Emails pertaining to Gateway Pacific Project
For July 28-August 3, 2012
Thank you!

-----Original Message-----
From: Amy Keenan [mailto:akeenan@co.whatcom.wa.us]
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:24 AM
To: Hadley Rodero
Cc: Tyler Schroeder
Subject: Fwd: GPT suscriber List

Good Morning Hadley,

Here are our newest subscriber requests.

Thanks,

Amy Keenan, AICP
Senior Planner
Whatcom County
Planning and Development Services
Northwest Annex, Suite B
5280 Northwest Drive
(360) 676-6907

This e-mail message and any included attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, copy, use, disclosure, or distribution is STRICTLY prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.
Good Morning Hadley,

Here are our newest subscriber requests.

Thanks,

Amy Keenan, AICP
Senior Planner
Whatcom County
Planning and Development Services
Northwest Annex, Suite B
5280 Northwest Drive
(360) 676-6907
From: PDS
To: Amy Keenan
Date: 7/31/2012 12:56 PM
Subject: Fwd: GPT suscriber List
Attachments: GPT suscriber List

Included as party of record.
Irene Blomberg

Flower Mountain Services LLC

220 Snowberry Lane

Lopez Island, WA 98261

360-468-3902
Included as party of record.
Please add my email to your list and send me the updates, information, deadlines, et. al.

Thank you,
Richard Bisbee
Included as party of record.
From: Rhayma Blake <rhayma@me.com>
To: <pds@co.whatcom.wa.us>
Date: 7/31/2012 10:30 PM
Subject: GPT Subscriber List

Rhayma Blake
Hey Tyler... looks like we are behind. Can I please get July 14-July 20 and July 21-27th pulled over so I can post to the web.

Thank you.
This arrived in our offices and it does not appear that you received it directly.

Arden
WHEREAS, SSA Marine proposes to develop a coal and commodities export facility called Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT) located in Whatcom County near the Cherry Point area of Bellingham Washington; and

WHEREAS, Whatcom County, Washington Department of Ecology and the United States Corp of Engineers have entered into a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) to jointly promulgate a required Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and are currently scoping the EIS for the GPT project; and

WHEREAS, potential adverse impacts from the proposed GPT project, such as reduced air and water quality, increased noise levels, decreased ability to provide effective emergency response, increased risk of accidents, and impediments to transportation and pedestrian movements, will be experienced by communities along rail line corridors within the Puget Sound region; and

WHEREAS, the City of Edmonds is concerned about the probable adverse economic and environmental impacts to our community resulting from increased rail traffic; and

WHEREAS, as a result of future GPT operations, an addition of nine to eighteen coal related trains per day, each with up to four engines and 125 cars and/or 1.5 miles in length, would equate to approximately one additional coal train every 1.3 hours passing through Edmonds, all day long, in addition to existing and projected train traffic; and

WHEREAS, Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail lines run along 4.5 miles of Edmonds' coastline which is lined with single and multifamily homes, the Port of Edmonds, Edmonds Senior Center, Washington State Ferry
Terminal, Sound Transit and Community Transit Comuter Rail and Bus Station, City beaches and parks, including a nationally recognized 27-acre underwater dive park; and

WHEREAS, in Edmonds, Dayton and Main Streets/SR/104, critical arterial streets used to access the City's waterfront, intersect with an existing BNSF rail line and in the near future, two BNSF rail lines at grade, and these at-grade rail crossings slow the movement of people and goods between downtown Edmonds and the City's waterfront, thus creating mobility and safety hazards; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Street crossing is the primary access to the Port of Edmonds, Marina Beach Park, Olympic Beach Park, Edmonds Senior Center, restaurants, businesses, residential units, etc., and the Main Street/SR104 crossing serves as the access and exit corridor for the Washington State Ferry Terminal, 27-acre Underwater Dive Park, Edmonds Senior Center, restaurants, businesses, residential units, etc.; and

WHEREAS, under existing conditions and without the additional train traffic proposed by the GPT project, loading and unloading of vehicles at the Washington State Ferry Terminal are routinely disrupted by existing trains moving along the mainline railroad tracks and such vehicles must cross existing/future BNSF rail line(s), the only at grade crossing in the Washington State Ferry System, and the addition of nine to eighteen coal related trains per day will increase the disruption of loading and unloading of vehicles at the Washington State Ferry Terminal; and

WHEREAS, due to reduced train speeds through the City of Edmonds and the need to lower approach warning crossing barriers at Main and Dayton Streets simultaneously due to their close proximity, rail crossing barriers for each train at each controlled crossing would need to be down for approximately 6-8 minutes for 1.5 mile long freight trains; and

WHEREAS, with the number of all trains per day expected to increase from the current 40 (weekday average) to as many as 70 by 2020 and 104 in 2030, the City is concerned that increased rail traffic generated from the Gateway Pacific Terminal project has the potential to adversely affect local environment and economy of Edmonds in the following ways:

- Effective emergency response times could be threatened if response times for police and fire are interrupted more frequently, and for longer periods of time, due to the length of each train
- Reductions in overall system mobility, i.e., pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles, buses, freight, etc.
• Increased risk of accidents (due to increased train traffic through pedestrian and vehicular intersections)

• A significant increase in coal train traffic will more frequently delay general commerce, commuters, and other vehicular traffic, thus impacting economic sustainability, e.g., impediments to Washington State Ferries operations and freight mobility, decreased tourism and waterfront activities due to congestion, noise, blockage, etc.,

• Delays in existing commuter and passenger train service due to lack of double tracks through Edmonds

• Air and water quality and attendant health impacts due to fugitive coal dust from trains and increased diesel exhaust from the four engines needed to operate each coal train; and the impact of which on the health of Edmonds residents and visitors is yet to be determined; and

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDMONDS, WASHINGTON, HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. We ask that the potential impacts to Edmonds' public health, safety, economy, traffic, and environment be studied by the agencies conducting the environmental review and request that Edmonds be included in any EIS hearing schedule pertaining to any project in the Northwest that may cause significant increases in associated rail traffic traveling via Edmonds.

Section 2. We urge the United States Corps of Engineers, Washington Department of Ecology, and Whatcom County Council to hold at least one of the environmental impact statement scoping hearings in Edmonds and to conduct thorough studies which identify and measure the major impacts to the City of Edmonds that would result from a significant increase in coal train traffic, and that said agencies include the impacts of the proposed increase in rail traffic and those referenced in this Resolution in the scope of the EIS and public hearings at the various stages of the EIS process.

Section 3. The City of Edmonds hereby urges Whatcom County, Washington Department of Ecology, and United States Corp of Engineers to fully study impacts to Edmonds, including but not limited to increased traffic congestion and delays to residents and commerce (including Washington State Ferries operations), potential impacts from coal dust and other particulates, noise, mobility, etc., in the scoping of the EIS for the GPT project,
and that adverse impacts are fully mitigated.

Section 4. That the City of Edmonds requests that the railroad provide representatives to meet periodically with local citizen groups and local government officials from Edmonds to seek mutually acceptable ways to address local concerns.

Section 5. That the City of Edmonds requests that SSA Marine and BNSF identify any improvement plans related to grading, widening, or otherwise providing crossings at intersections that would be necessary to address/mitigate impacts caused by increases in rail traffic and require that SSA and BNSF mitigate impacts by funding the design and construction of these upgrades.

Section 6. That Washington State Department Transportation, Washington Utilities and Trade Commission, Burlington Northern Santa Fe, City of Edmonds, etc., study the issue of capacity and the threshold at which point train operations essentially render connectivity between the City’s downtown and Waterfront, SR104/Main Street and Washington State Ferry Terminal ineffective/inefficient/nonfunctional, and that the City’s Waterfront ceases to be a place that is easily accessible and can be enjoyed by businesses, restaurants, visitors, tourists, residents, etc.

Section 7. That the City of Edmonds be made a Party of Record for all aspects of the environmental and permitting phases of the GPT project.

RESOLVED this 17th day of July, 2012

A

DAVID O. EARLING

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:

SANDRA S. CHASE
CITY CLERK, SANDRA S. CHASE

FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK: 07-13-2012
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: 07-17-2012
RESOLUTION NO. 1280
Hi Tyler,

I have heard that the lead agencies will be meeting with stakeholders soon. Who are the stakeholders? Are any of the cities included?

Thank you,

Jana Hanson
Hi Alice,

Thank you for your reply. I would be happy to assist in identifying possible meeting locations in San Juan County.

Please be sure that the full San Juan County Council is included in the notice about the scoping meetings:
council@sanjuanco.com
And also our Administrator Pro Tem, Bob Jean:
obbj@sanjuanco.com
Thank you for your work on this!

Lovel Pratt
San Juan County Council, District 1
Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor
Phone: 360-370-7473
Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.

From: Kelly, Alice (ECY) [mailto:AKEL461@ECY.WA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 1:32 PM
To: Lovel Pratt
Cc: Dewell, Jane (ORA); Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us; Perry, Randel J NWS; Summerhays, Jeannie (ECY)
Subject: FW: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Lovel,

The three co-lead agencies are currently developing the plan for scoping meetings. No final decisions have been made yet. When the scoping notices are ready for public distribution, we will put out press releases and inform the media, as well as inform those who have contacted us via email and US mail. The scoping notices will include the location of scoping meetings, as well as the time and date, and other pertinent information.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me.

Alice Kelly
Dept. of Ecology
Northwest Regional Office
3190 - 160th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA  98008
425-649-7128
To: Dewell, Jane (ORA)
Subject: RE: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Hi Jane,
Can I expect to hear back from the three co-lead agencies?
Thank you,
Lovel

Lovel Pratt
San Juan County Council, District 1
Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor
Phone: 360-370-7473
Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.

From: Dewell, Jane (ORA)
[jane.dewell@ora.wa.gov]<mailto:jane.dewell@ora.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 10:11 AM
To: Lovel Pratt
Subject: RE: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Lovel,

The three co-lead agencies - US Army Corps, Dept of Ecology, and Whatcom County - will be determining the scoping process. I will forward your inquiry on to them.

Hope that all is well. Thanks. Jane

************************
Jane Dewell, Regional Lead
Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance
3190 160th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98008-5452
(425) 649-7124 or (425) 577-8445

From: Lovel Pratt
[LovelP@sanjuanco.com]<mailto:LovelP@sanjuanco.com>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 9:45 AM
To: Dewell, Jane (ORA)
Subject: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Hi Jane,
Can you give me an update on the status of the San Juan County Council's requests for scoping meetings regarding the EIS for the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal project? Or can you tell me who I should ask for this information?
Thank you for your attention to this request.
Lovel

Lovel Pratt
We will take care of the response.

Randel Perry
Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
Regulatory NW Field Office
(360) 734-3156 (office)
(360) 393-3119 (cell)

-----Original Message-----
From: Dewell, Jane (ORA) [mailto:jane.dewell@ora.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 1:22 PM
To: Kelly, Alice (ECY); Tyler Schroeder; Perry, Randel J NWS
Subject: FW: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

I've not responded to Lovel on her follow-up question since I don't know the answer.

Thanks, Jane

From: Lovel Pratt [mailto:LovelP@sanjuanco.com]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 1:16 PM
To: Dewell, Jane (ORA)
Subject: RE: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Hi Jane,

Can I expect to hear back from the three co-lead agencies?

Thank you,

Lovel
Lovel Pratt
San Juan County Council, District 1
Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor
Phone: 360-370-7473
Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.

From: Dewell, Jane (ORA) [mailto:jane.dewell@ora.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 10:11 AM
To: Lovel Pratt
Subject: RE: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Lovel,

The three co-lead agencies - US Army Corps, Dept of Ecology, and Whatcom County - will be determining the scoping process. I will forward your inquiry on to them.

Hope that all is well. Thanks. Jane

*****************************************************
Jane Dewell, Regional Lead
Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance
3190 160th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98008-5452
(425) 649-7124 or (425) 577-8445
Hi Jane,

Can you give me an update on the status of the San Juan County Council's requests for scoping meetings regarding the EIS for the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal project? Or can you tell me who I should ask for this information?

Thank you for your attention to this request.

Lovel

Lovel Pratt

San Juan County Council, District 1

Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor

Phone: 360-370-7473

Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE
The three co-lead agencies are currently developing the plan for scoping meetings. No final decisions have been made yet. When the scoping notices are ready for public distribution, we will put out press releases and inform the media, as well as inform those who have contacted us via email and US mail. The scoping notices will include the location of scoping meetings, as well as the time and date, and other pertinent information.

If you have any additional questions, please feel free to contact me.
Alice Kelly
Dept. of Ecology
Northwest Regional Office
3190 - 160th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA  98008
425-649-7128

Hi Jane,
Can I expect to hear back from the three co-lead agencies?
Thank you,
Lovel

Lovel Pratt
San Juan County Council, District 1
Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor
Phone: 360-370-7473
Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.
Hi Jane,
Can you give me an update on the status of the San Juan County Council's requests for scoping meetings regarding the EIS for the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal project? Or can you tell me who I should ask for this information?
Thank you for your attention to this request.
Lovel

Lovel Pratt
San Juan County Council, District 1
Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor
Phone: 360-370-7473
Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.
I've not responded to Lovel on her follow-up question since I don't know the answer.

Thanks, Jane

Hi Jane,
Can I expect to hear back from the three co-lead agencies?
Thank you,
Lovel

The three co-lead agencies - US Army Corps, Dept of Ecology, and Whatcom County - will be determining the scoping process. I will forward your inquiry on to them.

Hope that all is well. Thanks. Jane

**********************************

Jane Dewell, Regional Lead
Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance
3190 160th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98008-5452
(425) 649-7124 or (425) 577-8445

From: Lovel Pratt
[mailto:LovelP@sanjuanco.com]<mailto:LovelP@sanjuanco.com>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 9:45 AM
Hi Jane,
Can you give me an update on the status of the San Juan County Council's requests for scoping meetings regarding the EIS for the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal project? Or can you tell me who I should ask for this information?
Thank you for your attention to this request.
Lovel

Lovel Pratt
San Juan County Council, District 1
Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor
Phone: 360-370-7473
Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.
MAP Team Members,

The three co-lead agencies - Whatcom County, WA Department of Ecology (Ecology) and, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - have been working hard on the National and State Environmental Policy Act (NEPA/SEPA) aspects of the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT) project. Since some of you are not directly involved with NEPA/SEPA activity, I wanted to provide you with a brief update so you're aware of upcoming activities.

1. Comments on February 29, 2011 documents (Project Information Document and Preliminary Conceptual Compensatory Mitigation Plan) - Agency comments were provided on these documents. These comments will need to be resubmitted by each agency during the scoping period to ensure that they are considered in the NEPA/SEPA process. The comment letters are available on the iPRMT MAP Team site at: https://secureaccess.wa.gov/ofm/iprmt24/site/alias__1357/library_agency_memos_comments/26731/agency_memos_comments.aspx (at the bottom of the Agency Comments table).

2. Scoping - The scoping period will open sometime in the next few months and will last 120 days. An agency scoping meeting sponsored by the NEPA/SEPA co-lead agencies will be scheduled sometime toward the middle of the scoping period. ORA will assist Ecology as needed for this meeting and it will include agencies beyond those on the MAP Team.

3. PIT Reports - The applicant has been working on reports for various disciplines and releasing them to Whatcom County, as part of the permit application process, or to the co-lead agencies for the NEPA/SEPA process. When reports are made available by the co-leads, we will be posting them to the MAP Team website and sending updates to let you know.

4. MAP Team After Scoping - It’s possible that discussions regarding methodology or early technical review, which would occur before the draft environmental impact statement is issued, would benefit from MAP Team involvement. However, there is not a schedule or definite plan for such discussions or meetings at this point. The co-lead agencies are in charge of the NEPA/SEPA process and ORA will follow their lead. As always, if you have questions or comments please contact me. Thanks.

Jane Dewell, Regional Lead
Governor’s Office of Regulatory Assistance
3190 160th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98008-5452
(425) 649-7124 or (425) 577-8445
From: "Dewell, Jane (ORA)" <jane.dewell@ora.wa.gov>
To: "Kelly, Alice (ECY)" <AKEL461@ECY.WA.GOV>, Tyler Schroeder <Tschoed@co....
Date: 7/30/2012 10:09 AM
Subject: FW: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

FYI.

From: Dewell, Jane (ORA)
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 10:09 AM
To: 'Lovel Pratt'
Subject: RE: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Lovel,

The three co-lead agencies - US Army Corps, Dept of Ecology, and Whatcom County - will be determining the scoping process. I will forward your inquiry on to them.

Hope that all is well. Thanks. Jane

**********************************
Jane Dewell, Regional Lead
Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance
3190 160th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98008-5452
(425) 649-7124  or (425) 577-8445

From: Lovel Pratt [mailto:LovelP@sanjuanco.com]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2012 9:45 AM
To: Dewell, Jane (ORA)
Subject: Request for update/info re. SJC Council's request for scoping meetings

Hi Jane,
Can you give me an update on the status of the San Juan County Council's requests for scoping meetings regarding the EIS for the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal project? Or can you tell me who I should ask for this information?
Thank you for your attention to this request.
Lovel

Lovel Pratt
San Juan County Council, District 1
Office: 55 Second St. N., 1st floor
Phone: 360-370-7473
Mail: 350 Court Street, No. 1, Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56 et al.
Phil,

Thank you for your letter dated July 25, 2012 GPT project. I further appreciate your follow-up discussions on the topic with Royce and I. I have attached the correspondence to the City of Bellingham, as discussed. This letter is similar to what we have been discussing in regards to the County using the EIS process to ultimately inform the permit decisions.

Kind Regards,

Tyler

Tyler R. Schroeder
Planning Manager
Phone: (360) 676-6907 ext. 50202
Fax: (360) 738-2525
Email: Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us
Address:
Whatcom County Planning and Development Services
5280 Northwest Dr.
Bellingham, WA  98225
August 3, 2012

Terry Bornemann, Council President
Bellingham City Council
210 Lottie Street
Bellingham, WA 98225


Dear Mr. Bornemann:

Thank you for your letters of May 15, 2012 and July 5, 2012 regarding the on-going permit review associated with the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT). The issue of off-site rail impacts associated with the GPT project review and the type and extent of necessary improvements to existing rail corridors is one that Whatcom County Planning and Development Services (WCPDS) shares with the Bellingham City Council.

As you know, the above-referenced permits are subject to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and a Determination of Significance (DS) and scoping for the required Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be forthcoming from the Co-Lead Agencies. As the SEPA EIS requires identification and study of significant impacts associated with the project, including those outside the jurisdiction of the project permits alone, the issue of rail impacts and necessary improvements is best vetted through that process.

Whatcom County will be using the EIS process to ultimately inform the permit decisions and will be including all of the comments submitted in response to the Notice of Application, including both the May 15, 2012 and July 5, 2012 letters from the Bellingham City Council in the EIS review. This will ensure that all issues brought forward during the comment period on the notice of application will be appropriately addressed in the EIS process.

Thank you for your continued involvement in the environmental review process on the GPT project. Please let me know if you have additional questions or concerns related to this correspondence.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Tyree R. Schroeder
Whatcom County Planning Manager

Cc: Jeannie Summerhays, DOE
    Randel Perry, USACE
    Kelli Linville, Mayor of Bellingham
    Jack Louws, Whatcom County Executive
Ari,

As you know, the County has received numerous comments associated with the Notice of Application for the GPT project. These letters/comments can be found at our website link, http://www.whatcomcounty.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/notice-of-application-comments.jsp. The County will be using the EIS process to ultimately inform the permit decisions and will be including all of the comments submitted in response to the Notice of Application in the EIS review.

Further, the City of Bellingham Council has submitted a follow up letter to the County on July 5, 2012. This letter can be found at the following link, http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/pdf/20120705-letter-city-bellingham.pdf. The County responded to the City of Bellingham with the letter that is attached to this email. I bring this letter to your attention, as a courtesy to the City of Bellingham, because the City specifically requested that an answer to the inquiry be provided by the applicant.

Thanks,

Tyler

Tyler R. Schroeder
Planning Manager
Phone: (360) 676-6907 ext. 50202
Fax: (360)738-2525
Email: Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us
Address:
Whatcom County Planning and Development Services
5280 Northwest Dr.
Bellingham, WA  98225
August 3, 2012

Terry Bornemann, Council President
Bellingham City Council
210 Lottie Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

RE: Notice of Application for Gateway Pacific Terminal (MDP2011-00001,
SHR2011-00009, VAR2011-00002)

Dear Mr. Bornemann:

Thank you for your letters of May 15, 2012 and July 5, 2012 regarding the on-going permit
review associated with the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT). The issue of off-site
rail impacts associated with the GPT project review and the type and extent of necessary
improvements to existing rail corridors is one that Whatcom County Planning and
Development Services (WCPDS) shares with the Bellingham City Council.

As you know, the above-referenced permits are subject to the State Environmental Policy
Act (SEPA), and a Determination of Significance (DS) and scoping for the required
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be forthcoming from the Co-Lead Agencies. As
the SEPA EIS requires identification and study of significant impacts associated with the
project, including those outside the jurisdiction of the project permits alone, the issue of rail
impacts and necessary improvements is best vetted through that process.

Whatcom County will be using the EIS process to ultimately inform the permit decisions and
will be including all of the comments submitted in response to the Notice of Application,
including both the May 15, 2012 and July 5, 2012 letters from the Bellingham City Council
in the EIS review. This will ensure that all issues brought forward during the comment
period on the notice of application will be appropriately addressed in the EIS process.

Thank you for your continued involvement in the environmental review process on the GPT
project. Please let me know if you have additional questions or concerns related to this
correspondence.

Kind Regards,

Tyrif R. Schroeder
Whatcom County Planning Manager

Cc: Jeannie Summerhayes, DOE
Randel Perry, USACE
Kelli Linville, Mayor of Bellingham
Jack Louws, Whatcom County Executive
Jack,

Please see the attached letter that is being sent to the City Council tomorrow. Please let me know if you would like to discuss this in more detail.

Thanks,

Tyler

Tyler R. Schroeder
Planning Manager
Phone: (360) 676-6907 ext. 50202
Fax: (360)738-2525
Email: Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us
Address:
Whatcom County Planning and Development Services
5280 Northwest Dr.
Bellingham, WA 98225
August 3, 2012

Terry Bornemann, Council President
Bellingham City Council
210 Lottie Street
Bellingham, WA 98225


Dear Mr. Bornemann:

Thank you for your letters of May 15, 2012 and July 5, 2012 regarding the on-going permit review associated with the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT). The issue of off-site rail impacts associated with the GPT project review and the type and extent of necessary improvements to existing rail corridors is one that Whatcom County Planning and Development Services (WCPDS) shares with the Bellingham City Council.

As you know, the above-referenced permits are subject to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and a Determination of Significance (DS) and scoping for the required Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be forthcoming from the Co-Lead Agencies. As the SEPA EIS requires identification and study of significant impacts associated with the project, including those outside the jurisdiction of the project permits alone, the issue of rail impacts and necessary improvements is best vetted through that process.

Whatcom County will be using the EIS process to ultimately inform the permit decisions and will be including all of the comments submitted in response to the Notice of Application, including both the May 15, 2012 and July 5, 2012 letters from the Bellingham City Council in the EIS review. This will ensure that all issues brought forward during the comment period on the notice of application will be appropriately addressed in the EIS process.

Thank you for your continued involvement in the environmental review process on the GPT project. Please let me know if you have additional questions or concerns related to this correspondence.

Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Tyler R. Schroeder
Whatcom County Planning Manager

Cc: Jeannie Summerhays, DOE
    Randel Perry, USACE
    Kelli Linville, Mayor of Bellingham
    Jack Louws, Whatcom County Executive
Dear Whatcom County council,

I hope your day is going well, and I also hope that this letter will benefit the community and your decision about the coal trains. I am concerned for the health of Bellingham and the South Fork Valley and if the coal trains come through I believe this will create a huge impact that will not help these two communities.

I feel that the coal train will not only affect Bellingham but also the Acme Deming area. I happen to live about 10min away from Acme and the train tracks run right over my road. This will impact the ecosystem and environment around my house and the corridor of wildlife up and down hwy 9. I am very interested in wildlife and especially birds, so to see this incredible stretch of nature get hit full on by the coal trains would be very horrible and sad. I have two examples that I would like to share with you. One is that my family just purchased a huge wildlife area that will stay there forever (through Greenways) and if the coal trains were to come by, I would think that the area would be destroyed. The second reason is that I have some family friends that live up the hwy on strand rd and they started an organic blueberry farm that has taken 2years to start producing berries and they live about 20-30 feet away from the tracks and if the trains were to come by the farm it would destroy their family business and an experience for the community, as we all go there to pick fresh blueberries and it is an amazing thing to do. One last note I would like to make is that if the trains come through it could make many of us have to move and I would loose my neighborhood and friends, and that is too sad to even think of.

However I do see your points about boosting the economy but why not put the jobs and money to eco-friendly power sources like solar panels, wind power and hydro. I feel that this would be a huge difference for the earth and to Bellingham and could possibly boost the economy too.

Thank you so much for taking time out of your day to listen to what I have to say about the coal and I hope I have made an impact on your decision. Once again that you for listening to this letter and I you will hear the phrase that everybody is saying, do not have coal trains come though Bellingham and south fork area.

Sincerely, Fanter Lane, participating in Cascades Montessori Middle School at the age of 14.
Honorable Jack Louws  
Whatcom County  
311 Grand Ave, Suite 108  
Bellingham, WA 98225  

RE: Update to Opinion Leaders  

July 26, 2012

Dear County Executive Louws:

**Public Opinion:** With the public Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping hearings coming up this fall, I’d like to ensure that you stay up-to-date on the Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT) project. I’ve included some recent documents which outline local and national support for the Gateway Pacific Terminal, along with a few pieces that address the environmental review process:

- A poll conducted in May 2012 throughout Whatcom and Skagit Counties found that a clear majority of local residents support the Gateway Pacific Terminal—*almost 60% favor the project in each County*. The poll also found that almost 2/3 of Skagitonians believe that economic growth in Whatcom County will benefit them too.
- Over the last nine months, we have actively engaged the citizens of Whatcom County and continue to do so by attempting to contact local residents to inform and educate them about the GPT and to answer any questions they may have. According to our outreach efforts, the majority of the county has consistently supported the project and currently over 58% of the County supports the project.
- A recent poll conducted for EarthFix by DHM Research, found that a *majority of residents throughout Washington, Oregon, and Idaho support new coal exporting facilities throughout the Northwest*. Of the 1,200 citizens polled, 55% said they support coal transportation. Coal is one of the dry-bulk commodities that will be handled at the Gateway Pacific Terminal. *(OPB EarthFix “Survey finds support for cool transport through NW” 7.25.12)*

**Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Process:** There has been much discussion around the nature of the environmental review process, which is controlled by the government permitting agencies, but paid for by the company. GPT expects an exhaustive environmental review.

The traditional approach under law is to require each project to be subjected to a thorough EIS review, including cumulative impacts. The regulatory agencies apply the law in determining the breadth or “scope” of issues to be examined. Some project opponents are seeking to pave new ground by lumping six proposed port projects in Washington and Oregon into one overall “programmatic,” or multi-project, EIS, although no one seems to know how this would actually work. These projects are located far away from one another, involve different waterways and transportation networks, and are proposed by different owners.
Setting such a precedent for examining multiple industrial projects together would likely create confusion, endless delay, and cripple job growth everywhere. Such a precedent could lead to a requirement, for example, that all waterfront development projects throughout Washington State be examined together in a single EIS. It could also lead to a diluted focus with less attention being given to local matters in favor of issues in, say, Coos Bay, Oregon where another port development is proposed.

Here is some additional information enclosed in this packet:

- **Environmental Impact Statement Briefing**—describes the difference between a cumulative affects analysis and “Programmatic” Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).
- **List of trade, business, and labor organizations who oppose a programmatic EIS**—this list represents millions of workers throughout the country.
- **Letter from 58 Members of Congress** who oppose expanding the environmental review and support proposed coal exporting facilities throughout the Pacific Northwest. The letter states: “There should be no misunderstanding: coal from the PRB [Powder River Basin] will make its way to Asia, it is merely a matter of whether its transport and shipment will be a boon to Canada and Canadian workers, or to America and American workers.”
- **Letter from Jeff Johnson, President of the Washington State Labor Council**—This letter was written in response to a Seattle City Council resolution calling for a programmatic EIS. On top of opposing a programmatic EIS, the letter states: “The labor community has investigated the pros and cons of the bulk commodity terminal being proposed at Cherry Point and at this point in time are in total support of the project on the grounds that the project would responsibly handle coal and other dry-bulk commodities such as grain, potash, and bio-fuels, and would have a major positive impact on family-wage jobs in Whatcom County in both the construction and operation phases of the bulk commodity terminal.”
- **Washington Public Ports Association letter**—explains that expanding the scope of the EIS may set a “dangerous precedent” for future port and transportation infrastructure projects.

As always, please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Best Regards,

Craig Cole, Senior Consultant
craig.cole@gatewaypacificterminal.com
Gateway Pacific Terminal
A Survey of Voters in Whatcom and Skagit Counties

May 22-24, 2012
601 Voters: 401 in Whatcom County
200 in Skagit County

Privileged & Confidential
A Clear Majority Continues To Favor The Project, Following Pro/Con Statements

Supporters say this new, highly efficient terminal will help make American commodities such as grain and coal more competitive in international markets. It will create more than four thousand jobs during the construction phase and more than twelve hundred permanent family-wage jobs once the facility is operational. It will also generate millions of dollars in needed new tax revenue for schools and public services in this part of the state, and the project's design will ensure that it meets stringent environmental standards.

Opponents say this project will pose environmental risks to the region, citing concerns about coal dust from rail cars and the terminal being discharged into the air and water. They say this will pose serious health risks to residents and harm local marine life. They say the job-creation claims of supporters of the project are exaggerated. Critics also say the terminal will require a major increase in train traffic throughout the region, hurting our quality of life and discouraging redevelopment of the Bellingham waterfront.

Are you inclined to favor or oppose the Gateway Pacific Terminal?

Now: 56% Favor 38% Oppose

May '11: 66% Favor 27% Oppose

*May '11 wording similar, not identical
In Our Final Test, Roughly Three-In-Five Favor The Project

Now that you've heard some more information, let me ask you again: are you inclined to favor or oppose the Gateway Pacific Terminal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>After Pros + Cons</th>
<th>After Messages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor (Good)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose (Bad)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Skagit County Voters See Economic Benefit For Their Area

Some people say that because the terminal is located in Whatcom County, none of the economic benefits will come to Skagit County. Others say that Skagit County would benefit greatly from the terminal, because Skagit and Whatcom counties are strongly connected, and nearly ten percent of Skagit workers are employed in Whatcom County. What is your view – that Skagit County would probably see a fair amount of economic benefit from the terminal, or would probably not see much economic benefit at all?

(Skagit County only: N=200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair amount of economic benefit</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much benefit at all</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cumulative Effects Analysis vs. Programmatic EIS

The analysis of cumulative effects in a project specific EIS and a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Programmatic EIS) are very different; cumulative effects must be addressed in every EIS, a Programmatic EIS is a process for analyzing complicated multi-tiered government programs.

What is a Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA) and how does it differ from a Programmatic EIS?

Cumulative Effects Analysis

The analysis of cumulative effects is a required part of every EIS. It informs the agency decision maker and the public of potential impacts that may not be of concern for the project under consideration but when combined with other future actions may become consequential and need regulatory attention. The CEA:

- Must always be included in an EIS.
- Analyzes the additional effects of future projects and actions on environmental resources in the same geographic area as the proposed project.
- Considers both direct and indirect effects on environmental resources.

In any project EIS, the impacts of the proposed project to the existing environment are analyzed first based on specific information about the proposed project. Then the combined effects of other projects, plans, or programs that may affect the same environmental resources (e.g. are in the same relevant geographic area) are considered and added to the impacts of the proposed project to assess “potential cumulative effects.” If the cumulative impact analysis reveals potential cumulative impacts that are consequential agency decision makers are alerted that future regulatory action may be required if the future projects or actions that cause such impacts are actually implemented.

Programmatic EIS

A Programmatic EIS differs from a project EIS; rather than address a single project or action, it covers a series of related actions or projects that are part of an integrated program. The actions within the program may take place over time in different locations and the details of the later actions may not be fully developed. All of the actions considered in a Programmatic EIS are however, typically part of a government-sponsored program and are interrelated in some way. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) provides for a tiered approach to environmental analysis where multiple interrelated actions that would be implemented through a sponsored program can be evaluated in a Programmatic EIS even though they may be approved and implemented sequentially.

The key features of a Programmatic EIS are:

- Actions (projects) are interrelated or are components of an overall program that is sponsored by a federal agency with jurisdiction,
• They are used to evaluate agency policy making, resource management programs (federal lands leasing programs; oil, gas and mineral exploration and production programs; habitat restoration programs); or federal infrastructure development programs (highway; navigation; hydroelectric energy).

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) has a similar provision for tiered analysis and development of a Programmatic EIS. As the SEPA lead agency Whatcom County would need to establish a jurisdictional basis for a SEPA Programmatic EIS. This would be difficult. First, there is no government program. Secondly, four of the seven proposed coal export projects are located outside the state and there is little similarity in the circumstances, location or effects of the three projects that are located in Washington.

Could a Programmatic EIS be prepared for the Proposed Export Terminal Projects?

A Programmatic EIS, designed to evaluate all of the Pacific Northwest (PNW) export terminal projects together, is inappropriate for the following reasons:

• Each of the seven projects in the PNW is an independent privately sponsored project; they are not proposed as part of, or in response to any announced government policy or program.
• Neither the Corps of Engineers (USACE) nor any other government agency with relevant jurisdiction has initiated a policy or program to promote the development of these projects.
• The USACE has not undertaken any planning and feasibility studies for port facility development nor requested congressional authorization for such studies which would ordinarily occur before a Programmatic EIS is prepared.
• Only three of the projects, Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT), Port of Morrow (at Boardman, Oregon), and Millennium (Longview, Washington) have started the permitting process. All the other projects are in a preliminary stage and there is not yet sufficient information available to permit thorough environmental review in a programmatic EIS.

Would including all PNW terminal projects in a Cumulative Effects Analysis enhance the EIS for the GPT?

A cumulative effects analysis is only useful if the projects considered have direct or indirect effects that affect the same environmental resources. In fact, the other six terminal projects will not affect the same environmental resources as the GPT project. In particular:

• All of the other projects are located at least 200 miles from Cherry Point so none of the local effects (wetlands, habitat, socioeconomics, local surface transportation, cultural, etc.) could be cumulative.
• None of the other projects use the Puget Sound for marine transportation access so none of the marine transportation related effects could be cumulative. All of the other projects are located on the Columbia River or access the Pacific Ocean directly.
• None of the other projects are located in the same air shed as the GPT so any local air quality effects could not be cumulative.
Organizations that Oppose a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

Trade, labor and business organizations across the state and country are asking regulatory agencies NOT to embrace a new Programmatic EIS philosophy because of its deeply troubling implications to businesses and workers. Here are some of them:

- **58 Members of Congress**
- **Washington State Labor Council**—represents over 400,000 workers throughout the state
- **Washington Public Ports Association**—represents 69 Port Districts throughout Washington
- **Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board**—includes city, county and port representatives from across the state, along with representatives from marine, rail, and trucking industries
- **Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen, Washington Legislative Board**—700 members
- **President of the Association of Washington Business**—includes more than 7,900 members representing 700,000 employees
- **Pacific Northwest Waterways Association**—includes over 100 member businesses, ports and other organizations from the Pacific Northwest
- **National Association of Manufacturers**—represents over 12,000 manufacturers
- **U.S. Chamber of Commerce**—represents over 3 million businesses and organizations and 300,000 members

July 2012
June 21, 2012

The Honorable John McHugh  
Secretary  
United States Army  
1400 Defense Pentagon  
Washington, D.C. 20301

The Honorable Ken Salazar  
Secretary  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
1849 C Street, NW, Room 5665  
Washington, D.C. 20240

Major General Meredith W.B. (Bo) Temple  
Acting Commanding General and Acting  
Chief of Engineers  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
441 G Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20314

The Honorable Mike Pool  
Acting Director  
The Bureau of Land Management  
1849 C Street, NW, Room 5665  
Washington, D.C. 20240

Dear Secretary McHugh, Secretary Salazar, Major General Temple, and Acting Director Pool:

We write to express our strong opposition to the requests made by some elected officials, advocacy groups, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to dramatically expand the scope of environmental reviews necessary for singular port projects necessary for coal exports. Such an action would have widespread implications for coal-producing states, as well as states that are home to the ports through which these products are shipped overseas. When federal action is involved, projects are rightly subject to appropriate review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). However, NEPA analysis must be limited in scope to the project itself.

The Powder River Basin (PRB) of Wyoming and Montana produce a significant volume of coal for domestic energy consumption. For the United States, this abundant, reliable supply of energy is the primary source of affordable power for many Americans. Political attacks and continual efforts by the EPA to regulate cost increases on working Americans’ electricity bills have had a chilling effect on coal’s market share in recent months, but not on its demand. This is particularly true in the case of world demand. The International Energy Agency (IEA) notes that between 2000 and 2010, world coal consumption increased by nearly 3.3 billion metric tons – an increase of nearly 60%. The IEA estimates that global coal use will continue to grow in the next decade.

There is no question that coal will be the primary source of new power for the currently 1.3 billion people without access to electricity today. The only question is if the western United States will benefit from this fact. In 2011 the combined total of exports heading east or south was nearly 100 million tons, while shipments originating at western ocean ports and heading to rapidly emerging markets in Asia languished at less than 7 million tons. Thanks to amazing feats of engineering that enable the efficient recovery of this vast resource, and the ability to safely transport it over land and sea, western ports are poised to significantly increase exports of coal to Asia. These western ports are the most efficient and cost effective departure point for PRB coal. There should be no misunderstanding: coal from the PRB will make its way to Asia, it is merely
a matter of whether its transport and shipment will be a boon to Canada and Canadian workers, or to America, and American workers.

Efforts by the EPA and others to pressure your agencies into an expansion of NEPA that strays beyond analysis of a pending federal action, and into the theoretical effects of coal mining, transport, and sales to Asia, is nothing more than a thinly-veiled attempt to hamstring our ability to benefit from meeting the global demand for coal. If agreed to, the requests for your agencies to use the NEPA process to analyze the speculative global implications of coal use would institute a dangerous new precedent: that NEPA analysis should go beyond the projects themselves. NEPA was not designed for, and federal agency employees should not be undertaking, broad analysis that reaches well beyond the direct impacts of specific projects and into the realm of policymaking and speculation.

Federal action on port projects, rail expansion, and mining all require separate and robust environmental reviews. We do not ask you to shirk these reviews. However, if a new precedent is established for how broadly NEPA is conducted on these projects, no clear boundary will exist for any product shipped by rail or port. A programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for one local project that encompasses the life-cycle of coal would establish a new baseline for NEPA analysis that could negatively affect exports of natural resources from all regions of the United States, including Midwest and Appalachian coal.

We urge you to resist pressure to expand the scope of NEPA reviews beyond what should reasonably be expected of federal employees to implement. Broader, speculative debates on national and global energy policy are properly left to Congress.

Thank you for your careful attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signatures of Congress members]

Cynthia M. Lummis
Member of Congress

Denny Rehberg
Member of Congress

Doc Hastings
Member of Congress

Harold Rogers
Member of Congress

Fred Upton
Member of Congress

Spencer Bachus
Member of Congress

Bill Shuster
Member of Congress

Michael K. Simpson
Member of Congress
Jeff Duncan
Member of Congress

Glenn Thompson
Member of Congress

Tim Scott
Member of Congress

Paul A. Gosar
Member of Congress

Bill Johnson
Member of Congress

Jason Chaffetz
Member of Congress

Larry Buchon
Member of Congress

Wally Herger
Member of Congress

Bob Gibbs
Member of Congress

Mike Kelly
Member of Congress

Rob Bishop
Member of Congress

James B.大道
Member of Congress

Todd Rokita
Member of Congress

Adam Kinzinger
Member of Congress

Brett Guthrie
Member of Congress

David B. McKinley
Member of Congress

Geoff Davis
Member of Congress

Tim Murphy
Member of Congress

Steve Stivers
Member of Congress

J. Morgan Griffith
Member of Congress
Seattle City Council
PO Box 34025
Seattle, WA 98124-4025

Dear Council Members:

On behalf of the Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, I am writing in opposition to Resolution 31379. While I applaud the City of Seattle’s position on climate change and local efforts to combat carbon emissions, I believe, however, that this resolution is an overreach.

Climate change is a very real issue and the fact that human activity is a major cause of climate change is, I believe, undisputed by most reasonable people. However, what to do about it poses some of the thorniest challenges and compromises that we as a nation, and as members of a world community, will have to make over the next several decades.

Seattle has made great strides to control our local carbon footprint through programs like the Emerald City Project that envision energy retro-fitting public, commercial and residential buildings on a major scale. Labor is your partner in these efforts.

But the problem of climate change is global. Energy needs in the world are great. It is estimated that 20% of the world’s population, 1.3 billion people, are still without electricity. China, the world’s largest producer of solar energy products, generates 79% of its electricity from coal, 20% from hydro sources and only 1% from solar and other alternative sources. India is expected to be the largest importer of coal by 2030, and in the U.S. we still generate 49% of our electricity from coal. Coal remains relatively cheap and plentiful.

Given this context and the magnitude of the problem, real solutions can only be found at the international level through some combination of carbon taxes, cap-and-trade policies, and industrial policies that direct significant investments towards non-fossil fuel energy production. Any resolutions from the Seattle City Council that encourage our own federal government to adopt a comprehensive vision on climate change and alternative energy investments would seem to be productive.
Resolution 31379's contention that transporting coal by train through Washington State and, more particularly, Seattle would pose serious negative health impacts on Seattle's residents as well as climate change, however, is quite a reach.

If the City of Seattle wants to oppose a coal terminal in Seattle then a specific resolution stating this should be drafted. But I think Seattle goes far astray in opposing a bulk commodity terminal in other parts of the state, for example, the Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Further, if the City of Seattle would like to mitigate negative health impacts of coal loading facilities in Seattle I would suggest that Section 7 of Resolution 31379 be modified to capture the state of the art environmental safety guards being proposed for the Gateway Project.

Of course, increased train traffic through Seattle, regardless of the commodity being transported, should be carefully analyzed for impacts on the public. Currently four to five coal trains a day go through Seattle on their way to Port Roberts in Canada for export. We are not aware of any scientific studies or public agency reports that reveal a problem with either coal dust or "chunks of coal" along the tracks having a deleterious health impact on residents of Seattle or railroad workers. If you have such knowledge please share it with us.

With regards to increased train traffic, should the Gateway Pacific bulk commodity terminal be approved, the Washington State Department of Ecology finds locomotive air particulate emissions to be one of the lowest contributors to air pollution. Rail transport is many times more fuel efficient than truck transport. We should be thinking about increased rail traffic as we consider the Port of Seattle's growth plans for the next couple of decades.

The labor community has investigated the pros and cons of the bulk commodity terminal being proposed at Cherry Point and at this point in time are in total support of the project on the grounds that the project would responsibly handle coal and other bulk commodities such as grain, potash, and bio-fuels, and would have a major positive impact on family wage jobs in Whatcom County in both the construction and operation phases of the bulk commodity terminal.

We in the labor community believe that we have obligation to our members and to the wider public to advocate for responsible family wage jobs. While we hope someday to be exporting solar panels and other green energy technologies overseas, in the meantime, we support the Gateway Pacific Terminal project that will transport and export bulk commodities, including coal, in an environmentally responsible way.
Seattle City Council  
May 25, 2012  
Page 3

On behalf of the Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, I am asking you to turn down Resolution 31379 and to work with us to encourage the federal government to make major investments in our public and social infrastructure, including placing a major emphasis in the creation of non-fossil fuel energy technologies and jobs.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey G. Johnson  
President

JGLjh  
afelorl/af-cio
May 4, 2012

Steve Gagnon
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 2946
Portland, OR 97208-2946

Re: Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 Permit Application for Coyote Island Terminals LLC Coal Transloading Facility at Port of Morrow

Dear Mr. Gagnon:

On behalf of the Washington Public Ports Association ("WPPA"), I am taking the unusual step of providing the following comments on a permit application notice for a project in Oregon. WPPA takes no position on the merits of the project itself or whether the requested permit should be granted. We are, however, extremely concerned with comments the Corps has received from elected officials and from other state and federal agencies concerning the needed scope of review under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). The project itself is controversial because it involves the export of U.S. coal to Asian markets. This controversy should not, however, drive the Corps to setting unworkable precedent concerning NEPA reviews of transportation infrastructure projects generally, and port projects in particular.

Public ports are in the transportation infrastructure business. By improving our ability to efficiently move freight and engage in commerce these ports support family wage jobs, improve local communities, and contribute to our overall economic prosperity. The impacts of constructing and operating new port facilities should always be analyzed through appropriate NEPA review documents when a federal action is involved. However, this review should be of the project itself, not of the overall system of commerce across our region, the United States, or as urged by some commenters, the entire world.

Reviews of potential environmental impacts that go beyond the construction and operation of the project itself very quickly get into conjecture and almost impossibly difficult problems of double counting and attribution. For instance, the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") has requested that the Corps review an extraordinarily broad range of potential impacts, including the impacts of mining coal on public lands. However, any federal authorizations...
granted for coal mining on federal lands would have already gone through NEPA review. Environmental review is also conducted for any permits necessary to expand the rail network. If, as suggested by EPA and other commenters, each project that contributes an additional increment of traffic to the system must analyze impacts related to that incremental increase all across the system, reviews would be piled one upon another for project after project, even though the impacts of improvements to the system had already been analyzed. This is not a public policy that encourages exports—which the current Administration has stated are central to our economic recovery. In fact, this policy would have a negative impact on those efforts.

It is not a fruitful exercise to speculate about possible long-term social and market changes that might be caused by a port dock project. NEPA has never been interpreted to require analyses of that which is purely speculative. A permit application to build a modest-sized export facility in the Columbia River at the Port of Morrow is not the occasion for a reversal of the Corps’ prior approach to such projects, whatever the controversy surrounding the particular cargo involved.

We can think of no meaningful way to distinguish between one cargo type and another when it comes to NEPA review of a transportation infrastructure project. Requiring predictions and analyses related to the national and global systems of commerce for a coal export project will invariably set a precedent for reviews of projects related to the movement in commerce of all other products. If this precedent is applied to all products imported and exported through our port transportation system, we will bog our project review timeline down in needless process.

To the extent NEPA is used to inform major policy debates, it is when the federal action involved is the development and implementation of a new program or policy. Here, the federal action involved is a project-specific permit approval, not a new federal policy or program. Commenters who see the need for a new national policy concerning the transportation and export of coal should focus their attention on those in Washington, D.C., who have the authority to direct that such new national trade, transportation and commerce policies be developed, rather than on Regulatory Branch employees of the Portland District Office of the Corps of Engineers who are processing a Section 10 permit application for a port export facility.

1 WPPA recently completed a very thorough rail system capacity analysis that identifies numerous projects that will be needed in the future as freight traffic increases. As those projects are implemented, NEPA reviews and analyses will be carried out as required for the necessary federal permits.
The Corps should resist the temptation to expand its NEPA analysis beyond what is required. By limiting its analyses to the potential impacts of the project itself, the Corps will be meeting its NEPA responsibilities and avoiding the establishment of a dangerous precedent that could severely harm the ability of ports to perform their essential functions.

Sincerely,

Eric D. Johnson
Executive Director

c: Governor Christine Gregoire
Dennis McClaran, US EPA Region X
Commissioner of Public Lands Peter Goldmark
This arrived in our offices and it does not appear that you received it directly.

Arden
WHEREAS, SSA Marine proposes to develop a coal and commodities export facility called Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT) located in Whatcom County near the Cherry Point area of Bellingham Washington; and

WHEREAS, Whatcom County, Washington Department of Ecology and the United States Corp of Engineers have entered into a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) to jointly promulgate a required Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and are currently scoping the EIS for the GPT project; and

WHEREAS, potential adverse impacts from the proposed GPT project, such as reduced air and water quality, increased noise levels, decreased ability to provide effective emergency response, increased risk of accidents, and impediments to transportation and pedestrian movements, will be experienced by communities along rail line corridors within the Puget Sound region; and

WHEREAS, the City of Edmonds is concerned about the probable adverse economic and environmental impacts to our community resulting from increased rail traffic; and

WHEREAS, as a result of future GPT operations, an addition of nine to eighteen coal related trains per day, each with up to four engines and 125 cars and/or 1.5 miles in length, would equate to approximately one additional coal train every 1.3 hours passing through Edmonds, all day long, in addition to existing and projected train traffic; and

WHEREAS, Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail lines run along 4.5 miles of Edmonds' coastline which is lined with single and multifamily homes, the Port of Edmonds, Edmonds Senior Center, Washington State Ferry
Terminal, Sound Transit and Community Transit Commuter Rail and Bus Station, City beaches and parks, including a nationally recognized 27-acre underwater dive park; and

WHEREAS, in Edmonds, Dayton and Main Streets/SR/104, critical arterial streets used to access the City’s waterfront, intersect with an existing BNSF rail line and in the near future, two BNSF rail lines at grade, and these at-grade rail crossings slow the movement of people and goods between downtown Edmonds and the City’s waterfront, thus creating mobility and safety hazards; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Street crossing is the primary access to the Port of Edmonds, Marina Beach Park, Olympic Beach Park, Edmonds Senior Center, restaurants, businesses, residential units, etc., and the Main Street/SR104 crossing serves as the access and exit corridor for the Washington State Ferry Terminal, 27-acre Underwater Dive Park, Edmonds Senior Center, restaurants, businesses, residential units, etc.; and

WHEREAS, under existing conditions and without the additional train traffic proposed by the GPT project, loading and unloading of vehicles at the Washington State Ferry Terminal are routinely disrupted by existing trains moving along the mainline railroad tracks and such vehicles must cross existing/future BNSF rail line(s), the only at grade crossing in the Washington State Ferry System, and the addition of nine to eighteen coal related trains per day will increase the disruption of loading and unloading of vehicles at the Washington State Ferry Terminal; and

WHEREAS, due to reduced train speeds through the City of Edmonds and the need to lower approach warning crossing barriers at Main and Dayton Streets simultaneously due to their close proximity, rail crossing barriers for each train at each controlled crossing would need to be down for approximately 6-8 minutes for 1.5 mile long freight trains; and

WHEREAS, with the number of all trains per day expected to increase from the current 40 (weekday average) to as many as 70 by 2020 and 104 by 2030, the City is concerned that increased rail traffic generated from the Gateway Pacific Terminal project has the potential to adversely affect local environment and economy of Edmonds in the following ways:

- Effective emergency response times could be threatened if response times for police and fire are interrupted more frequently, and for longer periods of time, due to the length of each train
- Reductions in overall system mobility, i.e., pedestrians, bicycles, automobiles, buses, freight, etc.
• Increased risk of accidents (due to increased train traffic through pedestrian and vehicular intersections)

• A significant increase in coal train traffic will more frequently delay general commerce, commuters, and other vehicular traffic, thus impacting economic sustainability, e.g., impediments to Washington State Ferries operations and freight mobility, decreased tourism and waterfront activities due to congestion, noise, blockage, etc.,

• Delays in existing commuter and passenger train service due to lack of double tracks through Edmonds

• Air and water quality and attendant health impacts due to fugitive coal dust from trains and increased diesel exhaust from the four engines needed to operate each coal train; and the impact of which on the health of Edmonds residents and visitors is yet to be determined; and

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDMONDS, WASHINGTON, HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. We ask that the potential impacts to Edmonds’ public health, safety, economy, traffic, and environment be studied by the agencies conducting the environmental review and request that Edmonds be included in any EIS hearing schedule pertaining to any project in the Northwest that may cause significant increases in associated rail traffic traveling via Edmonds.

Section 2. We urge the United States Corps of Engineers, Washington Department of Ecology, and Whatcom County Council to hold at least one of the environmental impact statement scoping hearings in Edmonds and to conduct thorough studies which identify and measure the major impacts to the City of Edmonds that would result from a significant increase in coal train traffic, and that said agencies include the impacts of the proposed increase in rail traffic and those referenced in this Resolution in the scope of the EIS and public hearings at the various stages of the EIS process.

Section 3. The City of Edmonds hereby urges Whatcom County, Washington Department of Ecology, and United States Corp of Engineers to fully study impacts to Edmonds, including but not limited to increased traffic congestion and delays to residents and commerce (including Washington State Ferries operations), potential impacts from coal dust and other particulates, noise, mobility, etc., in the scoping of the EIS for the GPT project,
and that adverse impacts are fully mitigated.

Section 4. That the City of Edmonds requests that the railroad provide representatives to meet periodically with local citizen groups and local government officials from Edmonds to seek mutually acceptable ways to address local concerns.

Section 5. That the City of Edmonds requests that SSA Marine and BNSF identify any improvement plans related to grading, widening, or otherwise providing crossings at intersections that would be necessary to address/mitigate impacts caused by increases in rail traffic and require that SSA and BNSF mitigate impacts by funding the design and construction of these upgrades.

Section 6. That Washington State Department Transportation, Washington Utilities and Trade Commission, Burlington Northern Santa Fe, City of Edmonds, etc., study the issue of capacity and the threshold at which point train operations essentially render connectivity between the City’s downtown and Waterfront, SR104/Main Street and Washington State Ferry Terminal ineffective/inefficient/nonfunctional, and that the City’s Waterfront ceases to be a place that is easily accessible and can be enjoyed by businesses, restaurants, visitors, tourists, residents, etc.

Section 7. That the City of Edmonds be made a Party of Record for all aspects of the environmental and permitting phases of the GPT project.

RESOLVED this 17th day of July, 2012

A

DAVID O. EARLING

ATTEST.AUTHENTICATED:

SANDRA S. CHASE
CITY CLERK, SANDRA S. CHASE

FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK: 07-13-2012
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: 07-17-2012
RESOLUTION NO. 1280