

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Public Open Houses.....	1
3.0 Agency Meeting.....	3
4.0 NGO Interaction.....	3
5.0 Tribal Contact.....	4

Chapter I. Coordination and Interaction

This page left blank intentionally.

1.0 Introduction

Coordination and interaction with the public, government agencies, Tribes, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are key components of EFSEC's Potential Site Study process. It is the intent of the Council to understand, as early in the review process as possible, the concerns of these individuals and entities regarding the Starbuck Power Project's potential impacts, both positive and negative. As a result, EFSEC's efforts to involve interested parties were initiated early in the preapplication process, at the start of the Potential Site Study.

Issues of concern raised through the EFSEC outreach program described below were considered as development of the Potential Site Study progressed through impact analysis and the creation of application criteria. These issues will continue to be considered during the application review process and in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that will be prepared for the Starbuck Power Project, particularly with regard to the analysis of potential impacts and the development of appropriate mitigation measures. In addition, contact information obtained during the public outreach efforts will allow EFSEC to directly communicate with those most interested in the progress of the application review process.

Initially, EFSEC and its independent contractor, Jones & Stokes, focused their efforts on involving the public, government agencies, Tribes, and NGOs through the public meeting process. This approach was supplemented with both direct mailings and telephone calls. The overall public outreach program consisted of the following elements:

- holding public open houses;
- holding an agency meeting;
- mailing information to potentially interested NGOs and making follow-up telephone calls; and
- sending letters to local Tribes inviting participation.

The remainder of this section of the Potential Site Study provides additional information on each of these elements of EFSEC's public outreach program.

2.0 Public Open Houses

As part of the Potential Site Study for the Starbuck Power Project, EFSEC and Jones & Stokes planned and hosted two public open houses near the project in Columbia County. The purpose of these meetings was to provide the public with an opportunity to learn about the project and to solicit comments from citizens about the issues of concern to them. The first open house was held in Dayton on December 5, 2000, at the Youth Building on the Columbia County Fairgrounds. The second was held on December 6, 2000, at the Starbuck

Public School in the town of Starbuck. The following methods were used to advertise the meetings:

- Display ads were placed in two local newspapers, the Dayton Chronicle and Walla Walla Union-Bulletin (documentation of the publishing of these notices is on file with EFSEC).
- Large signs containing project and meeting details were posted at the proposed project site to alert passing motorists.
- A notice of the meetings (informational flyer) was mailed to interested citizens, agency representatives, and government officials inviting them to the open houses. (In this same flyer, agency representatives were invited to the agency meeting described below.)
- A flyer was placed in every Starbuck post office box, and an invitation was posted at the post office.
- A meeting reminder was printed on each Starbuck water bill, delivered to Starbuck residents 1 week before the meeting.

Approximately 40 citizens attended the Dayton meeting (36 people signed the attendance sheet; several others did not), and approximately 50 people attended the Starbuck meeting (46 individuals signed the attendance sheet; several did not). There was minimal overlap of people attending both meetings (see Tables 1 and 2 for attendance lists). In addition, the council chair, two council members, the assistant attorney general representing EFSEC, and two EFSEC staff members attended both meetings. Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) had one official representative in attendance (two additional BPA employees attended the Dayton meeting). Two representatives of Jones & Stokes attended both meetings, and a third attended the Dayton meeting. The Starbuck Power Company (SPC) was represented by three executives, the company's environmental attorney, and six members of its consulting team.

Informational handouts were provided to those in attendance. These handouts provided the following information:

- text and graphics describing the Starbuck Power Project;
- a description of the overall EFSEC process, including the Potential Site Study, the application review process, the Draft and Final EISs, the contested case hearings, and the recommendation to the governor; and
- text and graphics that described the likely BPA transmission line route and the federal review process for constructing and operating transmission facilities.

At the beginning of each open house, attendees had an opportunity to view visuals about the project and the EFSEC review process and to visit with representatives of EFSEC, Jones & Stokes, SPC, and BPA. The more formal portion of each meeting, which was moderated by EFSEC, began with SPC providing a brief presentation about its team and project. After the SPC presentation, an EFSEC representative briefly described the energy facility siting process in Washington. A BPA representative who described BPA's project involvement

and the federal environmental review process conducted the final portion of the formal presentation.

At the end of each meeting, the public was invited to ask questions and provide comments about the project and the process. Jones & Stokes recorded public comments and questions, which were later compiled and distributed to EFSEC and SPC. Key comments and questions raised at the open houses are presented in Table 3.

3.0 Agency Meeting

On December 6, 2000, EFSEC hosted and moderated a meeting of government and agency personnel, again at the Youth Building on the Columbia County Fairgrounds in Dayton. In addition to the same EFSEC, BPA, Jones & Stokes, and SPC representatives who attended the public open houses, 12 state and local government representatives attended. Organizations represented at the meeting included Columbia County (three commissioners, two planners, and one engineer), the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Dayton Chamber of Commerce, the Washington State Department of Transportation, the Washington Department of Ecology, the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, and the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (see Table 4 for the attendance list).

Each attendee received a copy of the handout provided at the open houses (described above). The format of the agency meeting was identical to the formal portion of the public open houses: brief presentations by SPC, EFSEC, and BPA, followed by a question and comment period. Again, Jones & Stokes recorded and compiled comments made at the meeting and later provided them to EFSEC and SPC. Key issues raised at the agency meeting are listed in Table 3).

4.0 NGO Interaction

After the public open houses and agency meeting, Jones & Stokes and EFSEC staff members contacted 29 NGOs that were considered to have a potential interest in the Starbuck Power Project (Table 5 presents a list of NGOs contacted). A cover letter introducing the project and an informational guide similar to the public meeting handout were provided, both containing EFSEC contact information. Approximately 2 weeks after the mailing, Jones & Stokes made follow-up calls to determine whether or not each NGO (1) had received the information, (2) was interested in the project, and (3) could suggest other appropriate parties to contact. Only one NGO, The Lands Council, has provided substantive comments, which are included in Table 3. Most NGO representatives stated that they would contact EFSEC if further review of the proposed project indicated there were issues of concern.

5.0 Tribal Contact

Cultural resource laws and regulations stipulate that SPC and agencies involved in the Starbuck Power Project consult with affected Tribes. In October 2000, James Bard, a cultural resources specialist working with CH2M Hill (SPC's environmental consultant) sent letters introducing the Starbuck Power Project to the following Tribes to initiate consultation:

- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR);
- Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CCT);
- Yakima Indian Nation;
- Nez Perce Tribe; and the
- Spokane Tribe.

The letter provided a brief description of the project and summarized previous tribal and cultural work done pertaining to the proposed facility site. The letters also asked for guidance as to how to properly perform consultation with the Tribes.

The CCT and CTUIR have responded to the letters. Issues raised in these two letters are summarized in Table 6.

Tribal representatives also were invited to the public open houses and agency meeting but did not attend.

In December 2000, representatives of EFSEC, BPA, and Jones & Stokes met to further discuss BPA involvement in the environmental review process for the project, including tribal coordination needs. As a federal agency, BPA has the level of authority required to consult with Tribes and tribal organizations as a representative of the government of the United States. BPA agreed to serve as the government-to-government liaison for the project, with EFSEC coordinating with tribal organizations as appropriate.

Table 1. Starbuck Power Project Public Meeting Attendants (Dayton, WA)

Name	City, State	Organization
Eric Johnson	Dayton, WA	A.W. Bank
Bonnie Williams	Dayton, WA	Port of Columbia
Don Turner	Dayton, WA	Port of Columbia
Todd Trepanier	Yakima, WA	WSDOT
Gene Croll	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Carrie Chicken	Walla Walla, WA	Walla Walla <i>Union-Bulletin</i>
Bill Crawford	Yakima, WA	Painters Union
Barbara Crawford	Yakima, WA	Painters Union
Bill Turner	Dayton, WA	Landowner
Dallas Dickinson	Dayton, WA	Landowner
Sue Dickinson	Dayton, WA	Landowner
Kevin Floyd	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Mike Keizer	Benton City, WA	Ironworkers Local 14
Chris Miller	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Jennie Dickinson	Dayton, WA	Dayton Chamber of Commerce
Dick Jones	Dayton, WA	Columbia County Commissioner
Bill Brown	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Clark Posey	Dayton, WA	Columbia County Planner
Grant Low	Starbuck, WA	Town of Starbuck
Carol Veldman	Starbuck, WA	Town of Starbuck
Dwight Rabancke	Dayton, WA	Commissioner Elect
Bobbi Grende	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Yvonne Bontey	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Merrill English	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Tom Husted	Dayton, WA	Columbia REA
Robert Carlton	Dayton, WA	Columbia County
Diane Lusk	Starbuck, WA	Mayor
Don Jackson	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Steven Moss	Walla Walla, WA	Blue Mountain Action Council
Jane Lembeke	Starbuck, WA	Columbia County
Robert Snow	Richland, WA	TRI, Inc.
Scott Gruber	Walla Walla, WA	Citizen
Richard Monlux	Pasco, WA	WSA of Plumbers and Fitters
Kim Lyonais	Dayton, WA	Columbia County Planner
Corrin Castro		Bonneville Power Administration
Terri Berry		Bonneville Power Administration

Table 2. Starbuck Power Project Public Meeting Attendants (Starbuck, WA)

Name	City, State	Organization
Judith Johnson	Walla Walla, WA	Kooskooskie Commons
Ruth Shearer	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Gordon Perkins	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
RL Courson	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Cecil Harrison	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Mrs. Cecil Harrison	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Chuck Mead	Dayton, WA	Citizen
John Williams	Portland, OR	Rebound
Rebecca Hatchens	Dayton, WA	Dayton <i>Chronicle</i>
Diane Lusk	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Ray Honta	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Cindy Harris	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Jerry Taylor	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Helen Green	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Orval Green	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Audrey Perkins	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Angela Wood	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
John Wood	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Marge Thompson	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Ivan Thompson	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Marty Hall	Prescott, WA	Citizen
Loretta Bath	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Betsy Worth	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Don Jackson	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Judy Jackson	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Zonia Dedloff	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Bobbi Grende	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Tom Stamate	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Debby Stamate	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Lois Foust	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Dean Foust	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Sam Marchington	Starbuck, WA	Citizen

Name	City, State	Organization
Skip Meod	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Darrel Huwe	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Bette Huwe	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Ted Permer	Dayton, WA	Citizen
Robert Carlton	Dayton, WA	Columbia County Assessor
Thomas Hawks	Dayton, WA	Columbia County Fire District #1
Jay Penner	Waitsburg, WA	Citizen
Don Welt	Waitsburg, WA	Citizen
RA Stober	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Dick Rubenser	Starbuck, WA	Columbia County Fire District
Archie Taylor	Wallula, WA	Pacific Gas and Electric
Jerry Johnson	Pasco, WA	Carpenters
Dan Magill	Starbuck, WA	Citizen
Jim Magill	Starbuck, WA	Citizen

Table 3. Public Comment Summary (Starbuck and Dayton Public Meetings)

General Topic of Discussion	Specific Questions and Comments
EFSEC Siting Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who is represented on the EFSEC council? (* #) ▪ What are the application fees? (#) ▪ Will the NEPA process be triggered? (#) ▪ Opportunities for public participation? (*) ▪ How will information be disseminated? (*)
Project Details	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the major project obstacles? (*) ▪ What is the project's life expectancy? (*) ▪ Will ammonia be used onsite? (*) ▪ Who will supply the fuel? Will there be a backup fuel source? (* %) ▪ What safety procedures would be in place at the facility? (#) ▪ What is the expected short- and long-term fuel price for the facility? (%)
Community Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the Starbuck project related to the proposed Wallula project? (*) ▪ How will Columbia County planners be involved? (#) ▪ Costs to Columbia County vs. cost recovery? (#) ▪ How is the project related to local dam decommissioning? (*) ▪ Will the facility impact local agricultural crops? (#)
Workforce Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where will the construction force be housed? (* #) ▪ Will the construction force impact transportation patterns? (* #) ▪ How will local employment be effected? (*)
Environmental Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What environmental impacts could result from the project? (*) ▪ What environmental factors will be monitored? (*) ▪ How close will the facility be to the Snake and Tucannon Rivers (both contain salmon and bull trout)? (%)
Water Supply and Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Where will the water supply/source come from? (* # %) ▪ Will water rights be an issue? (* #) ▪ Water pipeline impacts (e.g., river, road, and railroad crossings; easements; potential new users)? (#) ▪ Where will wastewater be discharged?
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NO_x, CO_x, and particulate (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}) emissions? (*) ▪ Use of Best Available Control Technologies (BACT)? (*)
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are improvements planned for State Route 261? (#) ▪ Impact of labor force on transportation (especially during construction)? (* #)
Transmission Lines and BPA Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What will the cumulative impacts on the BPA system be? (*) ▪ What are the proposed needs and locations of new transmission lines and BPA facilities? (# %)
Noise Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will the plant be noisy? (*) ▪ Will noise be noticeable to neighbors? (*)
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General support voiced for project (citing tax benefits, employment, and economic development) (*)
<p>* = Comment Received at Public Open House # = Comment Received at Agency Meeting % = Comment Received from NGO</p>	

Table 4. Agency Meeting Attendees (December 6, 2000, in Dayton, WA)

Name	Organization
Ken Barnhart	Bonneville Power Admin.
Sarah Brandt	Jones & Stokes
Dick Byers	EFSEC Council Member; Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission
Don Caniparoli	CH2M Hill
Charles Carelli	EFSEC Council Member; Department of Ecology
Vicki Colton	CH2M Hill
Jennie Dickinson	Dayton Chamber of Commerce
Michael Elmer	Starbuck Power
Robert (Rusty) Fallis	Attorney General's Office (EFSEC)
Don Fields	PPL Global
Allen Fiksdal	EFSEC Manager
Marlena Guhlke	CH2M Hill
Dick Jones	Columbia County
Kim E. Lyonnais	Columbia County Planning
Irina Makarow	EFSEC
Bob Martin	Washington State Department of Transportation
Kyle McKeon	Washington State Department of Transportation Planning
Glen Mendel	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Roger Petersen	PPL Montana
Clark A. Posey	Columbia County Planning
Charles G. Reeves	Columbia County
Dwight Robanske	Columbia County
Gayle Rothrock	EFSEC Council Member; Department of Natural Resources
Tom Schirm	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Donald Shute	Washington State Department of Transportation
Bill Staeger	Jones & Stokes
Liz Thomas	Preston Gates Ellis
Chuck Wagner	Enventure (for PPL Global)
Robert K. Yates	Columbia County Engineer

Table 5. Nongovernmental Organizations Contacted

Organization Name	City	State
American Rivers – Northwest Office	Seattle	WA
Audubon of Washington	Olympia	WA
Blue Mountain Action Council	Walla Walla	WA
Blue Mountain Audubon Society	Walla Walla	WA
Campaign for the Northwest	Seattle	WA
Community Coalition for Environmental Justice	Seattle	WA
Earthshare of Washington	Seattle	WA
1000 Friends of Washington	Seattle	WA
Heart of America Northwest	Seattle	WA
The Lands Council	Spokane	WA
Lower Columbia Basin Audubon	Richland	WA
The Nature Conservancy	Mount Vernon	WA
Northwest Ecosystem Alliance	Seattle	WA
Northwest Energy Coalition	Seattle	WA
Organization to Preserve Agricultural Lands	Washtucna	WA
Palouse-Clearwater Environmental Institute	Moscow	ID
People for Puget Sound	Seattle	WA
Puget Soundkeeper Alliance	Seattle	WA
Save Our Wild Salmon	Seattle	WA
Sierra Club	Seattle	WA
Sierra Club – Northern Rockies Chapter	Boise	ID
US Public Interest Research Group (PIRG): Washington	Seattle	WA
Washington Environmental Council	Seattle	WA
Washington Native Plant Society	Walla Walla	WA
Washington Native Plant Society – Columbia Basin Chapter	Richland	WA
Washington Native Plant Society – Palouse Chapter	Pullman	WA
Washington Wilderness Coalition	Seattle	WA
Wilderness Society – Pacific NW Office	Seattle	WA
Yakima Valley Audubon	Yakima	WA

Table 6. Issues Raised In Tribal Response Letters

Group Responding	Key Issues
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The determination of significance of any cultural resources discovered ▪ Burial grounds are located in the general area and need to be further considered in spite of the results of the on-site archaeological study ▪ CTUIR wants to have a tribal monitor present during all ground disturbing activities. ▪ CTUIP requested further discussions regarding the proposed project
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed project lies within the traditional territory of the Palouse Indians who are legally represented by the CCT ▪ The archaeological resources investigation appears to have been thorough ▪ CCT requested additional information on the recommendation to formally submit a request for eligibility as a Traditional Cultural Property for the SPC proposed site. ▪ CCT requested that SPC identify the responsible BPA official who will serve in government-to-government consultations

This page left blank intentionally.