earth, where fresh and saline waters mix, creating natural resource biomass far exceeding all others. The proposed Jordan Cove / Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline development would reverse the biological recovery of the Coos Bay Estuary and cause irreparable and irretrievable ecosystem change.

Coos Bay consists of about 14,000 acres of varied intertidal and subtidal substrate habitat conditions including algae beds, eelgrass sites, marshlands, and mostly unconsolidated substrate. The upper Coos Bay estuarine habitat contains important rearing habitat supplied by estuarine wetlands, algae, and eelgrass beds, which are important conditions for estuarine fish and migratory salmon, as well as commercial oyster beds.

The Jordan Cove / Pacific Connector former Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) page 4.3-15 stated:

“The Integrated Report was reviewed to determine the locations of the Category 5 (303d list) water quality limited waters to determine if they are in the vicinity of Project components. The Port’s slip and access channel would involve dredging in Coos Bay. This waterbody was added to the Oregon 303(d) list in 2004 for fecal coliform contamination.” (Emphasis added)

The Coos River was also given a Category 5 listing in the Jordan Cove/Pacific Connector former FERC FEIS (under Appendix G) for fecal coliform contamination year round as was the tributary to Stock Slough. (See Exhibit 1) Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline must guarantee the waterbodies impacted by their alternative pipeline route will not suffer harm. This would
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include the use of a Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) under the Coos River along with other vital impacts to the vital streams and tributaries in Coos County impacted by these alternative routes. I am providing here for the record the complete Coos Watershed Association letter referenced in my Oct 7th letter concerning some of these impacts. (See Exhibit 2)

Due to the steep terrain on the North Side of the Coos River it will be difficult for PCGP to do an HDD in that area as previously explained. The 2006 Science Direct Research Report, "Analysis of wellbore instability in vertical, directional, and horizontal wells using field data," referenced in my Oct 7, 2013, letter states the following:

"An old offshore field produced using vertical and directional wells is being redeveloped by drilling horizontal wells. The experience gained while drilling vertical and directional wells is not useful for drilling horizontal wells, as the failure rate is 1 in 3 holes. Quantification of drilling problems in sixty wells show that majority are tight holes. Stuck pipes and hole pack offs are also significant in number. The major loss of productivity is due to stuck pipes..." (Emphasis added)

2. Responding to Pipeline Alternative Route Impacts on Increased Fire Hazards in Timber and Forest Areas among Other Impacts:

PCGP Resource Report 1 filed with FERC, page 65 states:

"No herbicides will be used for brush control to maintain the permanent pipeline easement. Vegetation at aboveground facilities will be periodically maintained using mowing, cutting, trimming, and herbicides (selectively). Vegetation within the permanent easement will be periodically maintained by mowing, cutting, and trimming (either by mechanical or hand methods). The permanent easement will be maintained in a condition where trees or shrubs greater than 6 feet tall will be controlled (cut or trimmed) within 15 feet either side of the centerline (for a total of 30 cleared feet). Maintenance activities are expected to occur approximately every 3-5 years depending on the growth rate. During maintenance, vegetation will be cut/trimmed in 4 to 6-foot lengths and scattered across the permanent easement to naturally decompose and to discourage OHV traffic. Occasionally where site conditions allow, chipping of this material may also occur. Pacific Connector believes that the slash materials generated and scattered across the permanent easement during maintenance activities would not exceed the fuel loading specifications provided in Section 1.6.1." (Emphasis added)

2 Science Direct - "Analysis of wellbore instability in vertical, directional, and horizontal wells using field data" M.A. Mohiuddin, K. Khan, A. Abdulraheem, A. Al-Majed, M.R. Awal; Center for Petroleum and Minerals, Research Institute, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia; Received 18 April 2005; accepted 26 April 2006; http://faculty.kfupm.edu.sa/PET/aamajed/publications_pdf/Analysis%20of%20Wellbore%20Instability.pdf
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PCGP Resource Report 1, page 66 states:

"If noxious weed infestation occurs on the permanent easement, selective use of herbicides would be used to control these species...." (Emphasis added)

PCGP is obviously unfamiliar with Oregon and the rapid plant growth cycles in Oregon. Plants, weeds and even small trees can grow rapidly within weeks here. There is no way a 3-5 year maintenance plan would be sufficient and no way that the use of herbicides, which will more than likely be transported by wind or runoff into our streams, many of which are salmon bearing, is acceptable. In addition, adding all this burnable slash in forested areas could prove devastating to those forests and will increase the fire hazard. Who will be monitoring these actions by PCGP? We are already well aware of the end result for landowners impacted by projects like this as explained in this August 2009 letter from Michael Hardamon. (See Exhibit 3)

PCGP Resource Report 1, page 22 states:

"Temporary Construction Right-of-Way. Pacific Connector proposes to utilize a standard 95-foot wide temporary construction right-of-way with a 50-foot permanent easement (see typical construction right-of-way configuration Figure 1.5-1 at the end of this Resource Report)...." (Emphasis added)

PCGP Resource Report 1, page 23 states:

"Steep or side slope areas will require the construction right-of-way to be greater than 95 feet in width, through the addition of TEWAs [Temporary Extra Work Areas]. These conditions may require unique construction techniques such as a “two-tone” right-of-way (see Figure 3430.34-X-0019 in the Erosion Control and Revegetation Plan [ECRP] provided in Appendix 1B to this Resource Report)...." (Emphasis added)

PCGP Resource Report 1, page 24 states:

"Temporary Extra Work Areas. In addition to the 95-foot wide construction right-of-way, site-specific characteristics of the right-of-way make it necessary to obtain TEWAs....

... A total of 1,094.47 acres of TEWAs will be disturbed during construction of the pipeline...." (Emphasis added)

The Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline easements will permanently scar and alter hundreds of miles of Oregon lands, much of this is timberland that will be permanently stripped bare. This will negatively impact our timber industry and flood the market with timber during construction which will negatively impact prices. In the end pipeline easements will permanently take timber out of production, costing jobs in this industry. There would also be permanent negative impacts on natural habitats, endangered species, waterways, views, property.
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use, privacy and property values. Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC, in their July 9, 2013, Motion to Intervene with FERC explained in detail some of the problems the proposed Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline project will have on Timber and Forest resources and operations. (See Exhibit 4).

3. Responding to Pipeline Safety and Hazard Issues:

In my October 7th testimony I submitted a listing of some of the major pipeline accidents that had happened with the Williams Pipeline Company. I have since learned that it is worse than I had previously indicated. (See Exhibit 5).

Conclusion

As I stated in my Oct 7, 2013, testimony, there is no public benefit to the negative impacts of this project on tourism, recreation, fishing, farming, timber harvesting, ranching, crabbing, clamming, oyster harvesting, property values and use, real-estate, local air travel, transportation, noise, air and water pollution. The World newspaper reported on Oct 12, 2013, that tourism dollars from July 1, 2012 to Jun 30, 2013 totaled more than $16 million for our area. (See Exhibit 6) The Pacific Connector will have a negative impact on this vital industry due to the entire project’s overall impacts on tourism, recreation and fishing. This would not be in the public’s best interest.

Exporting LNG out of Coos Bay would be for the sole benefit and “interest” of the foreign owned and controlled Jordan Cove Energy Project. The Pacific Connector has not proven their case in order to justify this application or these alternative routes. There are multiple pipeline route alternatives that would be far less environmentally impacting than these they are considering as I explained on October 7, 2013. The HBCU-13-04 application is not complete and it is not in the public interest. It should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Jody McCaffree

Jody McCaffree
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**Exhibit 1:** May 2009 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Jordan Cove / Pacific Connector – Appendix G page G-12.

**Exhibit 2:** December 4, 2008, Coos Watershed Association letter to FERC concerning waterbody impacts of the proposed Jordan Cove / Pacific Connector project in Coos County.

**Exhibit 3:** August 11, 2009 letter from Michael Hardamon to FERC concerning impacts of the REX pipeline on his property and their lack of response and maintenance of their easement.

**Exhibit 4:** July 9, 2013, Motion to Intervene of the Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC, on the FERC Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline Application.

**Exhibit 5:** Compliance and Safety Records of Williams (WMB), Williams Partners L.P. (WPZ), and Williams Midstream.

**Exhibit 6:** The visitor industry’s contribution - **OUR VIEW: A STRONG VISITOR INDUSTRY — JUST ONE MORE PART OF A GOOD ECONOMIC MIX**
October 12, 2013 – The World Newspaper:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterbody 1</th>
<th>Approximate Pipeline Milepost</th>
<th>Waterbody ID 2</th>
<th>Pacific Northwest Hydrography Waterbody ID Number 2</th>
<th>Width of Crossing (feet)</th>
<th>Excavated Volume (yd³)</th>
<th>Crossing Method</th>
<th>FERC Classification 4</th>
<th>Cowardin Classification</th>
<th>Stream Type</th>
<th>ODF or NWFP Stream Classification 5,6</th>
<th>Oregon DEQ Water Quality Limited Streams 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos Bay</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>BSP 246</td>
<td>124387435343</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Oregon Coos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fecal Coliform/Year-Round – Cat: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos Bay</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>NE026</td>
<td>124387435343</td>
<td>2948.30</td>
<td>Wet Open-Cut</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>E2EMP, ETUL, ESTM, ETUL</td>
<td>Estuary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos Bay</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>GB006</td>
<td>124207435450</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Kentucky Slough</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>EE004/GP27</td>
<td>124179543426</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>P2M</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Slough</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>EE005/GSP-28</td>
<td>124205643414</td>
<td>61.74</td>
<td>Conventional Bore</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos Bay</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>NW-17/E/E06</td>
<td>124190534206</td>
<td>847.15</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos Bay</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>EE097</td>
<td>124205434503</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Willamette Slough</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>GDX029/GE001</td>
<td>124161434088</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not Crossed by Centerline</td>
<td>Adjacent to centerline within ROW</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Willamette Slough</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>GDX010</td>
<td>124161434088</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Willamette Slough</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>GDX021</td>
<td>124161434088</td>
<td>49.89</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos Bay</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>BW-022</td>
<td>124103433710</td>
<td>151.88</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos Bay</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>GV-033/E/E010</td>
<td>124172433697</td>
<td>132.56</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos River</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>ESP013</td>
<td>124151433636</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos River</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>ESP012</td>
<td>124151433636</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos River</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>ESP011</td>
<td>124151433636</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adjacent to centerline within ROW</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos River</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>BSP119</td>
<td>124169543342</td>
<td>687.08</td>
<td>HDS</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Coos River</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>BSP119</td>
<td>124169543342</td>
<td>687.08</td>
<td>HDS</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>BSP104</td>
<td>124150433622</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>BSP105</td>
<td>124167543317</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>DSP001</td>
<td>124167543317</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>DSP002</td>
<td>124165433351</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Stock Slough (Meadow Ranch Slough)</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>DSP002</td>
<td>124165433351</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Slough</td>
<td>10.14, 10.15, 10.21</td>
<td>BSP088</td>
<td>124157433361</td>
<td>145.23</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>R2B/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasture Pond</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>BL084</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adjacent to centerline within ROW</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>PUDYx</td>
<td>Stock Pond</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catching Slough</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>BSP079</td>
<td>124157243328</td>
<td>256.30</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Conventional Bore</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>BSP114</td>
<td>124186843318</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>BSP103</td>
<td>124156543318</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>BSP101</td>
<td>124156543318</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>BSP100</td>
<td>124156543318</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R2C/Hx</td>
<td>Perennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>NS184</td>
<td>124156433318</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>Dry Open-Cut</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R4C/Hx</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>NS192</td>
<td>124156433318</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>Adjacent to centerline within ROW</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R4C/Hx</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>NS193</td>
<td>124156433318</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Adjacent to centerline within ROW</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R4C/Hx</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe to Catching Slough</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>NS194</td>
<td>124156433318</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adjacent to centerline within ROW</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>R4C/Hx</td>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2
December 4, 2008

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St., NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

Ref: OEP/DG2E/Gas 3
Jordan Cove Energy Project, L.P.
Docket Nos. CP07-444-000
Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline Project, L.P.
Docket No. CP07-441-000
FERC/EIS-0223D

Dear Ms. Bose,

The Board of Directors has asked me to provide these comments on the Jordan Cove Energy Project and Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline Project located in Coos Bay, Oregon. The Association takes no position as to the merits of these projects, but feels that certain aspects of the proposals that affect watershed concerns need to be addressed.

1. The August, 2008 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) states in numerous places that the proposed Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline “has been primarily aligned along ridgelines and watershed boundaries where it would traverse the Coast and Cascade Mountain Ranges” (cf. §4.3-37). This design criterion will likely minimize watershed effects by reducing the number of stream and wetland crossings. However, we are concerned that in the Coos Bay Frontal HUC 5th Field this approach was not used.

2. Based on the FERC comment on the Proposed Route requesting that the preferred pipeline route be Alternative WC-1A, we would like to provide information related to the environmental effects of this route. This route crosses two significant streams (Kentuck Slough and Willanch Slough), both of which have high value for coho salmon. The area downstream from the proposed for the crossing at Willanch Slough is presently being considered for a Wetland Mitigation Bank, while the area upstream has had significant and successful riparian restoration projects. The route down Lilenthal Creek (T.25S.;R.12W., Sections 20 and 30) will cross the entirety of the Brunschmid Wetland Reserve Project (WRP) that has a perpetual easement held by the U.S.D.A. Farm Services Agency. This site has had significant restoration work during 2008 and will be completed in the winter of 2009.
Juvenile coho salmon were found during fish surveys in this wetland. Across East Bay Drive, and hydrologically connected to the Brunschmid WRP are high quality tidal fringe wetlands (low and high salt marsh) adjacent to the Cooston Channel that have also been identified as having potential for long-term protection and enhancement. Additional details on watershed conditions in the proposed routes for this area can be found in the Coos Bay Lowlands Assessment and Action Plan on our website (www.cooswatershed.org/publications).

3. Once it crosses the Coos River the proposed pipeline route will traverse lowlands adjacent to Catching Slough and its tributaries (approximately MP 8.25 to MP 18). These areas provide some of the most significant current lowland habitat for coho and Chinook salmon rearing, potential wetland restoration opportunities, and needed riparian restoration to reduce summer stream water temperatures. Of particular importance are Stock Slough (MP 10.1), the crossing in lower Catching Slough (MP 11), and Boone Creek (MP 15.75). All these streams and sloughs are used by coho salmon, and the adjacent riparian areas provide resources for these fish and other aquatic life. Additional information on these resources is found in the recently completed Catching Slough Assessment and Action Plan in the Publications section of our website.

4. Consistent with Comments #1, #2, and #3 above, we would like to see a thorough analysis (rather than “desktop”) of the Blue Ridge Alternative Route at the same level of detail as the Proposed Route. Further, this route should be amended to include a ridgeline alignment beginning at approximately MP 8 on the Land Route (and WC-1A) in Section 20 (T.25S.;R.12W.) and joining with the Blue Ridge Route Variation in Section 33 (T.25S.;R.12W.). This route would avoid the impacts to lowland areas (particularly wetlands), while reducing the number of stream crossings. This “Amended Blue Ridge Alternative Route” largely follows the ridgeline between the Catching Slough and Daniels Creek watersheds, and is consistent with the design strategies identified in the DEIS to reduce environmental impacts. Information on the environmental resources in Daniels Creek is available in our Daniels Creek Assessment and Action Plan on our website.

The Coos Watershed Association is interested in working with FERC, Jordan Cove Energy, and Williams Pipeline consistent with our mission to “support environmental integrity and economic stability within the Coos watershed.” In addition to our watershed assessments and restoration action plans, we have a deep knowledge of local conditions and landowner concerns in the project area in the Coos Bay Frontal watershed, as well as experience in designing and implementing water quality and habitat restoration and road upgrade projects. We would be happy to discuss such possibilities with the project proponents as plans progress.

Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have questions or need additional information.

Cordially,

Jon A. Souder, Ph.D.
Executive Director

Cc: CoosWA Board of Directors
Exhibit 3
August 11, 2009

Commissioners
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

Via E-Filing

In Re: Letter requesting a FERC staff visit and inspection of my property
Docket Number: CP207-208-000

I'm trying to get you at the FERC to understand the ramifications of your permitting process and to formally request a site visit and inspection by the FERC staff. Since facts pertaining to this project end up no better than a proverbial volleyball I chose instead to begin with an analogy to better help you understand my plight.

Picture in your mind a prized possession of your own. A cherished picture of you and your grandfather, a blanket knitted for you by your grandmother, for my example, I'm using your family pet - your best friend Bob the Jack Russell Terrier. Now, picture a knock on your door, which you open to find an unsolicited stranger accompanied by an official from the Federal Government. The stranger informs you that he wishes the use of your Bob for an interminable period and will pay you a fair price for that use. You politely decline because in your mind Bob is irreplaceable and no such value can be assigned to the emotional attachment you hold to this dog, after all you raised him from a puppy and he only answers to you. The nice person from the government assures you that the stranger is perfectly fit to care for your dog and has in fact filed with the government a document detailing the feeding, caring, vet visits etc. to insure the well being of your dog. You again decline whereupon the stranger explains to you that if you don't take his most reasonable offer, he will, with the Federal Government's blessing sue you in Federal court to take your dog. So, reluctantly you settle with the stranger.

Remember, the stranger just wanted the use of your dog - he's not keeping it for good, you still get to see it there in the yard every day. Over time you notice that Bob's getting a little skinny. A call is made to the stranger's "people" because by now the stranger is too busy to talk personally to you, you're assured that the feeding program is just as it's supposed to be. Now its winter and it appears Bob has no shelter and his kennel has not been cleaned in weeks, you make a call and are again assured everything is according to planned. Returning home from business trip you arrive to find that Bob has been hit by a car and as a result now have only the use of 3 legs. The neighbor comes over to tell you that the dog laid in its kennel for the 2 days before being taken for treatment. Infuriated, you call the nice people at the Federal Government to demand an investigation - you're told that the stranger hires his own inspectors and that these inspectors have yet to note anything amiss on the part of the stranger.

In the end, the stranger remands Bob back to your care. Relieved, you take him to the vet whereupon you learn that due to the poor treatment of the leg wound he'll never be able to run again and that he's apparently now deaf in both ears due to untreated pneumonia accompanied by malnutrition. Now remember, you were compensated for A DOG, not necessarily YOUR DOG and by God even though he can't run or hear you've still got your dog.

In granting Rockies Express Pipeline its Certificate of convenience this is what you've done to me, only it's not my dog, it's my property and it will never be the same again:

- To quote a neighbor - our county roads look like the aftermath of an extended bombing campaign

- Literally tons of mud has been washed into my once pristine pond due to substandard erosion control measures on the part of REX. I've pointed this out to your staff who then call REX which then makes a token effort and assures your staff all is fine yet the problem resurfaces with every rainfall.
• I'm now looking at 1300' gaping scar running through my property which after our last rain now looks more like a Martian landscape than the once beautiful pasture it used to be.

• Water now openly runs in my field where field tiles have been missed.

• And to top it all off for those of you fellow allergy sufferers, ragweed season is now upon us in Central Indiana and due to REX's utter lack of stewardship over their easement I've got an mound of dirt 1300' long and up to 20 feet high fully stocked with 8' tall stands of giant ragweed just ready to bombard us with noxious pollen.

I feel it's time for your agency to come see all of this for yourself as my prior words and pictures have apparently fallen short - in fact, I've yet to see any evidence of my calls to your Hotline or the Indiana Department of Environmental Management so much as appear on this docket. At this point, I'd like to ever so politely demand a site visit by the FERC staff. After all your staff had no problem flying out here to assist REX in its efforts to finalize a route for this pipeline. Now it's time for you to witness the aftermath.

Should you feel inconvenienced by this request, please keep this in mind, since I initially met your staff at Greenwood Middle School in the summer of 2007 I have endured:

• A cancelled family trip over spring break to appear in Federal Court after having been wrongfully sued by REX.

• Missing spending my wedding anniversary with my wife on July 28, 2008 because REX felt it necessary to negotiate my easement prior to August 1, 2008

• 4-5 months of heavy machinery operating right outside my bedroom - our house is situated in a remote location, we didn't need curtains on the windows.

• Waking up on Christmas morning to the sound of, no - not sleigh bells but the sound of a generator on a REX subcontractor's x-ray rig right outside our bedroom window.

Please, I understand that we "affected landowners" represent more of an inconvenience to your agency than anything else. We won't benefit your career networking strategy, have nothing to offer in the way of resume enhancement and probably have no interest in hiring any of you in the future. Just the same, we do pay taxes and have been known to vote on occasion - so at the very least would you be kind enough to at least afford us the status we've earned as U.S. citizens?

I would appreciate a response one way or another as to whether you wish to accede to my request at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Michael B. Hardamon
Exhibit 4
Pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.214, Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC hereby respectfully moves to intervene in the June 6, 2013 application of Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline, L.P. in the above referenced dockets. In support hereof, Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC states the following:

I. Identity/Contact Information

Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC is an Oregon Limited Liability Corporation who owns real property consisting of forestland in Coos and Douglas Counties, Oregon. All communication can be forwarded to:

Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC
P.O. Box 10265
Eugene, OR 97440
ATTN: Monica Jelden
Phone: (541)461-6216
e-mail: mjelden@senecasawmill.com

II. Declaration of Interest

Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC is a family owned company that owns forest land to supply fiber to its sawmill facilities located near Eugene and Noti, Oregon, as well as a renewable energy cogeneration plant located near Eugene, Oregon on a sustained yield basis. These facilities provide living wage jobs for over 300 employees, while our business operations extend and employ a multitude of independent contractors and contribute importantly to the local economies in Lane, Douglas and Coos counties.

The proposed pipeline route directly dissects nine tax lot parcels of Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC property, affecting over 2,000 acres of our forest land. Additionally, the pipeline will utilize, construct and improve transportation routes on Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC property, affecting another eight tax lot parcels, consisting of 1,000 acres. Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline’s transportation routes across the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service also affect the ability to move and transport timber from these forest lands. As a result, we have a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding.
III. Basis for Intervention

Our concerns include, but are not limited to, the following direct social, economic and environmental impacts placement of this pipeline will have on Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC’s forests.

- Our forest is managed on a long-term sustained yield rotational basis and an annual harvest level is derived based on the number of timber growing acres. Any reduction in these acres will reduce harvest levels, while our mill facilities still require the same level of fiber to maintain both customer needs and employee positions. Over the years, the timber industry in Oregon has experienced devastating effects due to reduced harvest levels on public lands. This requires that we maintain adequate private timber growing ground for our facilities. A reduction in timber growing ground is a serious concern for our operations. Although, Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline indicates they can adequately compensate our loss; our sawmills and cogeneration facility need fiber rather than cash to operate on a long-term continual basis without negative economic impacts. We approached Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline at the onset of this project seeking an opportunity to trade lands and maintain the economic viability of our business. On May 9, 2013, we received official notification from Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline on their lack of interest in such a proposal. Obviously, Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline places a greater emphasis on their business venture versus Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC’s business, which has served Oregon well for approximately 60 years. The allowance of one business venture to succeed should not be at the detriment of other established local businesses.

- In addition to the direct installation of the pipeline, our forest land operations will be impacted by temporary extra work areas. These temporary extra work areas come in two types, one is to mobilize equipment and conduct construction work, while the other is a rock fall area. On steep slopes, Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline’s project takes into account and anticipates rock falls. Human safety, both to our employees and the public, is a weighty concern in these areas that are identified as rock fall areas, not to limit and consider the added liability risk.

- The placement of gas pipelines located on forest properties requires the timber industry to modify and employ atypical harvest methods, as characteristically the gas pipeline is located on the same ridge line in which a forest landowner must place its equipment or construct access. Topographical features, such as soils and slopes, can limit the number of viable equipment placement sites. In many circumstances, only one location may be available and/or feasible. Finding new alternatives can be costly to a business and will consequently increase operational costs. Long-term experience shows that gas pipeline installers are extremely reluctant to allow forest yarding operations and/or the hauling of heavy equipment across underground gas lines. Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline requests that landowners identify alternatives or determine in advance potential crossing locations in order to bolster these areas, placing the burden on the landowner without adequate cost recovery. Our forestlands and access routes are prominently impacted in a search for alternative solutions, which comes at an increased operational cost.

- The timber industry and the government have entered into access agreements to provide mutual utilization of transportation systems. Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline’s
use of these transportation systems are likely to impede and perhaps hamper Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC's ability to move its timber, an economic concern that is difficult to measure. Placement of the pipeline facilities crossing both these lands and roads is another concern, which will place unnecessary obstructions in our requests for additional construction, tailhold requests and use of existing roads on public lands under existing, established agreements. We have already seen significant disparity on the construction and proposed use of public lands by Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline versus requests by the timber industry. For example, due to environmental concerns, the construction of new roads on public lands outside of an agreement is virtually impossible and deemed as ground disturbing activities. The ardent process is so difficult and time consuming, we seldom make such a request and explore whatever alternatives might be available, despite increased cost and potentially greater environmental concerns. While the timber industry has a long standing cooperative relationship with both public agencies, United States Forest and the Bureau of Land Management, the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline is essentially a new entity locally, however, both of these public agencies are modifying their Region Management Plans to accommodate the project in sensitive environmental areas. Neither public agency would go to this measure to accommodate the timber industry's needs.

- Pipeline construction will likely require significant aggregate resources. Local aggregate resources are a non-renewable resource, which are at a premium. The pipeline construction needs will likely generate an increase in prices to forestland owners, who will be competing for the same product without economic reimbursement.

- Construction of the proposed pipeline will create substantial ground disturbing activities. While much of the excavated material will be returned to resurface the pipeline, significant portions will require creation of "waste areas" in stable areas. Stable areas suitable for waste sites are extremely limited in the forest. With the pipeline project utilizing what sites are available, the timber industry will be faced with fewer sites available in the future, increasing our costs and requiring movement of this material in greater distances.

- Pipeline corridors quickly become brushy areas with a high level of invasive species, such as scotch broom and blackberries. This project proposes reestablishing the pipeline right-of-way with grass. During the dry season, these grasses and brush varieties can contribute a substantial slash component that will be susceptible to forest fires. Fire behavior in these types of fuel loads can spread quickly and will increase the risk to Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC's forest land. The potential for invasive species to spread to our property requires mitigation to maintain tree growing sites and increases our operational costs.

- Pipeline corridors encourage off highway vehicle traffic and year round public entry into private forest lands. Unwanted traffic can lead to sedimentation issues and increased risk of fire on adjacent forestlands.

- Our experience with catastrophic wildfires clearly demonstrates that scorching of subsoils can occur to depths as much as three feet, along with retainage of perceptible temperatures in these soils. To suppress fire, often times heavy equipment is utilized to dig and turn over soils to adequately distribute the heat and suppress the fire. These normal suppression efforts will be impeded with the placement of a gas pipeline. The
risk of fire in these proposed pipeline locations is a very potential reality in forested areas and a serious concern, both economically and more importantly, from a safety perspective.

- Given the high pressure content, pipeline construction standards through forest land properties should match urban construction standards to prevent and minimize possible pipeline breach and/or ruptures due to heavy equipment operation or other natural phenomena, such as earthquakes or landslides, as an added effort to protect the valuable timberland resource lying adjacent to the located pipeline. Additionally, it is important to minimize re-entry and repairs in order to minimize loss of growth to our continually growing resource. The perception of less risk can be countered with resources to prevent damage in the forest are often miles away and any measures that can be employed to minimize damage should be considered a necessity at the onset of the project.

- Recent studies suggest that gas pipeline installations emit methane, a greenhouse gas. Our discussions with the Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline have failed to address either the quantity or direct and indirect impacts of methane gas releases on our sustainable forestry practices and how this will impact the resource on a long-term basis.

- Placement of a pipeline on Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC's forest land will diminish land values and have a potential to negatively impact resale. Disturbance of existing seedlings and tree stock within unintended timeframes contributes to significant loss of growth and affects our timber inventory modeling.

- As a traditional example, when an operator approaches Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC for use of its land on a commercial basis, as in the case of miscellaneous products, typically a fee is charged based on the revenue received by the operator, customarily 10-20%. In this case, Pacific Connector Gas Pipeline is offering a one-time payment while continuing to derive profit from the use of our property for many years to come as the pipeline will be capable of delivering up to 1,060,000 dekatherms per day of natural gas to the proposed Jordan Cove LNG Export Terminal. However, the underlying landowner is still responsible for property taxes on the pipeline area, despite an inability to effectively use the property as zoned. Assuming operational capacity, at $4.00/dekatherm, equates to potential revenue of $4,240,000 per day or $1,547,600,000 annually. Realizing that only approximately 3.5 miles of the proposed pipeline will cross Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC property, or approximately 1.5% of the total project ($23,214,000); at the customary rate of 10-20% we would be traditionally looking at revenues of $2,321,400 to $4,642,800 annually for use of our land, subject to negotiation and reasonable market escalation overtime.
IV. Conclusion

No other party will or can adequately represent Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC interests as an affected private landowner. Accordingly, we request that we be made a party to this proceeding and be permitted to intervene in this proceeding, with all rights attendant to such status.

Respectfully submitted this 9th of July, 2013.

Seneca Jones Timber Company, LLC.

By [Signature]
Title [Text]

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

We certify that on the 9th day of July, 2013, we filed by electronic filing this Motion to Intervene and ensured that it was served either electronically or by first class mail to each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Commission in the above-captioned proceeding.
Exhibit 5
The Compliance and Safety Records of Williams (WMB), Williams Partners L.P. (WPZ), Williams Midstream

- 2002 – Williams is reported to be in **financial distress** and on the **verge of bankruptcy** (38) (19)

- 2002 – Williams has class action **lawsuit** filed against it alleging that it **failed to disclose** failing financial conditions (33)

- 2003 – Williams **pays** $20 million (along with Encana Company) to settle claims of **reporting false data to manipulate** the U.S. natural gas market (25)

- 2004 – **FINED** $30,000 for a fire at a well in Parachute, Colorado (47)

- 2007 – Williams agrees to pay $290 million to settle class action **lawsuit** filed in 2002 (19) (32)

- 2008 – Natural gas **explosion** in Virginia [Transco] the blast ripped a 32-foot section of pipe from the ground and caused a 1,100 feet burn zone. **Property damage** reported to **exceed $3 million** (35)

- 2009 – **FINED** $952,000 for **failure to monitor** corrosion adequately with the Virginia pipeline explosion in 2008 (36) (43)

- 2010 – Transco Pipeline leak in Texas. **Leak was not reported for 4 days**. The 1/4 inch diameter leak caused a reported $57,000 in property damage. **Aerial patrol did not see the leak**. Found by an operator who saw some bubbles. (22)

- 2010 / 2011 – **FINED** $275 Thousand over **failing to implement** and/or maintain storm water **measures to prevent potential pollutants** during planned construction in Parachute, Colorado. State inspectors notified Williams (Bargath) in Nov. 2010 of violations and told them to take immediate action. According to report, **Williams did not fix violation for 7 months**. (8) (28)

- 2011 – **FINED** $23,000 by PHMSA for **failure to conduct own annual inspections** of Natural Gas compressors stations in Texas and Louisiana (18)

- 2011 – [Transco] Natural Gas Pipeline **rupture & explosion** in Alabama. **8 acres burn**. Coating failure blamed as cause. Reports state that the **corrosion was not recognized by Williams** even though they claimed to have systems in place. (2) (36)

- 2012 – Gas leak caused **explosion** at Natural Gas Compressor Station in Pennsylvania. **Williams restarts the station within 24 hours** and started pumping fracked gas **despite request** from PA Dept. of Environmental Protection **not to do so**. DEP states they make it very clear on the above matter but because it was not an official order no fines were issued. **1 ton of Methane released**. (2) (16)

- 2012 – Transco/Williams **FINED** $50,000 by PHMSA for **failure to follow own internal policies** with controlling corrosion in Natural Gas pipeline in NY (18)

- 2012 – Transco natural gas **leak** in New Jersey (18) (44)
• 2012 (Dec. 20) – The beginning of the Natural Gas Liquid (NGL) pipeline leak in Parachute, Colorado (population 1,000). Parachute Creek runs through the small town, which is nestled next to the Colorado River. (8)

• 2013 (Jan) – Williams discovers leak of NGLs in Parachute plant while working on construction to expand the plant. Reports say the leak was found by accident. Leak stopped, but Benzene, a cancer causing agent, has contaminated soil. Williams says leak not affecting creek. (8) (34)

• 2013 (March 8) – Williams begins cleanup (2 months later) of Benzene leak (NGL) in Parachute, CO. Authorities and landowners notified that the soil has been contaminated. No mention that groundwater is poisoned. Reports say that Williams didn’t report the spill/leak earlier because they thought less than 25 gallons had leaked. (8) (12)

• 2013 (March 15) – Groundwater in Parachute is contaminated with Benzene from NGL leak. Spill finally announced to public. Benzene is cancer-causing agent that breaks down bone marrow. (8) (20) (34) (41)

• 2013 (March) – Reports say Williams/Transco rejects U.S. Army Corp of Engineers safety recommendations in connection with the proposed Rockaway Lateral natural gas pipeline, claiming the requirements would “needlessly delay” the project and force cost overruns. (7)

• 2013 (March) – Williams Natural gas pipeline in West Virginia ruptures (30)

• 2013 (April) – Parachute, CO residents question credibility of Williams who is in charge of testing their water and want the government to take over. Contamination continues to spread into their creek. (8) (62)

• 2013 (April) – Williams say faulty pressure gauge cause of leak in Parachute. Diesel found at gates of Parachute water supply. Benzene detected in creek. State Health Dept takes over oversight of leak. (8) (9)

• 2013 (May) – Benzene levels rise in Parachute, CO creek. State agency tells Williams violated it the law. (8)

• 2013 (May) – Williams announces it will not expand the Parachute, Co plant expansion NOT because of the NGL leak but due to low gas prices. (8)

• 2013 (May 21) – Williams holds Analyst Day in New York City. CEO Alan Armstrong states they have been working on the Bluegrass pipeline project for about 9 - 10 months. Williams states Bluegrass Pipeline is BIG and it’s RISKY in terms of permitting. (45)

• 2013 (June 13) – Williams’ Natural Gas Liquid (NGL) cracker plant that process NGLs in Louisiana Explodes and Burns. That chemical plant was in middle of $350 million expansion. 700 contract workers were present; 2 people killed (ages 29 & 47); 70 injuries; 62,000 pounds of toxic chemical released (1) (4) (5) (6) (39)

• 2013 (June 14) – Investigations into Williams Louisiana explosion reveals three years of noncompliance with Federal Clean Air Act, Williams had NOT conducted an OSHA inspection in 10 years. (4) (14)
- 2013 (July 10) – Williams (Bargath) FINED $7,854 by OSHA for failing to protect workers they sent excavate toxic soil near the Williams’ Parachute, Co plant that leaked Benzene. Report states that Williams did not have a decontamination procedure or ensure its employees received safety training related to the spill. Williams states it has not agreed to or accepted OSHA’s allegations. (49)

- 2013 (July 13) – Benzene levels increase at a point in the Parachute, CO Williams NGL leak. 130 tons per day of contaminated soil has been stockpiled. (3)

- 2013 (July 20) – Report shows that Williams expects to remove and treat as many as 26 million gallons of groundwater over a half-year to a year at the site of its natural gas liquids leak alongside Parachute Creek. About 155,000 gallons of tainted groundwater removed in March has been disposed of in an injection well in Grand County, Utah. (52)

Sources

17. http://www.naturalgaswatch.org/?p=2056
   http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/CaseDetail_cpf_420111001.html?nocache=9859#_TP_1_tab_2
   http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/enforce/CaseDetail_cpf_120111015.html?nocache=9882#_TP_1_tab_2
20. http://wccongress.org/wcc/2013/05/30/parachute-creek-spill-overview/
Pipeline vs Rail & Truck

While accidents associated with the transportation of hazardous materials via rail and road are more frequent than pipeline incidents, rail and truck spills are limited to the amount of product that can be held in transit.

According to a review of data from the Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Administration (PHMSA) completed by the Association of American Railroads, total railroad crude oil spills between 2002-2012 equaled less than one percent of the total pipelines spills (railroads spilled 2,268 barrels total vs. pipelines spilled 474,441 barrels total). Additionally, during the same time period, average pipeline spills were four times larger than the average rail spill (average 65 barrels by rail vs. average 266 barrels by pipeline).
Exhibit 6
The World

The visitor industry’s contribution

OUR VIEW: A STRONG VISITOR INDUSTRY — JUST ONE MORE PART OF A GOOD ECONOMIC MIX

October 12, 2013

Members of the Coos Bay-North Bend Visitor and Convention Bureau met this week to review their 2013-14 marketing plan. With just a few tweaks here and there, the plan appears pretty solid, playing up the region’s unique offerings and benefits to visitors.

The plan, which covers the two towns plus Charleston, reconfirms our target markets: Baby boomers from the surrounding states, folks who like the outdoors and regional history. We’ve got plenty of both. The bureau also will be putting a bit more emphasis on the offerings of the downtown retail areas and the museums. We have two new features to look forward to: the Charleston Marine Life Center and the Coos Historical and Maritime Center, both scheduled to open next year.

There’s a lot more detail to the plan that we won’t go into here. You can see the plan yourself at: http://oregonsadventurecoast.com/

partners/.

The point is this: Oftentimes, visitors bureaus undertake a lot of effort, spend a lot of money and produce a resulting benefit on behalf of their regions that the folks at home are never aware of.

So, let’s look at some numbers:

The visitors bureau conducted a survey of visitors and potential visitors from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013. According to the survey, more than 20,000 visitors intended to stay in the area at least one night. The survey results estimated those individuals spent an average of $149 a day while here. The total — more than $16 million.

A different survey asked visitors to the bureau’s website about their plans to come here in the next 12 months, 64 percent of respondents planned on visiting. Nearly 91,000 visited the site. If those people follow through, that could be $56 million finding its way into the local economy.

We need a diverse economy in this region if we hope to improve the sagging employment numbers and high welfare rolls.

Having a strong and growing visitor industry is just one piece of the diversity we need.

(Emphasis added)