



MILLENNIUM Bulk Terminals - Longview

EIS Environmental Impact Statement

Stakeholder Interviews Summary Millennium Bulk Terminals-Longview Environmental Impact Statement

August 2013



STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS SUMMARY

MILLENNIUM BULK TERMINALS-LONGVIEW

NEPA/SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PREPARED FOR:



Cowlitz County
207 Fourth Avenue
Kelso, WA 98626



Department of Ecology, Southwest Regional Office
P.O. Box 47775
Olympia, WA 98504



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
2108 Grand Boulevard
Vancouver, WA 98661

PREPARED BY:

Berger ABAM
1111 Main Street, Suite 300
Vancouver, WA 98660

ICF International
710 Second Avenue, Suite 550
Seattle, WA 98104

August 13, 2013

Contents

	Page
MBTL Stakeholder Interviews Summary	1
General Project Awareness and Plans to Participate	1
Understanding the Difference between Scoping and a Public Hearing	2
Recommendations for Effective Outreach	2
Suggested Names of Others to be Kept Informed	2
Stakeholder Recommendations on Scoping Meeting Organization and Ground Rules.....	3
Meeting Logistics	3
Ground Rules	4
Stakeholder Recommendations Regarding Environmental Justice Outreach.....	5
Other Comments and Recommendations.....	6
Exhibit 1—List of Stakeholders Interviewed	7
Exhibit 2—Interview Questions	9

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BNSF	BNSF Railway Company
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EJ	Environmental Justice
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Act
GPT	Gateway Pacific Terminals
MBTL	Millennium Bulk Terminals-Longview
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act

MBTL Stakeholder Interviews Summary

During July 2013, the consultant team conducted a total of 30 stakeholder interviews with individuals, organizations, and public agencies identified by the Co-Lead Agencies as potential interested parties to the development of an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Millennium Bulk Terminals-Longview (MBTL) project (see Exhibit 1). The interviews were conducted either in-person or by phone, and sought responses to 12 questions approved by the Co-Lead Agencies (see Exhibit 2). The overall intent of the interviews was to determine stakeholders' awareness about the MBTL EIS process; identify their experience with previous complex EIS scoping processes; and seek feedback on ways to implement robust and authentic public outreach and involvement during the EIS scoping phase. Conversations on this latter topic focused on lessons learned from previous scoping processes, especially on establishing approaches and ground rules for managing MBTL public scoping meetings during September and October.

General Project Awareness and Plans to Participate

All the people interviewed were aware of the project at some level. That awareness can be broken down into three groups.

Aware and Interested

Either through the media, interactions in the community, or by their organization or department affiliations, people in this group have learned about the coal export terminal issue, with specific awareness of the Millennium proposal. Some community leaders in Kelso/Longview were engaged previously by Millennium staff through briefings and tours of the site. Some officials toured an Arch Coal mining operation in Montana. Plans of those in this group to participate actively in the scoping process varied. Their intent ranges from passive monitoring to submitting written and/or oral comments during scoping. Some organizations are undecided, awaiting more direction from their elected leaders or boards of directors.

Aware and Engaged at the Local Level

Interviewees in this group have tracked the Millennium development proposals since the 2010 permitting process was initiated. While aware of the broader coal terminal issues, their interest is focused on local economic development or potential environmental impacts. Two local organizations have broader, statewide affiliations with unions or environmental coalitions. Most of the stakeholders in this group expect to participate in the scoping process at some level.

Fully Engaged with Coal Terminal Issue Statewide (or Beyond)

This group comprises well-organized advocacy organizations representing either environmental or economic development interests. Most of these stakeholders have been tracking the coal terminal issue at the regional and national level and participated in the Gateway Pacific Terminals (GPT) scoping process last fall. Most expect to participate actively in the MBTL process by sending out information to their members and by encouraging and possibly organizing attendance and activities at the public scoping meeting sites. The two most visible umbrella organizations are the Power Past Coal Coalition, which includes organizations such as the Sierra Club and Columbia Riverkeepers, and

Alliance for Northwest Jobs and Exports, a consortium of export-oriented businesses which includes Millennium.

Understanding the Difference between Scoping and a Public Hearing

Two questions sought to assess the understanding of the stakeholders and their community of interest regarding the difference between public scoping and public hearing procedures. Responses to these questions were decidedly mixed. Some interviewees who participated in the GPT process said they clearly understood the difference. These respondents credited the GPT information outreach with clarifying that issue for them. Several other stakeholders were either not sure, or did not know at all. All of those interviewed agreed that people who have limited past experience with complex EIS processes will not understand the difference unless it is clearly explained.

The takeaway outcome of these questions is the need for the Co-Lead Agencies to clearly and simply explain the difference via multiple information channels, and to restate that difference repeatedly at the scoping meetings. Many organizational representatives said they would share information provided by the Co-Lead Agencies with their members via newsletters, emails, and links to the MBTL project website.

Recommendations for Effective Outreach

The most common recommendation for outreach is effective use of local media, both print and broadcast. For Cowlitz County, specific suggestions included articles in *The Daily News* and stories on the local radio stations (KLOG, KEDO and KBAM) and the public access TV station in Longview. Several organizations offered to share project information provided by the Co-Lead Agencies with members and/or other people within their communications network through forwarded emails, presentations at meetings, door-to-door distribution, and links to the project website. This list of offers to share project information will be included as an update to the current Public Involvement Plan draft. Direct mail or information hand-delivered by neighborhood volunteers was also recommended for the Highland Neighborhood. One innovative suggestion for the Longview area was to place a brief ad in the high school football programs handed out on game nights, directing people to the project website.

All respondents said that the best way to communicate with them was via email, supplemented by direct mail to elected officials and tribal leaders. Stakeholders who participated in the interviews will be added to the project LISTSERV.

Suggested Names of Others to be Kept Informed

The following is a list from stakeholders about other organizations that should be informed about the MBTL public scoping process. Some participants also promised to send additional contact information. For now, this is simply a list of organization names. The Co-Lead Agencies can determine if additional follow-up is warranted to compile contact information for addition to the LISTSERV.

- Lifework (Longview)
- Earth Justice
- Vancouver and Willapa Audubon chapters
- Trout Unlimited
- Columbia Gorge Windsurfing Assoc.
- Pacific Merchant Shipping
- Brotherhood of Engineers and Trainmen
- Earth Ministries
- Columbia River Gorge Commission
- Spokane RTC
- Pacific NW Waterway Assoc.
- Ethnic Support Council (Longview)
- CRAG Law Center
- Friends of the East Fork Lewis River
- Fish First (Clark County)
- Columbia Gorge Kiteboarding Assoc.
- United Transportation Union
- Northern Plains Resource Council
- Clean Columbia County
- USCG Harbor Safety Committee (Portland)
- Spokane Clean Air Agency
- Building Trades Union

Stakeholder Recommendations on Scoping Meeting Organization and Ground Rules

The interview questions sought to draw-out stakeholder recommendations for scoping meeting logistical arrangements, as well as specific suggestions for meeting ground rules. Most of the feedback came from people who were involved with the GPT scoping meetings or who followed the process closely through the media.

Meeting Logistics

There was no consensus among the stakeholders about the overall format of the scoping meetings. Most of the organizations identified as coal terminal opponents preferred the large group meetings conducted during the GPT scoping process that allowed a strong advocacy group presence. Project proponents favored meeting designs that avoided large gatherings and offered smaller-room options for providing comments over an extended period. The recent Oregon Department of Environmental Quality 12-hour hearing approach for Morrow Pacific was noted as a good example for gathering testimony.

There was consensus that if the meetings did use the large-group format, then the following elements needed to be in place:

- Adequate security to maintain a safe, non-intimidating environment.
- Strong facilitation that makes the ground rules clear and enforces them.
- Levels of agency and consultant staffing that supports good crowd management, including staff outside the venue entrance to interact and share information with attendees as they enter the facility.
- One or more smaller rooms where people can comment either orally or in writing without speaking in front of the large group.
- Good information in handouts and exhibits that explains the scoping meeting process, guidelines for effective comments, and meeting ground rules.

- Tables that are clearly visible where people can use official comment forms to make written comments.
- Meeting length of 2 to 3 hours to accommodate as many commenters as possible in the large room(s).
- Meetings that start after 5:00 PM to allow greater participation. (Again, there was some support for longer hours to accommodate people who work evenings or may have childcare conflicts.)
- Using the lottery method to select people to testify. There was general agreement that the first-come, first-served approach of early GPT meetings was not productive.

Other suggestions about logistics that did not have consensus included:

- Establishing a specific area for rallies and demonstrations in designated areas away from people entering the facility.
- Providing water and toilets outside the facility for people waiting in line.
- Having a strong police presence outside and within the venues.

Ground Rules

Stakeholders had the following suggestions for ground rules for the scoping meetings.

- Ground rules should be posted on exhibit boards at the venues and included in the meeting handout given to attendees when they enter the venue. The facilitator should explain the ground rules at the start of the meeting, with periodic reminders throughout the comment process. The rules should be strictly enforced.
- Confronting or interfering with attendees inside or outside the venue should be prohibited.
- Interest group meetings should be allowed in designated areas outside the venues, and in rooms that may be rented by groups inside the venues.
- Rallies and/or demonstrations should not be allowed within venue common areas shared with the scoping meeting or at entryways to the scoping meeting.
- Monitor the number of people entering the meeting space and close the space to additional attendance if legal capacity is reached
- Choose speakers by the lottery drawing method.
- Limit speakers to two minutes each for comments. Provide a visible light timer to assure equitable treatment of all speakers.
- No foul language or personal attacks should be allowed during comments. The facilitator should interrupt the speaker if this occurs, with the time lost to the interruption counted against the speaker.
- If the audience interrupts a speaker and causes a delay, the speaker should be allowed extra time to complete the comments.
- Vocal expressions of support or opposition to comments should be prohibited within the meeting room(s). Noisemaking (e.g., clapping or booing) should not be allowed.

- Silent expressions of support or opposition (e.g., holding up a small sign or raising one's hand) should be allowed. Signs should be no larger than 100 square inches (10" x 10") and may not be held for an extended period so as to block the view of others. There was not, however, stakeholder consensus on use of signs in meetings. Some of those interviewed felt they should be banned inside the meeting room.
- Distracting behavior such as sign or arm waving and mass activity such as standing up as a group should be prohibited.
- The facilitator should note up front that there are multiple ways for people to comment and that these scoping meetings, provided as a courtesy, are not required by NEPA or SEPA. Therefore, the Co-Lead Agencies reserve the right to close the meeting at any time if disruptions interfere with the opportunity for participants to comment orally.

Stakeholder Recommendations Regarding Environmental Justice Outreach

There was consensus among the stakeholders familiar with the project area that the Highlands Neighborhood should be dealt with as an Environmental Justice (EJ) area given the close proximity of its residents to the BNSF mainline and the Millennium property. This is confirmed by the data provided in the project Public Involvement Plan identifying a Latino population in that area approaching 20% of the population. The City of Longview also identified a high-density, multi-family residential area in the vicinity of 33rd and Dorothy streets.

One stakeholder provided specific ideas and offered support for outreach to the neighborhood. He noted that the area is low income, with a significant Latino population. He recommended specifically that any written materials should use simple language in both English and Spanish. He noted that direct mail is the most effective way to reach residents as many do not have Internet access. He offered the use of neighborhood volunteers to hand-deliver postcards to the 1,500 households within the boundaries of the neighborhood association. The same stakeholder also supported gaining additional visibility by placing bilingual flyers in public places such as the Community Center and local markets, and by distributing flyers to students at local elementary and middle schools. He provided contact information for four convenience stores in Longview used by residents. These include:

- Miller's Market, 3152 Washington Way
- St. Helens Shopping Center, 236 30th Avenue
- Store N' Deli, 447 Oregon Way
- 20th Avenue Grocery, 425 20th Avenue

Several stakeholders recommended advertising on Spanish-language radio. Some people interviewed also recommended coordinating Latino outreach with the Ethnic Support Council, a local non-profit service provider for non-English speakers and minority populations in the area. The Council also could provide a translator/interpreter for the Longview scoping meeting if the Co-Lead Agencies agree to this approach. One stakeholder recommended consulting with the Region 10 EPA Environmental Justice office for additional guidance on developing an Environmental Justice outreach approach.

Other Comments and Recommendations

Many stakeholders did not answer the final question. Those who did often reiterated the comments made in answering previous questions, such as providing a non-intimidating environment for people to speak, providing adequate security for crowd control, and allowing an adequate amount of time for people to speak. Specific issues raised included the need for wider, regional outreach and involvement of other Western states, and a broad scope of study for the EIS to include communities affected by coal transport, not just the coal export facility.

Exhibit 1—List of Stakeholders Interviewed

Organization	Person Interviewed	Phone	Email
Alliance for Northwest Jobs and Exports	Lauri Hennessey	(206) 650-4153	lauri.hennessey@edelman.com
Association of Washington Businesses	Don Brunell, President	(360) 943-1600 (office number)	donb@awb.org
City of Longview	Bob Gregory, City Manager	(360) 442-5004	bob.gregory@ci.longview.wa.us
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission	Paul Lumley, Executive Director	(503) 238-0667	plumley@critfc.org
Columbia River Pilots Association	Ann McIntyre, Vice President	(503) 289-9924	officers@colrip.com
Columbia Riverkeeper	Jasmine Zimmer-Stucky	(503) 929-5950	jasmine@ColumbiaRiverkeeper.org
Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership	Chris Hathaway	(503) 226-1565 ext. 227	chathaway@estuarypartnership.org, dmarriott@estuarypartners.org
Power Past Coal/ Climate Solutions	Ross Macfarland & Joelle Robinson	(206) 443-9570 ext. 26	joelle@climatesolutions.org
Sierra Club	Laura Stevens	(503)238-0442 ext. 305	laura.stevens@sierraclub.org
City of Kelso	Steve Taylor	(360) 423-1371	staylor@kelso.gov
Coast Guard	CDR John Moriarty, Commander	(206) 220-7273	john.f.moriarty@uscg.mil
Rosemere Neighborhood Association	Dvija Michael Bertish		dmb88@iinet.com
Cowlitz Economic Development Council	Ted Sprague	(360) 423-9921	sprague@cowlitzedc.com
Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Council of Governments	Scott Patterson	(360) 577-3041	spatterson@cw cog.org
International Longshore and Warehouse Union, Local 21	Jake Whiteside, President	Cell (360) 353-8533, (360) 423-0950	ilwu21@qwestoffice.net
Landowners and Citizens for a Safe Community	Ms. Gayle Kiser, President	(360) 749-7029	kiser@cni.net
Port of Longview	Lisa Hendriksen, Director of Planning and Environmental Services	(360) 425-3305	lhendriksen@portoflongview.com
Cowlitz County Fire Chief's Association	Dave LaFave	(360) 575-6286	Dave.lafave@c2fr.org
CAP	Michael Torres	(360) 425-3430	ionak@lowercolumbiacap.org
Kelso/Longview Chamber	Bill Marcum	(360) 423-8400	bmarcum@kelsolongviewchamber.org
Highlands Neighborhood Association (HNA)	Leri Jacobson, HNA Community Center Director	(360) 703-5630	lerijacobs@gmail.com
Port of Camas-Washougal	Dave Ripp, Port Director	(360) 901-4787	BillW@portcw.com
Washington Public Ports Association	Eric Johnson	(360) 943-0760	ericj@washingtonports.org
Columbia River Economic Development Council	Lisa Nisenfeld, President	(360) 567-1060	lnisenfeld@credc.org
City of Vancouver	Chad Eiken, City Planning Manager	(360) 487-8617	chad.eiken@cityofvancouver.us
Resources for Sustainable Communities	Crina Hoyer, Executive Director	(360) 733-8307	crinah@re-sources.org

Organization	Person Interviewed	Phone	Email
The Lands Council	Mike Petersen	(509) 209-2406	mpetersen@landscouncil.org
Washington Environmental Council	Becky Kelley	(206) 631-2602	becky@wecprotects.org
Friends of Columbia River Gorge	Kevin Gorman, Michael Lang	(503) 241-3762	kevin@gorgefriends.org
BNSF Railway Company	Terry Finn, Dava Kaitala	(206) 625-6135	terry.finn@bnsf.com

Exhibit 2—Interview Questions

Over the next 45 minutes or so, we will be asking you the following questions:

1. Are you familiar with the proposal to develop a coal export terminal in Cowlitz County?
2. Do you plan to participate in the public scoping process by either attending scoping meetings or submitting comments through other means?
3. Are you aware of the difference between an EIS public scoping meeting and a public hearing?
4. Scoping is the first opportunity for public comments regarding what people want to be examined during the development of the EIS. From your perspective, what should an open, objective, and user-friendly scoping process include?
5. What do you consider the most effective way to make people aware of this project and encourage public participation in the scoping process? Do you think your group/stakeholders understand the purpose of scoping meetings and how they differ from public hearings? Do you think they know there probably will not be answers to specific questions at this point in the process?
6. What would be your preferred way to receive information about the project as the EIS process moves ahead?
7. Can you provide names of other organizations or individuals who may be interested in the EIS process?
8. Have you participated previously in large-scale EIS public scoping processes?
9. In your view, what should the MBTL scoping meeting and outreach process seek to model, and what should be handled differently from previous EIS scoping processes?
10. What would be the most useful or user-friendly method to submit comments?
11. We anticipate large numbers of participants at the scoping meetings. What ground rules do you think will encourage open and orderly participation?
12. Do you have any suggestions about how we should conduct outreach to minority and low-income residents to increase their awareness of and encourage their participation in the scoping process?
13. Are there any other thoughts you would like to share?