

---

# Appendix G. Questions and Concerns from the Public

No significant changes have been made to this section.

The questions and comments listed below are derived from the many questions and comments sent from the public as a result of the public meetings and publications made available to the public. In many instances, the questions and comments of various individuals addressed the same issue. These questions or comments were addressed with a single question or comment. Some of the questions were received while an Environmental Assessment (EA) was being worked on and some were received during the public comment period (and later) for this EIS. Thus, there are references to both an EA and EIS within this Appendix.

As much as possible, the questions and comments (within their respective sections) are arranged keeping similar topics together.

## Questions from the Public

### 1. Question:

Why is the pipeline route changed from the route proposed in the referendum (Hwy 42) submitted to the voters in November of 1999?

Answer:

The Highway 42 route was chosen by the County's bond issue consultant RMI Navigant, who also assessed the CBW Road. Navigant said the choice between the two routes was difficult but they narrowly preferred the Highway 42 route because of their belief environmental permitting would be easier — such is probably not the case. Relative to the original Highway 42 route, the now-preferred CBW Road is about 25 miles shorter, about \$20 million less expensive to construct, and the pipeline will be much less susceptible to third-party dig-in damage. The currently proposed route impacts far fewer streams and wetlands, and will not disrupt traffic on Highway 42 for thousands of travelers per day during construction. Additionally, worker safety will be greater on the CBW Road versus working on the Highway 42 route

### 2. Question: The questions of two individuals are addressed together in Question 2.

Given the current BPA moratorium on installation of pipelines in their ROW, what are the risks of having a natural gas pipeline in the vicinity of a power line ROW? Why are the risks not significant? Is it wise to use utility corridors for the pipeline corridor?

Answer:

The primary perceived risk of locating a gas pipeline near a power line is related to a gas explosion or fire which could possibly damage a tower or a conductor. Such events could also cause a forest fire, which could spread and cause damage to the electrical system. Natural gas pipeline incident statistics indicate that the risk for significant damage to occur to the BPA electrical system is very small. In fact, there has never been a report of such an incident in the history of gas pipeline safety regulation by the US DOT since 1970. Because the risk is insignificant compared with reduced impact on environment and population, most Federal, state and local government agencies prefer to have gas pipelines located in existing utility corridors, such as the preferred CBW Road/BPA/PP&L route.

### 3. Question:

Is it true the pipeline will be installed under an elementary school and within its playground located within the eastern end of the corridor? If so, what direct, indirect, or cumulative effects are involved at this location?

---

Answer:

The pipeline **will not** be installed under a school, nor will it be installed closer than 50 feet to any occupied building. The preferred route follows a PP&L power corridor which passes about 300 feet south of the Lookingglass School in Douglas County. Even a catastrophic failure of the pipeline could not be expected to damage the school at that distance.

**4. Question:** The questions of two individuals are addressed together in Question 4.

Is the Environmental Assessment study assessing the impacts on county and private lands (including infringement of rights held by private land owners) located along the proposed pipeline corridor?

Answer:

The environmental study must, by law, assess the impacts of the proposed pipeline on all lands, regardless of ownership. The entire 60-mile route is reviewed, even though the current proposal will only impact approximately 3 miles of BLM land.

**5. Question:**

Will this pipeline cause future problems if roads in which it is constructed are closed, restored or recontoured?

Answer:

There is almost no chance of any road along the preferred route being closed. If the road is closed, the pipeline will not be impacted. If restored or recontoured, the location of the pipeline will be considered when the work is done.

**6. Question:**

What rural fire protection access is available along the pipeline route (in the event of an pipeline accident causing a fire)?

Answer:

Rural Fire Departments are located at Lookingglass, Dora, and Fairview. Fire equipment is also located at Winston and Roseburg in Douglas County, and Coquille, Myrtle Point, Millington and Coos Bay in Coos County. Federal regulations (49CFR 192.615) provide that local emergency response personnel be informed about the pipeline location and operations and be involved in the development of emergency response plans for the pipeline.

**7. Question:** The questions of two individuals are addressed together in Question 7.

In the event of a gas line explosion or a leakage causing stream pollution, will the county have insurance coverage for such an event? Could you please explain the likely process for cleaning up surface or ground water polluted from a natural gas leakage? What consideration will be given to fish kill and fish or marine habitat destruction? Will such an event be a taxpayer liability?

Answer:

Natural gas is composed of inert components and consequently does not pollute or dissolve into water. Natural gas is 35% lighter than air. Any gas leak from the pipeline would pass through the soil or groundwater and then dissipate into the air. There is usually no effect of a gas leak on habitat, fish or wildlife. A catastrophic failure of this 12-inch pipeline at its usual operating pressure may cause surface damage within about 50 feet of the rupture. The gas escaping from a pipeline rupture could explode or otherwise burn if a source of ignition is contacted by the gas; therefore, a larger area could be affected by a fire. Once the gas flow is shut off, there would be no residue left from the gas. In comparison, a petroleum liquids pipeline rupture would spill products that could leave behind residual product that would require a "clean-up" operation even after the pipeline had been shut off. With regards to taxpayer liability, Coos County will carry general liability insurance to cover potential losses and to limit taxpayer liability.

---

**8. Question:**

Given the fact construction activities are noisy, are the sensitive raptors, protected under the Endangered Species Act, given full consideration in the Environmental Assessment regarding their need for quiet nesting habitat (Spring survey requirements, for example)?

**Answer:**

Any effects of construction, including noise and dust, will be of a short duration. For a typical quarter mile section of pipe, the entire construction sequence will likely be started and finished within a week. Coos County has agreed to abide by any time-of-day and time-of-year restrictions on work for raptors and other species. All sensitive and T&E sites have been identified through surveys, and these are directly addressed in the Terrestrial Biological Assessment (for the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Letter of Concurrence) and the Environmental Assessment.

**9. Question:**

What are the current decisions and contingencies of the communities of Coquille, Myrtle Point, Bandon and North Bend regarding their commitment to hook up secondary (feeder) pipelines to the proposed pipeline?

**Answer:**

Refer to the answer given for Question 10 for information regarding North Bend hookups. Coquille and Myrtle Point are included in the NW Natural exclusive territory. NW Natural has agreed to terms with Coos County that will require NW Natural to perform market surveys in each community and to construct a substantial distribution system in each town within 3 years of Coos County starting construction of the pipeline. Bandon distributes electricity within its incorporated area, and they have asked to be removed from NW Natural's expanded territory application with OPUC. Bandon will be asked to decide who (if any entity) will distribute gas in Bandon, before their pipeline lateral is built from Coquille.

**10. Question:**

Exactly where (street location) are the "city gates" for the pipeline's natural gas deliveries to the cities of Coos Bay, North Bend, Coquille, and Myrtle Point?

**Answer:**

The exact location of "gate stations" will depend on the availability of a small parcel (about 50 feet square) of land. A gate station is currently planned near Ocean Blvd. in the Coos Bay / North Bend area on Water Board property. The Coquille and Myrtle Point gate stations would be along Highway 42 or existing railroad grade corridors.

**11. Question:**

Is Bandon planning to hook up to the proposed pipeline?

**Answer:**

There are no definitive plans for Bandon, until it decides its fate (refer to the answer given for Question 9).

**12. Question:**

Will all the pipeline laterals (to areas other than Coos Bay) be in place when taxpayers begin paying down the bond for the pipeline's costs?

**Answer:**

Yes. The laterals are included in the current project plan and cost estimates, and will be built soon after the mainline construction begins.

**13. Question:**

Will the lateral pipelines to these "gates" impact more BLM lands?

---

---

Answer:

The laterals will not be located on BLM or other Federal land.

**14. Question:** The questions of several individuals are addressed together in Question 14.

Given the fact (the policy decision) the proposed natural gas pipeline is supposed to attract heavy industry to the County, due to the newly available supply of “cheaper energy” (natural gas), how are the following questions answered:

- a. What is driving this desire for attracting heavy industry as opposed to being content with attracting industries whose needs are met with the fiber-optic line recently established?

Answer:

Natural gas will benefit ALL energy users in the service area, from existing industries to schools, hospitals and public buildings, restaurants and other businesses, and individual homes. Any business - “heavy” or “light” - will benefit if energy costs are lower.

- b. What are the motives of the major participants promoting this policy?

Answer:

Coos County government and community leaders wish to stabilize the local economy by making the area more attractive to new and established commerce through lower energy costs.

- c. Are land use planning considerations (state regulations) being utilized to determine industrial siting?

Answer:

Coos County is required to follow all land use regulations.

- d. Will the U.S.A. trend toward more tourism and less manufacturing cause this policy to fail simply because it is based on a false premise for promoting economic development?

Answer:

Without regard to the “U.S.A. trend toward to more tourism and less manufacturing”, “manufacturing” is not the only type of economic development that could possibly be attracted to Coos County as a result of the natural gas pipeline project.

- e. Does the Environmental Assessment assess heavy industry’s impacts (direct, indirect, and cumulative effects) to the estuary, to the waters of Coos Bay, and to the waters of the oceanline?

Answer:

No. The Environmental Assessment must consider impacts enabled by the pipeline construction, but it does not address speculative issues such as the impact of any or all of the thousands of possible industrial processes which use natural gas. Once a specific project is proposed, the impact of that project would be addressed in a separate document.

- f. Does the Environmental Assessment assess industry-caused impacts to the visual, sound and air quality of the region surrounding the industrial park (the airport area, and the North Spit)?
-

---

Answer:

No. It is not possible to know what future industries, if any, will locate in the area. It is accurate to state that any use of natural gas will reduce air pollution from existing processes and energy uses.

- g. Does the Environmental Assessment assess the impact to the County if retirees move out of the County to get away from the heavy industry?

Answer:

No. It is not possible to state whether a possible future industry would change the quality of life in Coos County, as this is speculative. If a new industry or business is recruited for Coos County, the environmental impacts (if any) will have to be weighed against the economic impacts (if any) of the quality and quantity of jobs brought in.

- h. Does the Environmental Assessment assess the impact of new heavy industry on the fishing and tourism industry already established in the County?

Answer:

No, that would be a speculative assessment.

- i. Does the Environmental Assessment assess the potential for increases in the already-high risk and high incidence of lung cancer, bronchial asthma and other respiratory problems known to exist in the County?

Answer:

Yes. Since most existing energy needs other than from electricity are supplied through fuel oil, bunker fuel and wood waste, the use of cleaner-burning natural gas is expected to improve air quality.

**15. Question:** The questions of two individuals are addressed together in Question 15.

Are the road systems and the railroad system leading to the potential industrial sites (the North Spit and the airport areas) adequate for the required shipments of raw materials and finished products.

Answer:

This issue is not pertinent to this Environmental Assessment.

**16. Question:**

What will be done with the industrial waste produced by the heavy industry this pipeline is supposed to attract? What level of toxic wastes from these newly introduced industries (utilizing natural gas) will be allowed to flow into the waters, the air or the soils? Will the release of such toxic wastes cause a transition from “acceptable” to “significant and unacceptable” levels of change in the ecosystems of the bay (including its estuaries) and the population (people and wildlife)?

Answer:

These issues are not addressed in the Environmental Assessment, since they are not pertinent to the proposed action, which is construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline. The question issues regarding toxic wastes would be addressed through the permitting process when a specific project is proposed.

---

**17. Question:** The questions of two individuals are addressed together in Question 17.

Since the private sector found this pipeline project to be economically infeasible, and since the County failed to properly manage the land fill/incinerator facility (referring to the recent embezzlement case), what makes the County believe it will succeed in proper management of the proposed pipeline operation (which should include economic success)?

Answer:

No private company would bear the risk of the pipeline investment without a guaranteed market. The Coos County project cannot be slowly developed - it is 50 miles of pipe to the first customer of any size. Most pipeline and utility companies, such as Williams and NW Natural, have dozens of projects which can earn their expected rates of return, so there is no reason for them to take much risk. The State of Oregon granted the project \$24 million to aid in economic development. With that grant covering most of the risk, the project is feasible. The County plans to contract operations and maintenance of the pipeline to experienced pipeline operators. Additionally, the County will have contracts with shippers that will ensure recovery of operating expenses.

**18. Question:**

Do we really want the County owning another utility (the gas pipeline)? Is not this a trend toward more Socialism? Do the principles of Socialism really work?

Answer:

Without speculating on the “principles of Socialism”, the concept of publicly owned utilities is very well proven. Most cities and towns own and operate their own water and sewer systems. Much of the country’s electricity distribution is done by not-for-profit public agencies such as City of Bandon, Coos-Curry Electric and the Bonneville Power Administration. Also, the “utility” function will be served by NW Natural, not Coos County. Coos County will not be directly involved with the distribution of natural gas to the public, but rather only the transportation of natural gas to NW Natural.

**19. Question:**

Is there really enough evidence to support a likely improvement to the economic status of Coos County once the proposed pipeline is established?

Answer:

There are dozens of pipeline extensions around the U.S. with which to compare the Coos County pipeline. In each case, natural gas captures a significant portion of the heating load within the first few years. Refer to the economic analysis in this Environmental Assessment for quantitative evidence supporting economic improvements to the County from the pipeline. (Note: The economic analysis is contained in Chapter 4 of the EIS).

**20. Question:** The questions of several individuals are addressed together in Question 20.

Does the Environmental Assessment include an assessment for each of the tax implications listed below?

- a. The tax burden to the County residents will be increased, due to the passage of ballot measure # 6-63 (Nov. 1999). Indirect tax increases may result, due to the need for road improvements to accommodate the needs of heavy industry, which might be attracted to the County.

Answer:

The EA is not required to review a ballot measure already voted upon. The County residents voted in a 1999 double majority (i.e., more than half the registered voters voted, and a majority of those voting approved the measure) to authorize up to \$27 million in county bonds to fund the balance of the pipeline project. Roads and road improvements are paid for with gas tax monies only.

- 
- b. The tax burden could shift if new large employers - coming to invest in the “Enterprise Zone” of the Coos Bay/North Bend area - are given 15 years of exemption from real estate taxes, plus a 62% payroll tax credit.

Answer: This issue is not pertinent to the EA.

- c. The impact of the tax burden (imposed from passage of the bond initiative approved for the pipeline project) as it relates to the scenario which lacks major industrial commitments to purchase natural gas.

Answer:

The county has committed that the pipeline will not be built unless the annual operating expenses will be covered by gas transporters. NW Natural has agreed to this concept. Thus, the lack of a major industrial commitment will not affect the County’s coverage of operation and maintenance costs (O&M costs), nor will it change the cost of the project or repayment of county bonds.

- d. Changes to real estate values (especially to properties of the North Spit, where heavy industry is expected to locate its facilities).

Answer:

This issue is highly speculative, and it is not part of the EA.

**21. Question:**

Does the proposed action have potential of causing deregulation of electrical utilities in the state of Oregon?

Answer:

No.

**22. Question:** The questions of several individuals are addressed together in Question 22.

Does the Environmental Assessment address the economic concerns listed below?

- a. Changes to current market conditions — due to supply and demand — can and do occur; is the proposed action economically viable when such conditions change (including the pricing of natural gas, the pricing of alternate forms of energy, and the pricing of manufacturing raw materials which new industries attracted to Coos County might depend upon)?

Answer:

We do not expect the economics of the pipeline project to change over time. Please review the economic assessment in this EA (Chapter 4 of the EIS). Wholesale prices of energy media (natural gas, propane, fuel oil, electricity, bunker fuel, coal, wood waste) fluctuate widely. The major energy media are traded on the commodity markets, but the prices of each of the media are related closely to one another (i.e., pricing of propane relates to pricing of natural gas and oil, and pricing of electricity relates to pricing of coal and natural gas), and they are loosely related to all of the others. In the last three decades, those price relationships have been out of synchronization only briefly. There is no fundamental reason or mechanism which should change the relationship between natural gas and its alternate forms of industrial energy. Raw materials prices are largely connected to energy prices. Therefore, the component costs of manufacturing and commerce rise and fall together (in general).

- b. The proposed action could have adverse impact to existing businesses in Coos County.
-

---

Answer:

The EA includes an updated economic analysis done by ECO Northwest, which published earlier studies for use in the bond election (see Chapter 4 of the EIS). This analysis lists several propane and fuel oil businesses which may be adversely affected by natural gas availability. There are no other entities which are expected to be significantly and negatively impacted by this project.

- c. The gas distribution company's actions could adversely affect future pipeline operations. (Lack of commitment, for example, to invest sufficient funds for marketing and delivering the natural gas to a suitable customer base within the County).

Answer:

NW Natural has agreed to a contractual commitment to a significant construction and marketing effort which will result in widespread availability and use of natural gas.

**23. Question:**

What arrangements will ensure the pipeline's self-sufficiency (i.e., operating costs and contingency funds will be paid on an on-going basis)?

Answer:

Refer to the answer given for Question 20c.

**24. Question:** The questions of two individuals are addressed together in Question 24.

The proposed action needs "firm capacity demands" (For example, potential customers giving Letter of Intent to purchase natural gas, or the natural gas distribution company obligates itself to purchase the amount of gas required to make the County's costs for operating the pipeline economically viable) to assure its success over the first 5 years of its operation. Are such assurances being given?

Answer:

As long as the O&M costs are a contractual obligation paid by shippers (see 20c, 22c and 23 above), the County does not need "firm capacity demands" in order to pay operating and maintenance costs.

**25. Question:**

Will NW Natural pay the cost to extend the pipeline across the bay to the "North Spit"?

Answer:

Yes - NW Natural or some entity other than Coos County will pay for the cost of the connection to the North Spit.

**26. Question:**

What "surcharges" could be applied (by Northwest Natural Gas) to the gas users? Under what conditions would these surcharges be applied?

Answer:

There is currently no plan by NW Natural to charge a "surcharge" to Coos County natural gas customers.

**27. Question:**

Why was the MOU between the County and BLM not available to the public until four months after it was created?

Answer:

The MOU is a public document, which has been discussed for months. It has been available upon request

---

---

since its execution last summer.

**28. Question:**

Where is the County's "Plan of Development" for the proposed action?

Answer:

There is no section titled "Plan of Development" in the EIS, but wording equivalent to that required by a "Plan of Development" is included in EIS; incorporating descriptions of the project, the project route, and the construction processes required to complete the project.

**29. Question:**

Are the BPA studies (for the Draft EIS for the 500 kilowatt [Kw] transmission line project) truly qualified as a source of data for the Environmental Assessment of the proposed corridor, since this Draft EIS never received public review?

Answer:

The BPA process gathered a lot of pertinent information on the exact route now deemed the preferred route. The information also received public review through public meetings, although the EIS was never finalized. The Project Advisors and B.I.S., Inc. have added much pertinent information to the BPA efforts. All of the old and new data will be analyzed and available for review.

**30. Question:**

What assurances (documentation) can the following entities give to show an unbiased approach to the EIS (no financial interest will accrue to them upon acceptance of this project, and they have no other interest driving them toward causing the acceptance outcome of this project)?

- a). Coos Bay BLM District
- b). Pipeline Solutions Inc.
- c). Industrial Gas Services, Inc.
- d). BIS, Inc.
- e). Coos County Commissioners

Answer:

A statement of financial disclosure was submitted to the BLM for the Project Advisors (Pipeline Solutions, Inc., and Industrial Gas Services, Inc.) and for the environmental contractor, BIS, Inc. The Coos County Commissioners represent Coos County and, although Coos County will economically benefit from the proposed action, the Coos County Commissioners, as publicly elected officials, are prohibited by state law from personally receiving economic benefit from the proposed pipeline project. The Coos Bay BLM District is the agency overseeing development of the EA (and subsequent EIS) and thus can have no financial interest or benefit accruing from approval of the proposed pipeline project.

**31. Question:**

There have been indications that the proposed route will cross some Indian campgrounds and burial grounds. Have the affected tribes been consulted?

Answer:

The pipeline ROW were purposely chosen to avoid known Indian archaeological sites. The Indian tribes in Coos County have been consulted throughout the entire permitting process and will identify any areas of concern. Additionally, representatives from the Indian tribes will be on site or readily available during construction to help identify any archaeological sites located during construction.

---

**32. Question:**

Will the EIS determine the effects to the environment if the pipeline were subject to rain storms causing normal and abnormal landslides in the notoriously unstable Coastal Mountain range? The 100 year flood event must be considered.

Answer:

The pipeline ROW were purposely chosen to avoid potential slide areas. Geotechnical concerns, including the possible impact of a “100 year flood event”, have been addressed in the geotechnical report.

**33. Question:**

I am confused about the relationship of the different players, specifically: BLM, the County, Project Advisors, Pipeline Solutions, Inc., Industrial Gas Services, Inc., and Biological Information Specialists. The Information for Environmental Assessment states that the “Project Advisors cannot prepare the EA.” But the project advisors and the regional firm selected to prepare the EIS, BIS, have the same e-mail address. Is it true that the consultants, Industrial Gas Services and Pipeline Solutions have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the Environmental Analysis? Did they also sign a Statement of Financial Interest as required by 40 CFR 1506.5 (c)?

Answer:

Steve Shute is principal of Pipeline Solutions, Inc., and Steve and Bob Oxford are Vice President and President, respectively, of Industrial Gas Services, Inc. Both companies are jointly under contract with Coos County as Project Advisors.

Neither company has a financial ownership interest in the pipeline project nor has the BLM required either company to file a Statement of Financial Interest. In order to address the concern presented above, both companies have signed a Statement of Financial Interest and that Statement is on file with the BLM. Biological Information Specialists, Inc. (BIS) is a contractor hired by the County to perform the environmental work required by the BLM’s MOU and revised MOU. As a contractor performing environmental services, BIS has signed and filed a Statement of Financial Interest with the BLM. Brian Cox is the principal contact with BIS for the EIS work.

The “coosproj” e-mail address was set up as a convenient site to use when collecting comments during the EA process. All comments received at the coosproj address were also forwarded to the BLM and to BIS. Occasionally, a Project Advisor responded directly to comments received at the coosproj e-mail address but those comments were also forwarded to others involved in the project.

**34. Question:**

Will the Environmental Assessment be released by the BLM for public review?

Answer:

The EA was never completed and is not considered a final document by the BLM. Because the EA was not completed, it will not be released to the public. An EIS is being prepared and will be available to the public for review and comments.

**35. Question:**

I have concerns regarding the fact that the Environmental Assessment study plans to utilize studies done by BPA for the Transmission Line EIS but which have not even been published in draft form for public perusal. I question the use of such studies in a process which has the potential for bypassing public input.

Answer:

Questions about an EA are moot because the Coos Bay BLM has decided to abandon work on an EA and to begin work on an Environmental Impact Statement. The terms under which that work will be performed were clearly stated to the public and are addressed in the BLM’s revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Coos County. Terms and conditions under which Coos County may construct a pipeline in the BPA corridor are still under negotiation.

**36. Question:**

When the leak or explosion occurs deep in the back country, will we have insurance to cover such a disaster, and will this infringe on private property owners as well?

Answer:

Coos County will carry general liability insurance to cover damage incurred to property owned by others in the event of a pipeline leak or explosion.

**37. Question:**

Since the taxpayers bond is only to take the pipeline to the gates of the cities, is everyone in agreement that NW Natural will pay the cost to cross the bay and not the taxpayers?

Answer:

We do not know if “everyone is in agreement” but NW Natural has agreed with Coos County that NW Natural rather than Coos County will construct a pipeline across Coos Bay to the North Spit. Coos County pipeline construction funds will not be used to construct the Coos Bay pipeline crossing.

## Comments from the Public

**1. Comment:** The following comment is a compilation of the sentiments of several individuals.

WE DON'T NEED THE PIPELINE! The rationale supporting heavy industrial development, which the pipeline is supposed to attract, does not address the needs of the public. The chief asset to coastal southern Oregon - a high quality of life - will be threatened by the pollution of heavy industry. There are many concerned citizens who did not want the pipeline bond; the measure passed by a margin of 300+ votes - this is a small margin.

Response:

The EA does not address speculative issues or voting margins.

**2. Comment:**

We strongly support construction of the pipeline. Please do all you can to further this project.

Response:

Thank you for your positive support.

**3. Comment:**

I favor getting natural gas to Coos County, but I have concerns about the project's appearance of economic irrationality.

Response:

Please see the economic assessment in this EA (Chapter 4 of the EIS).

**4. Comment:**

The County officials have listed the following industries as “desirable heavy industry” for the County: Steel mills, and manufacturers of plastics, glass, and gypsum. It appears they will welcome any heavy industry. These heavy industries are also heavy polluters. There is no evidence the regulatory agencies (EPA and DEQ) will provide the County any locally tailored protection against these toxins.

Response:

The EA does not address speculative issues. It is unknown which industries may or may not attempt to develop facilities in the future.

---

**5. Comment:**

The availability of natural gas in Coos County will not, in and of itself, attract industry to the area.

Response:

Please see the economic assessment in this EA. This question has been addressed in numerous public meetings and it has been publicly stated that the availability of natural gas, in and of itself, is not the sole factor that any new business (“industry”) would use to determine whether or not to choose a site in Coos County.

**6. Comment:** The following comment is a compilation of the sentiments of several individuals.

We feel the process currently underway - Environmental Assessment of the pipeline project - is flawed. The public deserves ample opportunity to provide input after the release of the Environmental Assessment. When the Environmental Assessment explores the possible direct and indirect environmental and socio-economic effects of enabling establishment of heavy industry on the North Spit and near the airport, the need for a full Environmental Impact Study (an EIS) will be evident.

Response:

Please see the economic assessment in this EA (Chapter 4 of the EIS) and the response to Comment #4. Additionally, the BLM and Coos County have decided to prepare an EIS in consideration of these comments. The public will have the opportunity to review and comment on the EIS.

**7. Comment:**

This gas line is a very bad thing. It destroys the CBW Road, and it causes grave damage to the creatures inhabiting the proposed pipeline corridor.

Response:

Virtually no damage to the CBW Road or creatures in the corridor is anticipated. Any effects will be so insignificant as to be unmeasurable (i.e., negligible).

**8. Comment:**

The way natural gas prices are soaring, no one will be able to afford hooking up to the gas.

Response:

All forms of energy presently used in Coos County have suffered significant price increases during the past year.

**9. Comment:**

I would like to see this issue resubmitted to the voters of Coos County. The County Commissioners failed to properly inform the voters of all the pertinent factors prior to the original vote.

Response:

EAs do not assess public votes.

**10. Comment:**

We should ask for the help of Representative Peter DeFazio. He should oversee this Environmental Assessment process.

Response:

He is welcome to comment on this EA, as are all citizens.

**11. Comment:**

My family and I strongly support construction of the natural gas pipeline. The few noisy people...want nothing that will cost any taxes regardless of the long-term benefits of any project. They do not represent the majority of us in Coos County. Please do all you can to further this project.

Response:

Thank you for your support.

---