



# Meeting Notes

## Multi-agency Permit (MAP) Team Gateway Pacific Terminal (GPT) Project Community Meeting September 22, 2011

Please send questions to [Jane.Dewell@ora.wa.gov](mailto:Jane.Dewell@ora.wa.gov)

---

<b>Meeting Locations</b>	Salish Land Policy Solutions – Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance (ORA) Office, Olympia
<b>Meeting Purpose</b>	Brief on ORA and MAP Team. Listen about community interests and concerns.

---

### Introduction

The community meeting was initiated by Salish Land Policy Solutions (SLPS) to speak with ORA staff about MAP Team process and other concerns. The agenda included a brief overview of ORA mission and MAP Team purpose and goals, and listening to concerns about the MAP team process and GPT project.

The meeting included Tom Ehrlichman and Barbara Dykes of SLPS; Bob Rose, a conservation consultant; and Michael McCormick, a planning consultant. ORA representatives were Jane Dewell and Scott Boettcher. The notes provide a brief summary of discussion items raised during the meeting.

### Key Points

The following issues were discussed:

- Public process and MAP Team set up. There isn't a statutorily defined public process associated with MAP Team development or early project review. SLPS expressed the concern that the public process associated with environmental review and permits is inadequate because the MAP Team early project review has been stretched to almost a year, without public meetings and without a mechanism for public input. It would be useful to define how the public could interact with and provide input to the MAP Team.
- The status of regulatory process – NEPA/SEPA, and County permits and extension. ORA shared that the co-lead agencies are close to completing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on co-lead NEPA/SEPA process, and are drafting a request for proposal (RFP) to procure a consultant for the environmental impact statement (EIS) document. It is ORA's understanding that the MOU will be procedural and not define the scope of the EIS, although ORA is not a party to the MOU.
- It may be useful to define how the public could provide baseline questions for consideration by the co-lead agencies prior to issuance of the RFP.
- It is unlikely the NEPA/SEPA scoping would begin in 2011.



- There is concern that the MAP Team is defining the scope of applicant studies in detail before baseline information is developed and before the public has an opportunity to provide input on the scope of those studies or feedback on the agency comments. .
- SLPS is interested in the overall process for decisions on siting large-scale projects. It would be useful for future projects to define how the team is set up, and what requirements (e.g., permit applications, deadlines for submittal of information) are necessary before a MAP Team convenes for a particular project.
- The GPT project triggers consideration of policy issues such as where industries are sited and whether the expected high volumes of coal rail shipments should be exported through WA. These are issues that need discussion and consideration in advance of developing site-specific projects such as GPT.
- Under the existing MAP team process, and to properly evaluate the GPT project, there is a need to compile basic baseline data. Public input on how baselines are determined would be valuable. This includes baseline data on existing water quality in the Cherry Point marine environment and baseline levels of freight and passenger rail traffic.
- Discussed how input on the project and MAP Team process could work prior to the opening of the NEPA/SEPA public scoping process. ORA could act as a contact for input to the MAP Team, but the public may also provide input directly to any public agency at any time. An idea put forth for receiving input prior to scoping included issuance of a 'Request for Information' prior to the end of the year, and without a requirement for agency responses.
- SLPS expressed a concern that the original schedule – submittal of applications and project information document, review by the MAP team, and EIS scoping – slipped and the applicant has not informed the agencies or the public when the schedule would restart. While development of additional studies and information by the applicant could improve the review process, the applicant has not defined what work is being done, the reasons for delay, or the anticipated completion date, prior to starting public input. SLPS believes public open houses and/or other avenues for public input would be helpful.