

Emails pertaining to
Gateway Pacific Project
For February 2013



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 4:20 PM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From Mr John Joseph Brophy

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from Mr John Joseph Brophy.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

Mr John Joseph Brophy

5318 W 119th Place

Inglewood

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 3:57 PM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From Darrel McLaughlin

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from Darrel McLaughlin.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

Darrel McLaughlin

6526 192nd Pl SW

Lynnwood, WA 98036

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 2:48 PM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From William Thomas

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from William Thomas.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

William Thomas

5500 Sehome Crt

Blaine WA 98230

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2013 2:41 PM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From Dennis Becker

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from Dennis Becker.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

Dennis Becker

15208 52nd Ave S Suite 120

Tukwila Wa.

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From vadim kasko

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from vadim kasko.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

vadim kasko

7530 portal way

cust-er-wa-98240

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2013 7:32 AM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From Jerome HUsted

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from Jerome HUsted.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

Jerome HUsted

4207 Cherry Lane

Anacortes, WA 98221

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 11:02 AM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From Richard Fonda

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from Richard Fonda.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

Richard Fonda

8 Marigold Drive

Bellingham

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.



From: Tyler Kendig <tylerkendig@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 07, 2013 7:42 AM
To: Bill Knutzen
Cc: Council
Subject: Interview about GPT for WWU's student newspaper

Good morning Mr. Knutzen and members of the County Council,

I was recently assigned a rather large story about the GPT for WWU's student newspaper, The Western Front, and was wondering if it would be at all possible to get a phone interview sometime preferably today to ask some questions I'm confused about. This email was sent to Mr. Knutzen, but also to the rest of the County Council; I'm sure you're all very busy, so an interview with any council member would be greatly appreciated. With so many sides and biases to the issue, I don't want to get information about the council's involvement in the issue from an outside source.

I can imagine you are all probably constantly requested for interviews about the proposed GPT project, and are possibly wary regarding them. However, given that the majority of students at WWU don't likely read the Bellingham Herald or any other local news source, I wanted to write a readable, informative and balanced story for Western's 15,000 students. I can promise none of the questions would ask for any sort of personal opinion or stance on the project, I just want to know a bit more about the process.

Sorry for the wordy email, and I hope to hear from you soon.

Thank you

Tyler Kendig
(360) 471-3623
The Western Front



From: site@supportgpt.com
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2013 3:07 PM
To: Council; site@supportgpt.com
Subject: Support Gateway Terminal - A Letter From Justin Goldston

This is a **Support Gateway Pacific Terminal!** letter from Justin Goldston.

Dear County Council:

I write to urge you to support SSA Marine's proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal at Cherry Point. Our County and this region desperately need this infusion of high quality family wage jobs that this full service bulk commodity export-import terminal will generate.

As you explore the issues regarding SSA Marine's jobs proposal, I want to respectfully remind you that for decades Whatcom County shoreline and zoning ordinances have designated Cherry Point as the place for more good jobs. We settled this debate as a community more than 10 years ago when Cherry Point was designated for this use.

That is why SSA Marine plans to bring jobs and tax revenues to our area with a private investment of nearly \$665 Million. This project, if approved by you, will create between 3,500 and 4,500 new jobs during construction and between 850 and 1,250 jobs through its operations.

This boost for local families and the economy is sorely needed. We simply must not pass up this opportunity to address our county's need for community and economic development. Yet, now there are those who want to reopen this debate.

I urge you to stay strong and fair during this time of review and consideration of the Gateway Pacific Terminal project. I am confident that the process set forth by the County, the State and the Federal governments will safeguard the community while helping to deliver much needed jobs to the region. Please remember, our community needs strong leaders like you who know that we can protect the environment without sacrificing good jobs and economic development that our community needs today.

Sincerely,

Justin Goldston

9317 stein rd

custar wa 98240

For more information, please visit us at GatewayPacificTerminal.Com.

From: Perry, Randel J NWS <Randel.J.Perry@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 10:18 AM
To: Tyler Schroeder; alice.kelly@ecy.wa.gov; Emails, Sandy Robson
Cc: Jodi.Ketelsen@CH2M.com
Subject: RE: following up our call from last Friday with my questions regarding Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS

Ms. Robson:

We have received your request and will get back to you as soon as we have had time to review and prepare a response.

Randel Perry
Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District Regulatory NW Field Office
(360) 734-3156 (office)
(360) 393-2867 (cell)

-----Original Message-----

From: Sandy Robson [mailto:sjrer2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:24 AM
To: alice.kelly@ecy.wa.gov; tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us; Perry, Randel J NWS
Subject: Fwd: following up our call from last Friday with my questions regarding Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS

I wanted to forward you my email (below) that I sent to Jodi Ketelsen from CH2M Hill. I had called CH2M Hill asking if I could speak to the Public Involvement task manager and they put me through to Jodi Ketelson who said she is the Sr. Project Manager on the GPT project and she could answer my questions. I think the actual Public Involvement Task Manager is Kristin Hull, but I only got to speak with Jodi for a very brief phone call as she was on her way out the door so I sent an email with my questions.

Jodi said before she gets back to me with answers that she is going to be checking with the co-leads (you all) to make sure she would be meeting your protocols which I'm assuming she means are communications protocols.

Could you please let me know if it is within your protocols that I can get answers to my questions? I figured it is not sensitive information since it is just pertaining to the public involvement plan but I thought I would also check with you all.

Thank you very much.

Regards,

Sandy Robson
Email: sjrer2@yahoo.com
Cell: 949-677-5565
Office: 360-746-8160
7446 Seashell Way
Birch Bay, WA. 98230

From: Sandy Robson <sjrer2@yahoo.com>

Date: February 25, 2013 9:31:20 AM PST

To: jketelse@ch2m.com

Cc: kristen.hull@ch2m.com

Subject: following up our call from last Friday with my questions regarding Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS

Reply-To: Sandy Robson Emails <sjrer2@yahoo.com>

Jodi,

Thank you for talking briefly with me last Friday. I hope you had a nice weekend. As we discussed, I have some questions regarding the Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS process I hope you can answer for me. Some questions have multiple parts. Thank you in advance for your help with these as I greatly appreciate it. I copied Kristen Hull on this as well since I think she is listed as the Public Involvement Task Manager for this project EIS.

1). How many Determination of Significance announcement mailings were mailed out to residents living near the GPT site and the Custer Spur? Who determined who these notices were sent out to and how was that determination made? Is there a record somewhere of the names and addresses these notices were sent to so that if residents wanted to check and see if they were on that list they somehow can? How can someone find out if they were on that list?

2). In what specific newspaper publications were notifications of when the EIS scoping period commences published? What dates were those notifications/ads placed? Can I get a copy or view a copy of one of those that was sent out?

3). In what specific newspaper publications were notifications regarding the EIS public scoping meetings published? What date/s were those notifications/ads placed? Can I get a copy or view a copy of one of those that was sent out?

4). How was the notification area for postcards announcing the commencement of the EIS scoping period determined and who made that area determination? How can I find out the specific area that was decided upon for these mailing notifications?

5). Was there a mailing done of some kind of postcards or information sheets regarding the commencement of EIS scoping period sent out to residents in the communities near the GPT site? If so, how many were mailed out and what date/s were those mailed out?

6). Was there a mailing done of some kind of postcards or information sheets regarding the commencement of EIS scoping period sent out to residents in the communities near or along the Custer Spur? If so, how many were mailed out and what date/s were those mailed out?

7). Is there a record somewhere of the names and addresses those postcard mailings regarding the commencement of EIS scoping period were sent to so that if residents wanted to check and see if they were on that list they somehow can? How can someone find out if they were on that list?

8). Can I get a copy of the actual postcard/mailer (mentioned in my questions 5 and 6) that was sent to residents?

9). In CH2M Hill's Public Involvement Plan under section 1.1 Project Management what does Posting of Public Notices refer to? Also, if those were done, when and where were those done?

10). Will there be another mailing of postcards/sheets alerting the public to the Draft EIS comment period? Will you be sending to the same residents that you mailed out to before?

11). In the Public Involvement Plan under the Stakeholder interview section it said that CH2M Hill and PRR interviewed 18 stakeholders. Who is PRR? Who or what entity made final decisions about who those stakeholders should and would be? Are there additional stakeholders beyond the 18 interviewed stakeholders that were named in this plan? If so, where can I view that list or can you send me a copy?

12). Was a mailing list of stakeholders created? If so, can I find a record of that list somewhere and if not, can you send me a copy? Were mailings sent out to them about the start and duration of the scoping period and information about the public scoping hearings?

13). Was there an email list of stakeholders created? If so, can I find a record of that email list of names somewhere and if not, can you send me a copy? Were emails sent out to them about the start and duration of the scoping period and information about the public scoping hearings?

14). The Public Involvement Plan has a section called Outreach Ideas. One idea mentioned is briefings to City Councils. Was that done? If so, when, how and by whom, and to which City Councils?

15). Also under Outreach Ideas-one idea mentioned is posters and information at public places. Was this ever done? If so, can I find out what information was on those posters, what places were those placed, and when those posters were placed?

16). In the Public Involvement Plan under Public Involvement During Scoping Process Goal #2, Objective C it says the Public Involvement Team will publicize EIS-related activities through multiple and diverse communication vehicles. Can you tell me what EIS-related activities were publicized and in what communication vehicles they were publicized, and when they were publicized?

Again, thank you very much.
Regards,

Sandy Robson

sjrer2@yahoo.com
Cell: 949-677-5565
Home: 360-746-8160
Birch Bay, WA. 98230

From: Sandy Robson <sjr2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2013 9:24 AM
To: Tyler Schroeder; alice.kelly@ecy.wa.gov; Randel.J.Perry@nws02.usace.army.mil; Emails, Sandy Robson
Subject: Fwd: following up our call from last Friday with my questions regarding Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS

I wanted to forward you my email (below) that I sent to Jodi Ketelsen from CH2M Hill. I had called CH2M Hill asking if I could speak to the Public Involvement task manager and they put me through to Jodi Ketelson who said she is the Sr. Project Manager on the GPT project and she could answer my questions. I think the actual Public Involvement Task Manager is Kristin Hull, but I only got to speak with Jodi for a very brief phone call as she was on her way out the door so I sent an email with my questions.

Jodi said before she gets back to me with answers that she is going to be checking with the co-leads (you all) to make sure she would be meeting your protocols which I'm assuming she means are communications protocols.

Could you please let me know if it is within your protocols that I can get answers to my questions? I figured it is not sensitive information since it is just pertaining to the public involvement plan but I thought I would also check with you all.

Thank you very much.

Regards,

Sandy Robson

Email: sjr2@yahoo.com

Cell: 949-677-5565

Office: 360-746-8160

7446 Seashell Way

Birch Bay, WA. 98230

From: Sandy Robson <sjr2@yahoo.com>
Date: February 25, 2013 9:31:20 AM PST
To: jketelse@ch2m.com
Cc: kristen.hull@ch2m.com
Subject: following up our call from last Friday with my questions regarding Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS
Reply-To: Sandy Robson Emails <sjr2@yahoo.com>

Jodi,

Thank you for talking briefly with me last Friday. I hope you had a nice weekend. As we discussed, I have some questions regarding the Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS process I hope you can answer for me. Some questions have multiple parts. Thank you in advance for your help with these as I greatly appreciate it. I copied Kristen Hull on this as well since I think she is listed as the Public Involvement Task Manager for this project EIS.

1).How many Determination of Significance announcement mailings were mailed out to residents living near the GPT site and the Custer Spur? Who determined who these notices were

sent out to and how was that determination made? Is there a record somewhere of the names and addresses these notices were sent to so that if residents wanted to check and see if they were on that list they somehow can? How can someone find out if they were on that list?

2). In what specific newspaper publications were notifications of when the EIS scoping period commences published? What dates were those notifications/ads placed? Can I get a copy or view a copy of one of those that was sent out?

3). In what specific newspaper publications were notifications regarding the EIS public scoping meetings published? What date/s were those notifications/ads placed? Can I get a copy or view a copy of one of those that was sent out?

4). How was the notification area for postcards announcing the commencement of the EIS scoping period determined and who made that area determination? How can I find out the specific area that was decided upon for these mailing notifications?

5). Was there a mailing done of some kind of postcards or information sheets regarding the commencement of EIS scoping period sent out to residents in the communities near the GPT site? If so, how many were mailed out and what date/s were those mailed out?

6). Was there a mailing done of some kind of postcards or information sheets regarding the commencement of EIS scoping period sent out to residents in the communities near or along the Custer Spur?

If so, how many were mailed out and what date/s were those mailed out?

7). Is there a record somewhere of the names and addresses those postcard mailings regarding the commencement of EIS scoping period were sent to so that if residents wanted to check and see if they were on that list they somehow can? How can someone find out if they were on that list?

8). Can I get a copy of the actual postcard/mailer (mentioned in my questions 5 and 6) that was sent to residents?

9). In CH2M Hill's Public Involvement Plan under section 1.1 Project Management what does Posting of Public Notices refer to? Also, if those were done, when and where were those done?

10). Will there be another mailing of postcards/sheets alerting the public to the Draft EIS comment period? Will you be sending to the same residents that you mailed out to before?

11). In the Public Involvement Plan under the Stakeholder interview section it said that CH2M Hill and PRR interviewed 18 stakeholders. Who is PRR? Who or what entity made final decisions about who those stakeholders should and would be? Are there additional stakeholders beyond the 18 interviewed stakeholders that were named in this plan? If so, where can I view that list or can you send me a copy?

12). Was a mailing list of stakeholders created? If so, can I find a record of that list somewhere and if not, can you send me a copy? Were mailings sent out to them about the start and duration of the scoping period and information about the public scoping hearings?

13). Was there an email list of stakeholders created? If so, can I find a record of that email list of names somewhere and if not, can you send me a copy? Were emails sent out to them about the start and duration of the scoping period and information about the public scoping hearings?

14). The Public Involvement Plan has a section called Outreach Ideas. One idea mentioned is briefings to City Councils. Was that done? If so, when, how and by whom, and to which City Councils?

15). Also under Outreach Ideas—one idea mentioned is posters and information at public places. Was this ever done? If so, can I find out what information was on those posters, what places were those placed, and when those posters were placed?

16). In the Public Involvement Plan under Public Involvement During Scoping Process Goal #2, Objective C it says the Public Involvement Team will publicize EIS-related activities through multiple and diverse communication vehicles. Can you tell me what EIS-related activities were publicized and in what communication vehicles they were publicized, and when they were publicized?

Again, thank you very much.
Regards,

Sandy Robson
sjrer2@yahoo.com
Cell: 949-677-5565
Home: 360-746-8160
Birch Bay, WA. 98230

From: pspweb@bna.com
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 1:34 PM
To: Tyler Schroeder
Cc: pshukovsky@bna.com
Subject: Investigative coal story from Bloomberg BNA
Attachments: tw:der-not-a0d6q8u2y9.HTML

Hi Tyler,

Thought you'd be interesting in seeing this story. Be good to chat with you sometime soon.

Rgds,

Paul Shukovsky
Pacific Northwest Correspondent
Bloomberg BNA
(206) 718-0348

From: Royce Buckingham
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 3:13 PM
To: Tyler Schroeder; Lynn, Bill
Subject: Re: Gateway Pacific Terminal - Settlement Agreement

Got it.

Thank you, Bill,

rsb

>>> "Lynn, Bill" <BLynn@gth-law.com > 2/22/2013 2:22 PM >>>

Attached is a letter sent today regarding the Settlement Agreement. We hope to meet with you in the near future to discuss the Settlement Agreement in general and our plans for implementation.

William T. Lynn
Attorney at Law

1201 Pacific Avenue, Suite 2100
Tacoma, Washington 98402
T 253 620 6416
F 253 620 6565

<http://www.gth-law.com> < <http://www.gth-law.com/> >

NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail communication is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client or work product privileges. If you are not the intended recipient or believe that you have received this communication in error, please do not print, copy, retransmit, disseminate, or otherwise use the information. Also, please indicate to the sender that you have received this email in error and delete the copy you received. Thank you.

From: ECY <KUBA461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 12:45 PM
To: Tyler Schroeder
Subject: FW: Question on NPDES for Parcel 15

Hello Tyler-

See below. Should a SEPA have been done for the groundwater monitoring equipment installation on Parcel 15? Is it an "exempt" activity?

Kurt Baumgarten
Water Quality Specialist
WA Department of Ecology
Bellingham Field Office
1440 10th St. Suite 102
Bellingham, WA 98225-7028
(360)715-5210 desk
(360)715-5225 fax

"It's cheaper to prevent pollution than to clean it up..."

From: Dunkin, Kristie A [mailto:Kristie.Dunkin@amec.com]
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 11:51 AM
To: Baumgarten, Kurt (ECY)
Subject: Question on NPDES for Parcel 15

Kurt;
I am following up on your suggestion that we extend the current NPDES for geotechnical and other investigative work to the 336 acre Parcel 15, which Pacific International Terminals Inc. now has under contract. We are having trouble with SEPA section of the Notice of Intent. As you know, Whatcom County was the lead agency for SEPA on the prior work on the 1090 acre site. There has been no SEPA review on the 336 acre site and no "action" under SEPA is proposed for that parcel.. The definition of action under SEPA is

WAC 197-11-704

(1) "Actions" include, as further specified below:

(a) New and continuing activities (including projects and programs) entirely or partly financed, assisted, conducted, regulated, licensed, or approved by agencies;

(b) New or revised agency rules, regulations, plans, policies, or procedures; and

(c) Legislative proposals.

(2) Actions fall within one of two categories:

(a) Project actions. A project action involves a decision on a specific project, such as a construction or management activity located in a defined geographic area. Projects include and are limited to agency decisions to:

(i) License, fund, or undertake any activity that will directly modify the environment, whether the activity will be conducted by the agency, an applicant, or under contract.

(ii) Purchase, sell, lease, transfer, or exchange natural resources, including publicly owned land, whether or not the environment is directly modified.

We could complete a SEPA checklist for the 336 acres but that would not serve any purpose we can see since there is no activity proposed, i.e., no modification of the environment. One option would be to defer this until some action is proposed on Parcel 15 that would necessitate coverage under an NPDES permit. What do you think?

Kristie Dunkin, Ph.D, PMP

Sr. Associate

AMEC

Environment and Infrastructure

11810 North Creek Parkway N

Tel 425 368-10000

Direct 425 368-0963, mobile/cell (206) 979-5032 kristie.dunkin@amec.com<<mailto:firstname.surname@amec.com>>

[amec.com](http://www.amec.com)<<http://www.amec.com>>

Be more sustainable - think before you print.

Business sustainability starts here... AMEC is committed to reducing its carbon footprint.

Business sustainability starts here... AMEC is a signatory to the UN Global Compact.

Business sustainability starts here... AMEC supports SOS Children<<http://www.soschildrensvillages.org.uk>>

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed.

Its contents (including any attachments) may contain confidential and/or privileged information.

If you are not an intended recipient you must not use, disclose, disseminate, copy or print its contents.

If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete and destroy the message.

From: Lynn, Bill <BLynn@gth-law.com>
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2013 2:22 PM
To: Royce Buckingham; Tyler Schroeder
Subject: Gateway Pacific Terminal - Settlement Agreement
Attachments: image001.png; SSAItrYoungWiseOsborn-KleinreSettlementAgr.pdf

Attached is a letter sent today regarding the Settlement Agreement. We hope to meet with you in the near future to discuss the Settlement Agreement in general and our plans for implementation.

William T. Lynn
Attorney at Law

1201 Pacific Avenue, Suite 2100
Tacoma, Washington 98402
T 253 620 6416
F 253 620 6565

<http://www.gth-law.com> <<http://www.gth-law.com/>>

NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail communication is confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client or work product privileges. If you are not the intended recipient or believe that you have received this communication in error, please do not print, copy, retransmit, disseminate, or otherwise use the information. Also, please indicate to the sender that you have received this email in error and delete the copy you received. Thank you.

From: Jennifer Morgan
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2013 12:41 PM
To: Pamela Brown; Stephanie Drake; Tyler Schroeder
Subject: SSA Marine Invoice for Jan13 Staff Time
Attachments: SSA Marine Invoice 18736 Jan13 Staff Time.pdf

Jennifer Morgan
Financial Accountant
Whatcom County Finance
360-676-6734 ext. #50190

From: Arden Landry
Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 8:44 AM
To: Tyler Schroeder
Subject: RE: report to council

Sure. Thanks for letting me know. I'll let Jack know.

Arden

From: Tyler Schroeder [mailto:Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us]

Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2013 8:42 AM

To: Arden Landry

Subject: RE: report to council

Arden,

I would like to wait on this presentation to council for a couple of weeks, if we can. I was hoping that we would have the scoping report prepared, and due to the amount of comments it is not quite finished. I will let you know when we get the scoping report and I will more than likely present to Council sometime in March.

Please let me know if this works.

Thanks,

Tyler

>>> Arden Landry <ALandry@co.whatcom.wa.us<mailto:ALandry@co.whatcom.wa.us>> 2/12/2013 4:23 PM >>>

Hi Tyler,

I just spoke to Jack (I was also away in Hawaii until today) and he is comfortable with you proceeding with an update to council at the finance committee meeting on Feb. 26. Of course, the update would be on the contract, where we are in the process going forward....

Let me know if you need help with an agenda bill. Jack will not be here (on vacation and then WA DC).

Arden

From: Schroeder, Tyler [mailto:Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us]

Sent: Friday, January 25, 2013 1:00 PM

To: Arden Landry

Cc: Ryan, Sam

Subject: Re: report to council

Arden,

I am open for a discussion with council at one of the upcoming Council Finance Committee meetings in February. I think once of the meetings later in the month would work best for me. Please let me know what works and I will plan on that.

Thanks,

Tyler

>>> Arden Landry 1/16/2013 11:46 AM >>>

Hi Tyler,

At a November council meeting Jack had committed to them that administration would provide an update to them on the GPT contract (this came up because of questions related to direct costs being covered under this contract -- and ensuring that we are covered under the next one); as well as the next steps in the process....timeline, etc.

He'd like you do that at a February Council Finance Committee meeting. Is that doable?

Arden

From: Arden Landry
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2013 4:24 PM
To: Tyler Schroeder
Subject: RE: report to council

Hi Tyler,

I just spoke to Jack (I was also away in Hawaii until today) and he is comfortable with you proceeding with an update to council at the finance committee meeting on Feb. 26. Of course, the update would be on the contract, where we are in the process going forward....

Let me know if you need help with an agenda bill. Jack will not be here (on vacation and then WA DC).

Arden

From: Schroeder, Tyler [mailto:Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us]
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2013 1:00 PM
To: Arden Landry
Cc: Ryan, Sam
Subject: Re: report to council

Arden,

I am open for a discussion with council at one of the upcoming Council Finance Committee meetings in February. I think once of the meetings later in the month would work best for me. Please let me know what works and I will plan on that.

Thanks,

Tyler

>>> Arden Landry 1/16/2013 11:46 AM >>>

Hi Tyler,

At a November council meeting Jack had committed to them that administration would provide an update to them on the GPT contract (this came up because of questions related to direct costs being covered under this contract -- and ensuring that we are covered under the next one); as well as the next steps in the process....timeline, etc.

He'd like you do that at a February Council Finance Committee meeting. Is that doable?

Arden

From: Sandy Robson <sjrer2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Tyler Schroeder; Emails, Sandy Robson
Cc: Jack Louws; alice.kelly@ecy.wa.gov; jane.dewell@ora.wa.gov;
randel.j.perry@usace.army.mil
Subject: following up after my January 25th phone call with you and additional information to bring to your attention regarding GPT EIS public record information

Good Morning Tyler,

I wanted to follow up with you since my phone call to you on January 25, 2013 regarding the 3 pro-GPT promotional documents that were on your PDS webpage regarding the Gateway Pacific Terminal EIS. I had copied and pasted (it is at the bottom of my email) the Whatcom County PDS GPT EIS webpage as it looked on January 12, 2013 when I first noticed this when I was doing a web search for Gateway Pacific Terminal and PDS looking for some information and it took me to the PDS webpage at <http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/index.jsp>.

When I looked at the information on the PDS webpage under the Gateway Pacific Terminal /Pacific International Terminals header it had pertinent information on it, but then I was shocked when a little further down the page it had a list that read, "Below Are Recent Documents from 2012" and at the very top of that list was what seemed outrageous to me; it said, "Petitions and support statements (a) & (b) for GPT". So, there were 3 separate pro-GPT promotional documents at the top of that list. If you click on the Petitions link it takes you to a signature petition in support of GPT. Then if you click on document (a) and document (b) those both are also clearly full-on promotional documents for GPT including photos of people holding signs with various slogans like "Good Jobs Now" and "Build Jobs Here", etc. There are also photos featuring residents and video and written testimonials in support of GPT, etc. There are numerous letters written by various organizations in support of GPT also. This is all obviously pro-GPT biased information that should not be on the Whatcom County PDS webpage for the GPT EIS since your department is one of the 3 agencies involved in the GPT EIS process which are all supposed to be objective and give the public objective information regarding GPT.

I know that these 3 pro-GPT promotional documents were removed from the PDS GPT EIS webpage after Terry Wechsler (Protect Whatcom) contacted your department and alerted Stephanie (I think) on January 13th or 14th about them being on the webpage, however who knows how long they were on the PDS webpage for the GPT EIS and what effect they may have had on the public visiting that PDS webpage for supposedly impartial information about the proposed GPT project. I decided that the least I could do about this is to get this information (along with additional information that I'm bringing to your attention in this email today), on the public record by writing you this email rather than calling you again.

When we spoke in January, you were going to find out who authorized those promotional documents to be placed on the PDS webpage for the GPT EIS, why they were placed on there, and exactly when those documents were loaded onto the website. Have you been able to ascertain that information yet, and if so, what did you find out?

Also, I have been researching a lot of the documents available to the public associated with the proposed GPT and have found something else that I would like to bring to your attention and to any other agencies including the consultant, CH2MHill, if it also has access to the documents I refer to below and would give them any consideration in the EIS process for the GPT.

Recently, in reading carefully through the documents in those 3 attachments mentioned above that I called you about, I found that there are "support letters" included in both the (a) and (b) documents that are not even concerning the GPT proposal, but rather are letters regarding the EIS for the Port of Morrow, Oregon Coal Terminal Project/s. Those are letters from the following organizations: National Association of Manufacturers, Washington Public Ports Association, Pacific Northwest Waterways Association, Western Business Roundtable, and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States—these organizations' letters are specifically addressing and regarding the EIS for the Port of Morrow, Oregon Coal Terminal Project/s. The letters do not mention the GPT project in WA so I do not know why they are even included in any Whatcom County record/s pertaining to the GPT proposal EIS.

I respectfully request that these letters (including the listing of these letters in both documents) of support regarding the EIS for the proposed coal terminal/s in OR be removed from the GPT EIS public record information so these promotional documents are not confusing to the public. Also, in document (b) under the section titled "Business and Civic Organizations Comment On Project and Process" there are logos shown for these business and civic organizations (listed above) showing support of GPT and in support of a site-specific EIS process which is misleading because these letters I am referencing are regarding the Oregon Coal terminal proposal/s. I also respectfully request that you have these organizations' logos removed from those documents in the public record along with the letters.

Additionally, throughout the GPT promotional document/s the creators of these pro-GPT promotional documents have listed various organizations and touting their numbers of members thus inflating the referenced supposed total number of people who support the GPT project and I would ask that information to be revised/corrected as well. For instance, the Association of Washington Business (AWB) is listed as a supporter of GPT and a site specific EIS in promotional document (a) and there is nothing even within that document to substantiate that claim—no letter or statement of any kind. In document (b) there is a column written by Don Brunell, the President of the AWB, and it's entitled "Will the Northwest Economy be a Casualty of the War on Coal", but there is not any letter, statement, or document stating that the organization, AWB, supports GPT or a site-specific EIS, or that Brunell is speaking on behalf of AWB. What is shown is merely a column by Don Brunell expressing his personal perspective (his column on the AWB website is actually called "President's Perspective") that he writes about, and there is no mention of an endorsement from the organization itself, and there is no mention of the GPT. The creators of these pro-GPT promotional documents are claiming that the AWB (which they report represents 7,900 members and 700,000 employees) is endorsing and supporting GPT and a site-specific EIS, yet nowhere in that column does it say that Brunell is speaking on behalf of the AWB. So, unless there is a document submitted backing that claim up I would also respectfully request that the AWB and its logo be removed from both of those GPT promotional documents (a) and (b) in the GPT EIS public record.

SSA/PIT and its hired consultants, especially Bellingham locals Craig Cole and Ken Oplinger, who I believe put these pro-GPT advertising documents together, have been disseminating

incorrect and questionable information regarding the proposed GPT for far too long now, and at the very least, these misleading letters purporting to be in support of GPT and a site-specific EIS for GPT that are actually specifically pertaining to Oregon coal terminal/s should not be in the public record for the GPT EIS. The only time these letters should be in the public record for GPT's EIS is if and when GPT's EIS becomes a regional cumulative impact assessment or a Programmatic EIS which I strongly believe should be the case for the GPT project, and then all of the 5 proposed terminals in WA and OR would be included so only then would those letters be relevant.

Also, the listing of the AWB organization and display of its logo by the creators of these pro-GPT promotional documents claiming its endorsement and support of the GPT proposal and a site-specific EIS should not be in the public record for the GPT EIS since the column by Don Brunell, President of the Association of Washington Business appears to merely demonstrate Brunell's expression of his personal perspective and does not state that he is speaking on behalf of the AWB.

I look forward to hearing from you regarding my questions I mentioned above (about who authorized putting these GPT advertisement pieces on the PDS website, why they thought that these documents were objective GPT information, and when those documents were loaded onto the PDS GPT webpage) that we discussed.

Additionally, I look forward to hearing that you are able to rectify the issues I have called to your attention in this email regarding the so-called "support letters" from the 5 organizations I listed above that do not actually pertain to the GPT proposal that are presently in the public record for the GPT EIS, and the listing of the AWB and display of its logo in both pro-GPT promotional documents (a) and (b) and the seemingly baseless claim by the creators of these promotional documents that the AWB, representing 7,900 members with 700,000 employees, supports the GPT and a site-specific EIS.

Thank you very much for your attention to these matters.
Regards,

Sandy Robson

sjrer2@yahoo.com

Cell: 949-677-5565

Home: 360-746-8160

7446 Seashell Way

Birch Bay, WA. 98230

Below, I have copied and pasted the PDS GPT EIS webpage that I first saw on January 12, 2013 so that you can see exactly what I saw that day. In case the links are no longer active I copied and pasted the links for the 3 promotional documents for you here so you can review the information I have brought to your attention in this email.

The web address for document (a) is: <http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/pdf/gpt-statements-of-support-20121127.pdf>

The web address for document (b) is: <http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/pdf/gpt-2nd-installment-support-msg-july2012.pdf>

The web address for the Petition with signatures is: <http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/pdf/gpt-petitions-20121127.pdf>

Whatcom County | Departments | Contacts | Help | Search

Planning and Development Services

[PDS Home](#) | [Building](#) | [Code](#) | [Fire](#) | [GIS](#) | [Natural Resources](#) | [Permits](#) | [Planning](#) | [Calendar](#)

Our Services

- [Building Services](#)
- [Code Enforcement](#)
- [Fire Marshal](#)
- [GIS Maps & Data](#)
- [Natural Resources](#)
- [Permit Center](#)
- [Planning](#)
- [SEPA](#)
- [Contact Us](#)

Gateway Pacific Terminal Project

Quick Links

- [Applications / Forms](#)
- [Calendar](#)
- [Reports](#)

Director:

J.E. "Sam" Ryan, CBO

5280 Northwest Drive
Bellingham, Washington
98226

Telephone: (360) 676-6907

E-

mail: pds@co.whatcom.wa.us

Gateway Pacific Terminal / Pacific International Terminals, Inc.

The GPT project, which is being proposed by Pacific International Terminals, Inc., is a multi-user import and export marina terminal for bulk, break-bulk, and other marine cargoes. The project will include new rail loop tracks, covered and open terminal storage areas, and a pier and trestle connection to the terminal storage area. The property is located between the BP Refinery to the north and the INTALCO facility to the south. The project area is located in the Cherry Point Industrial Urban Growth Area (UGA), which is zoned for heavy-impact industrial land use. The property is also designated as part of the Cherry Point Management Area, under the Whatcom County's Shoreline Management Program. The facility is located within the Cherry Point State Aquatic Reserve south of Birch Bay.

EIS for the Proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal and Custer Spur Projects Begins

The scoping period for the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Gateway Pacific Terminal and Custer Spur modifications begins on September 24 and will conclude on January 21, 2013. During the scoping process, the Co-Lead Agencies, Whatcom County, the Washington State Department of Ecology and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, are interested in your comments on:

- Reasonable range of alternatives
- Potentially affected resources and extent of analysis for those resources
- Significant unavoidable adverse impacts
- Measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate effects of the proposals

All comments received during the scoping process will be considered the same way. There are many ways that you can participate in the scoping process. You can submit comments by:

- Mail to GPT/Custer Spur EIS c/o CH2M HILL, 1100 112th Avenue NE Suite 400, Bellevue, WA 98004
- Email to comments@eisgatewaypacificwa.gov
- Web at www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov
- In person at a scoping meeting

In addition to the online scoping meeting that is available throughout the 120 day scoping process, the Co-Lead

Agencies hosted scoping meetings in seven cities:

<p>Bellingham Sat., Oct. 27 Squalicum High School 3773 E McLeod Road, Bellingham, WA</p>	<p>Friday Harbor Sat., Nov. 3 Friday Harbor High School 45 Blair Avenue, Friday Harbor, WA</p>	<p>Mount Vernon Mon., Nov. 5 McIntyre Hall 2501 E College Way, Mount Vernon, WA</p>	<p>Seattle Thurs., Dec. 13 Washington State Convention Center, Ballroom 6F; 800 Convention Pl., Seattle, WA</p>
<p>Ferndale Thurs., Nov. 29 Ferndale Events Center 5715 Barrett Road, Ferndale, WA</p>	<p>Spokane Tues., Dec. 4 Spokane Co. Fairgrounds Plaza 404 N Havana Street, Spokane Valley, WA</p>	<p>Vancouver Wed., Dec. 12 Clark College Gaiser Student Center 1933 Fort Vancouver Way, Vancouver, WA</p>	

The Determination of Significance for SEPA and a guide to the scoping process are available on the [project web site](#). We look forward to hearing from you during the scoping process.

Please send any questions about the scoping process or logistics to comments@eisgatewaypacificwa.gov or call 360-398-5087.

If you would like to join the email subscriber list, please visit the project website (www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov/get-involved/comment). You can fill out your contact information and click the "Add to mailing list" box at the bottom of the form.

The co-lead agencies have created a general [Question & Answer page](#) through the Department of Ecology website that will help answer many of the questions that have been asked by the public.

Please visit our [correspondence page](#) which contains county-wide emails, along with general letters received at PDS, and correspondence between other agencies & PIT regarding this

project.

Pages Last Updated January 10, 2013

Below are recent documents from 2012

- [Petitions](#) and Support Statements [\(a\)](#) & [\(b\)](#) for GPT Project.
- [Letter from WCPDS to PIT granting an extension for the Land Disturbance Permit \(LDP2011-00054\)](#)
- [Letter from PIT to Agencies regarding pending work by Bonneville Power Administration on PIT property, October 26, 2012](#)
- [Letter from Whatcom County to AMEC, August 13, 2012 and Parcel 15 Hydrology Study, June 8, 2012](#)
- [Communication Protocol Agreement](#)
- [Contract #201205028 between Whatcom County and CH2M Hill & Notice to Proceed, June 12, 2012](#)
- [Contract #201205029 between Whatcom County, Pacific International Terminals, Inc., and BNSF Railway Company, June 12, 2012](#)
- [Memorandum of Agreement Regarding the Preparation of the Vessel Traffic Study as required by the GPT Settlement Agreement, SHB No. 97-22 & No. 97-23](#)
- [Whatcom County Council Agenda Bill from June 5, 2012 Council Meeting](#)
- [Land Disturbance Extension Letter from Whatcom County PDS to Pacific International Terminals, Inc., May 24, 2012](#)
- All written public comments sent to Whatcom County PDS via US Mail or e-mail regarding the Notice of Application which was issued on Monday, April 16, 2012 are posted on our site. [Click here to view.](#)
- [Notice of Application issued April 16, 2012 by Whatcom County for the MDP, SHR, and VAR applications.](#)
- [Determination of Completeness from Whatcom County to PIT for MDP, SHR, and VAR applications, April 2, 2012](#)
- [Major Development Permit \(MDP\), Zoning Variance \(VAR\) and Shoreline Substantial Permit \(SHR\) Applications, March 19, 2012](#)
 - [Attachment D-1](#)
 - [Attachment D-2](#)
 - [Attachment E](#)
 - [Attachment F](#)
 - [Attachment H](#)
 - [Attachment - 2008 Wetland Final Report](#)
 - [Supplemental - Clarifying Materials](#)

- [Supplemental -Ordinary High Water Mark Determination](#)
- [Supplemental - Parcel 14 Wetland Delineation](#)
- [GPT Environmental Review Process slideshow from meeting held March 20, 2012](#)
- [GPT Timeline Slides from meeting held March 20, 2012](#)
- GPT Environmental Review Process meeting video, held March 20, 2012. Because of size constraints, this video is split into nine parts. Click on the following links to view in order: [1](#), [2](#), [3,4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)

Click on this link to view [documents from 2011 and back.](#)



Copyright © 2007 [Whatcom County](#) [Privacy Policy](#)
Webmaster: webmaster@co.whatcom.wa.us

From: Jennifer Morgan
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 2:57 PM
To: Stephanie Drake
Cc: Pamela Brown; Tyler Schroeder
Subject: Pacific International Terminals Payment for Dec12 Staff Time
Attachments: Payment for Invoice 18568 Dec12 staff time.pdf

Jennifer Morgan
Financial Accountant
Whatcom County Finance
360-676-6734 ext. #50190

From: ECY <AKEL461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:44 AM
To: Jodi.Ketelsen@CH2M.com; Tyler Schroeder; Rodero, Hadley
Subject: FW: WHATCOM COUNTY- ECOLOGY - U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS JOINTNEWS RELEASE: More than 124,000 comments received on scope of environmentalreview for proposed Cherry Point export terminal

From: Altose, Larry (ECY)
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:41 AM
To: Baldi, Josh (ECY); Kelly, Alice (ECY); Terpening, Dustin (ECY); Allen, Douglas R. (ECY); Dewell, Jane (ORA); White, Gordon (ECY); McFarland, Brenden (ECY); Graesser, Patricia C NWS; Perry, Randel J NWS; Young, Tom (ATG)
Cc: Kent, Linda (ECY); Toteff, Sally (ECY); Butorac, Diane (ECY); Watson, Laura (ATG); Howard, Sandy (ECY); Beeler, Brook (ECY); Redfield-Wilder, Joye (ECY)
Subject: FW: WHATCOM COUNTY- ECOLOGY - U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS JOINT NEWS RELEASE: More than 124,000 comments received on scope of environmental review for proposed Cherry Point export terminal

The Department of Ecology has issued the news release below on behalf of the EIS co-lead agencies for the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal and BNSF Railway Custer Spur project to area news media and to e-mail subscribers who receive all of Ecology's news releases.

Larry Altose
Public Information Officer
Dept. of Ecology, Northwest Region
3190 160th Ave SE
Bellevue WA 98008-5452
425-649-7009

From: Partridge, Sandra (ECY)
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:32 AM
Subject: WHATCOM COUNTY- ECOLOGY - U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS JOINT NEWS RELEASE: More than 124,000 comments received on scope of environmental review for proposed Cherry Point export terminal

Joint news release:
Whatcom County, Washington Dept. of Ecology, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE - Feb. 6, 2013
13-043

More than 124,000 comments received on scope of environmental review for proposed Cherry Point export terminal

BELLEVUE - The public provided more than 124,000 comments on the scope of an upcoming environmental impact statement (EIS) for a proposed bulk-cargo shipping terminal and rail spur improvements at Cherry Point, according to a preliminary count by the three agencies that conducted a recently-concluded four-month public comment period.

Form-letters or e-mails made up approximately 108,000 of the total, submitted by people who responded to 24 organized comment campaigns identified so far. The agencies received more than 16,000 uniquely worded comments. Work continues on a final comment count and breakdown.

The 121-day comment period ran from Sept. 24, 2012, to Jan. 22, 2013.

The official website, www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov<<http://www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov>>, provides additional details about the scoping process, project proposals, and displays comments received.

Pacific International Terminals, a subsidiary of SSA Marine Inc. (SSA), proposes to build and operate the Gateway Pacific Terminal between Ferndale and Blaine. The terminal would provide storage and handling of exported and imported dry bulk commodities, including coal, grain, iron ore, salts and alumina. BNSF Railway Inc. proposes to add rail facilities and install a second track along the six-mile Custer Spur.

Whatcom County, the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) together are conducting the EIS process for the proposed terminal projects and jointly will produce one EIS. Whatcom County and Ecology must follow the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and the Corps must follow the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Scoping is a preliminary phase of the EIS process when the agencies identify potential adverse impacts and decide which of these to analyze in the EIS. The three lead agencies gathered input from other agencies, tribes and the public. After considering comments, the lead agencies will decide what should be included in the EIS.

The EIS will evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives, potentially affected resources, significant unavoidable adverse impacts of various alternatives, and explore possible means to avoid, minimize and mitigate effects of the proposals.

The three co-lead agencies hosted seven public meetings during the comment period, which drew total attendance of more than 8,700. People at the meetings submitted 1,419 hand-written comments and 1,207 verbal comments. Of the verbal comments, 865 were given in front of audiences, and 342 were recorded individually.

The agencies consider all comments on an equal basis, regardless of how people submitted them.

The joint NEPA/SEPA EIS process enables the co-lead agencies to avoid duplicated efforts where the two laws overlap, while meeting each statute's separate requirements. Parts of the joint EIS process described on the website apply to both statutes and parts apply to one or the other.

The scoping process does not address whether the proposal should receive permits. Scoping only helps define what will be studied in the EIS. Decisions about issuing permits to construct the proposed projects will not be made until after the EIS is complete.

The co-lead lead agencies plan to issue a scoping report in the next few weeks with a thorough assessment of the comments. Then, they will review that input and issue plans later this year for a draft EIS, which may take at least a year to prepare. The lead agencies will seek public comment on the draft EIS, and then produce a final NEPA/SEPA EIS.

###

Media Contacts:

* Whatcom County Planning Manager: Tyler Schroeder , 360-676-6907, tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us<<mailto:tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us>>

* Ecology media relations: Larry Altose, 206-920-2600, larry.altose@ecy.wa.gov<<mailto:larry.altose@ecy.wa.gov>>

* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers media relations: Patricia Graesser, 206-764-3750, patricia.graesser@us.army.mil
<<mailto:patricia.graesser@us.army.mil>>

Mailroom photos of comments:

* <http://flic.kr/s/aHsjDT6uXa>

For more information:

Official website for the Gateway Pacific Terminal/Custer Spur EIS and scoping process<<http://www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov>>

Ecology's Gateway Pacific Terminal page<<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/geographic/gatewaypacific/>>

Whatcom County's Gateway Pacific Terminal page<<http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/index.jsp>>

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District<<http://www.nws.usace.army.mil>>

Washington Office of Regulatory Assistance<<http://iprmt.ora.wa.gov/>>

Ecology's website: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov>

Ecology's social media: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/about/newmedia.html>

###

Broadcast version:

Officials are sifting through more than 124-thousand comments on what to cover in an upcoming environmental review for a proposed bulk-cargo shipping terminal and rail spur improvements at Cherry Point in Whatcom County.

Most comments were form letters or e-mails from organized comment campaigns. But more than 16-thousand messages came in with unique wording.

The Army Corps of Engineers, state Department of Ecology and Whatcom County ended a four-month comment period last week. They expect to need several months to consider that input before starting work on the project's environmental impact statement.

From: ECY <shug461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2013 9:32 AM
To: Partridge, Sandra (ECY)
Subject: WHATCOM COUNTY- ECOLOGY - U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS JOINT NEWSRELEASE: More than 124,000 comments received on scope of environmental review for proposed Cherry Point export terminal

Joint news release:

Whatcom County, Washington Dept. of Ecology, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE – Feb. 6, 2013
13-043

More than 124,000 comments received on scope of environmental review for proposed Cherry Point export terminal

BELLEVUE – The public provided more than 124,000 comments on the scope of an upcoming environmental impact statement (EIS) for a proposed bulk-cargo shipping terminal and rail spur improvements at Cherry Point, according to a preliminary count by the three agencies that conducted a recently-concluded four-month public comment period.

Form-letters or e-mails made up approximately 108,000 of the total, submitted by people who responded to 24 organized comment campaigns identified so far. The agencies received more than 16,000 uniquely worded comments. Work continues on a final comment count and breakdown.

The 121-day comment period ran from Sept. 24, 2012, to Jan. 22, 2013.

The official website, www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov<<http://www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov>>, provides additional details about the scoping process, project proposals, and displays comments received.

Pacific International Terminals, a subsidiary of SSA Marine Inc. (SSA), proposes to build and operate the Gateway Pacific Terminal between Ferndale and Blaine. The terminal would provide storage and handling of exported and imported dry bulk commodities, including coal, grain, iron ore, salts and alumina. BNSF Railway Inc. proposes to add rail facilities and install a second track along the six-mile Custer Spur.

Whatcom County, the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) together are conducting the EIS process for the proposed terminal projects and jointly will produce one EIS. Whatcom County and Ecology must follow the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and the Corps must follow the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Scoping is a preliminary phase of the EIS process when the agencies identify potential adverse impacts and decide which of these to analyze in the EIS. The three lead agencies gathered input from other agencies, tribes and the public. After considering comments, the lead agencies will decide what should be included in the EIS.

The EIS will evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives, potentially affected resources, significant unavoidable adverse impacts of various alternatives, and explore possible means to avoid, minimize and mitigate effects of the proposals.

The three co-lead agencies hosted seven public meetings during the comment period, which drew total attendance of more than 8,700. People at the meetings submitted 1,419 hand-written comments and 1,207 verbal comments. Of the verbal comments, 865 were given in front of audiences, and 342 were recorded individually.

The agencies consider all comments on an equal basis, regardless of how people submitted them.

The joint NEPA/SEPA EIS process enables the co-lead agencies to avoid duplicated efforts where the two laws overlap, while meeting each statute's separate requirements. Parts of the joint EIS process described on the website apply to both statutes and parts apply to one or the other.

The scoping process does not address whether the proposal should receive permits. Scoping only helps define what will be studied in the EIS. Decisions about issuing permits to construct the proposed projects will not be made until after the EIS is complete.

The co-lead lead agencies plan to issue a scoping report in the next few weeks with a thorough assessment of the comments. Then, they will review that input and issue plans later this year for a draft EIS, which may take at least a year to prepare. The lead agencies will seek public comment on the draft EIS, and then produce a final NEPA/SEPA EIS.

###

Media Contacts:

- Whatcom County Planning Manager: Tyler Schroeder , 360-676-6907, tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us<<mailto:tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us>>
- Ecology media relations: Larry Altose, 206-920-2600, larry.altose@ecy.wa.gov<<mailto:larry.altose@ecy.wa.gov>>
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers media relations: Patricia Graesser, 206-764-3750, patricia.graesser@us.army.mil<<mailto:patricia.graesser@us.army.mil>>

Mailroom photos of comments:

- <http://flic.kr/s/aHsjDT6uXa>

For more information:

Official website for the Gateway Pacific Terminal/Custer Spur EIS and scoping process<<http://www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov>>

Ecology's Gateway Pacific Terminal page<<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/geographic/gatewaypacific/>>

Whatcom County's Gateway Pacific Terminal page<<http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/index.jsp>>

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District<<http://www.nws.usace.army.mil>>

Washington Office of Regulatory Assistance<<http://iprmt.ora.wa.gov/>>

Ecology's website: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov>

Ecology's social media: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/about/newmedia.html>

###

Broadcast version:

Officials are sifting through more than 124-thousand comments on what to cover in an upcoming environmental review for a proposed bulk-cargo shipping terminal and rail spur improvements at Cherry Point in Whatcom County.

Most comments were form letters or e-mails from organized comment campaigns. But more than 16-thousand messages came in with unique wording.

The Army Corps of Engineers, state Department of Ecology and Whatcom County ended a four-month comment period last week. They expect to need several months to consider that input before starting work on the project's environmental impact statement.

###

From: Jack Delay <jackdelay@communitywisebellingham.org>
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2013 3:21 PM
To: Tyler Schroeder
Cc: Decker, Patricia
Subject: Re: Weekly Summaries of GPT correspondence

Thanks much for the update Tyler.

I have been really impressed with how the County has handled the public transparency aspects of this complex project and I know from work with the City that all local jurisdictions are pretty resource strapped these days. That's definitely the reason I put off mentioning this until after that process was over and I can assure you that I have come across any people that appreciate looking over the correspondence and emails. There is definitely a large collection of folks from different perspectives that have an interest and I think this process has gained confidence for the staff approach at the County.

My CWB work is stretched pretty thin also as we are in planning, budgeting, grant writing mode.

Look forward to the continuing process.

On Feb 4, 2013, at 3:10 PM, "Tyler Schroeder" <Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us> wrote:

Jack,

Hope you are well. As you know, I have been diligently working on the scoping process associated with GPT. As you point out, one of the things that has been limited over the scoping period is the updating of Whatcom County's GPT website page. One reason for this is the sheer amount of work to keep that page updated, and second, the Co-Lead's wanted to make sure that the EIS project website was used to the best extent possible. Now that scoping is finished I will be updating the County's website on a more frequent basis. I am glad to hear that it is a resource for the public and will work on keeping it updated.

On the petitions specifically, a link will be provided to that document within the week. Please go to <http://www.whatcomcounty.us/pds/plan/current/gpt-ssa/comment.jsp> to find the link under, recent correspondence from 2012.

Thanks and please call me if you would like more information.

From: James Wells <travertine9@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2013 1:38 PM
To: Perry, Randel J NWS
Cc: Tyler Schroeder; Kelly, Alice (ECY)
Subject: Re: Gateway Pacific Terminal scoping: Drop Box for new information

Thank you - that's very helpful.

If I could follow up on something:

- Will the Scoping Report include information about Scope of the EIS as determined by the agencies? Your reply simply says that the Scoping Summary Report will summarize the comments that were received.
- If the Scoping Report does not define the Scope of the EIS, when will that information be released? Will it be in advance of the publication of the Draft EIS?

Thanks,

--

James Wells

We shall not participate in our own destruction

[Our Cousins of the Salish Sea](#)

[101 Reasons to be Concerned About Coal Export](#)

On Mon, Feb 4, 2013 at 8:47 AM, Perry, Randel J NWS <Randel.J.Perry@usace.army.mil> wrote:
Mr. Wells:

On behalf of the Environmental Impact Statement co-lead agencies, the following is a response to your message of 30 January 2013.

Now that the scoping comment period has ended, the co-lead agencies will be reviewing the comments, and summarizing the input in a scoping summary report. Any comments that were submitted after January 22, 2013 will not be included in the scoping summary report.

The Co-lead agencies' position is that we accept and will review information regardless of when it is sent. However, there is no guarantee that the information will be utilized in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) or that any information submitted will affect our agency decisions. In addition, we will not delay making agency decisions, such as the scope of analysis for the DEIS, based on the potential to receive additional information submitted outside the official comment period.

The GPT EIS website <http://www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov/get-involved/comment> provides a place to submit information to the agencies. In addition, the US mail address of the consultant can be used, or comments can be mailed or emailed to one or all of the co-lead agencies.

The next public comment period will occur when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is published.

We appreciate your interest in the matter and your recommendations. Please feel free to contact us if you have

any questions.

Randel Perry
Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
Regulatory NW Field Office
[\(360\) 734-3156](tel:3607343156) (office)
[\(360\) 393-2867](tel:3603932867) (cell)

-----Original Message-----

From: James Wells [mailto:travertine9@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2013 11:13 PM

To: Perry, Randel J NWS; Sturdevant, Ted (ECY); Walker, Michelle NWS; Bennett, Matthew J NWS; Eugenio, Francis X NWS; Summerhays, Jeannie (ECY); White, Gordon (ECY); jlouws@co.whatcom.wa.us; Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us

Subject: Gateway Pacific Terminal scoping: Drop Box for new information

Dear agency personnel,

Thank you for your diligent efforts during the EIS scoping public comment process.

During the public hearings, I had a few informal conversations with agency staff how they would accept new input beyond the end of the public comment period.

The theory I provided was:

- (1) The agencies have an obligation to continue to gather all relevant information during the course of the EIS, and
- (2) Certain interested parties will be motivated to supply that information as it may become available, so
- (3) There needs to be a mechanism where we can alert the agencies to new info, so the agencies can then evaluate it.

My recollection was that the agency people I spoke with agreed that was reasonable in concept, for genuinely new information. This is especially so considering that the EIS process may take some time, and that our state of knowledge about the world will not stay still.

I'd like to request information about a reasonable process by which interested people can provide the agencies with new information such as may arise, now that the public comment period has ended.

From: Jack Delay <jackdelay@communitywisebellingham.org>
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2013 11:59 AM
To: Tyler Schroeder
Subject: Weekly Summaries of GPT correspondence

Hello Tyler

I just noted that September 25th was the last time that the County PDS GPT page was updated with GPT related materials. I have always felt that your approach to transparency was an important commitment to Whatcom citizens and the process, but I also know that it consumes resources. I assume, since the work of catching up with this documentation is related to processing the GPT application, you are reimbursed for the clerical staff time involved.

As the date this stopped was around the start of EIS scoping I am not surprised, especially if you have to be directly involved. It is clear, however, that there continues to be correspondence with the County that is both highly relevant to continuing transparency in the public process and that is not a part of the formal comments record being maintained by the EIS Consultants. I fully understand that the publication of those EIS comments do not need to be duplicated, but there other important submission that have been made which are very much in the news like the petitions submitted by SSA. In fact those petitions have not only found their way into media around the region, but they have been prominently featured in advertisements and statements. The petitions I am referring to were chronicled in the Herald as being delivered to PDS:

On Tuesday November 27th SSA representatives delivered petitions that they indicated included 10,000 citizens "xxx" to Executive Jack Louws office. As reported in the media "Louws was not there to greet them. His receptionists said they would forward the petitions on to Tyler Schroeder, the Whatcom County planning manager in charge of the local portion of regulatory review of the project."

I have not been able to find those petitions as an EIS comment (which makes sense if they are simply expressing opinions about the project as the news article suggests). That means it is the County PDS site, with your long established practice of publishing GPT related submissions, that is the only place the general public could hope to see those petitions now in your possession. They have very much become an important public document by actions of project proponents. I, as a private citizen, I am very interested in reviewing them.

Do you have any idea when we might expect to see those petitions as well as any other backed up GPT related materials scanned and presented?

Thanks and have a nice day.

From: Perry, Randel J NWS <Randel.J.Perry@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2013 8:48 AM
To: Wells, James
Cc: Tyler Schroeder; Kelly, Alice (ECY)
Subject: RE: Gateway Pacific Terminal scoping: Drop Box for new information

Mr. Wells:

On behalf of the Environmental Impact Statement co-lead agencies, the following is a response to your message of 30 January 2013.

Now that the scoping comment period has ended, the co-lead agencies will be reviewing the comments, and summarizing the input in a scoping summary report. Any comments that were submitted after January 22, 2013 will not be included in the scoping summary report.

The Co-lead agencies' position is that we accept and will review information regardless of when it is sent. However, there is no guarantee that the information will be utilized in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) or that any information submitted will affect our agency decisions. In addition, we will not delay making agency decisions, such as the scope of analysis for the DEIS, based on the potential to receive additional information submitted outside the official comment period.

The GPT EIS website <http://www.eisgatewaypacificwa.gov/get-involved/comment> provides a place to submit information to the agencies. In addition, the US mail address of the consultant can be used, or comments can be mailed or emailed to one or all of the co-lead agencies.

The next public comment period will occur when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is published.

We appreciate your interest in the matter and your recommendations. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Randel Perry
Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District Regulatory NW Field Office
(360) 734-3156 (office)
(360) 393-2867 (cell)

-----Original Message-----

From: James Wells [mailto:travertine9@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2013 11:13 PM
To: Perry, Randel J NWS; Sturdevant, Ted (ECY); Walker, Michelle NWS; Bennett, Matthew J NWS; Eugenio, Francis X NWS; Summerhays, Jeannie (ECY); White, Gordon (ECY); jlouws@co.whatcom.wa.us; Tschroed@co.whatcom.wa.us
Subject: Gateway Pacific Terminal scoping: Drop Box for new information

Dear agency personnel,

Thank you for your diligent efforts during the EIS scoping public comment process.

During the public hearings, I had a few informal conversations with agency staff how they would accept new input beyond the end of the public comment period.

The theory I provided was:

(1) The agencies have an obligation to continue to gather all relevant information during the course of the EIS, and
(2) Certain interested parties will be motivated to supply that information as it may become available, so
(3) There needs to be a mechanism where we can alert the agencies to new info, so the agencies can then evaluate it.
My recollection was that the agency people I spoke with agreed that was reasonable in concept, for genuinely new information. This is especially so considering that the EIS process may take some time, and that our state of knowledge about the world will not stay still.

I'd like to request information about a reasonable process by which interested people can provide the agencies with new information such as may arise, now that the public comment period has ended.

Thanks,

--

James Wells

We shall not participate in our own destruction Our Cousins of the Salish Sea

<<http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/01/23/1178789/-Our-Cousins-of-the-Salish-Sea>>

101 Reasons to be Concerned About Coal Export <<http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/05/02/1088274/-101-Reasons-to-be-Concerned-About-Coal-Export>>