Public Meeting Agenda

✓ Introduction of Staff
✓ Administrative Details
✓ Draft EIS NEPA Review Process
✓ Public Comments
✓ Closing Remarks and Meeting Adjourned
Important Address

Written comments must be postmarked and/or received by the Corps no later than August 6, 2014.

Mail Comments to:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Regulatory Branch
Olivia Romano, Project Manager
Post Office Box 3755
Seattle, Washington 98124

Send e-mail comments to:
olivia.h.romano@usace.army.mil
NEPA Environmental Review Process

• Lead Agency: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  primary responsibility for complying with NEPA because of Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10, Permitting Authority

• Cooperating Agency: U.S. Coast Guard
  primary responsibility for Vessel Traffic Management in Puget Sound
NEPA Environmental Review Process

- Steps
  - Publish Notice of Intent (done)
  - Conduct Scoping (done)
  - Prepare Draft EIS (done)
  - Public Meetings - We are here
  - Prepare Final EIS
  - Prepare Record of Decision
NEPA Environmental Review Process

Purpose Of Public Meetings

• Seek comments on the Draft EIS – including but not limited to:
  • Proposed Alternatives
  • Risk Analysis (vessel traffic)
  • Environmental Consequences
  • Cumulative Impacts
  • Mitigation
BP Cherry Point Refinery
Marine Terminal

South Wing Constructed in 1972
- handles refined product and crude

North Wing Constructed in 2001
- handles refined product only
Project History

- Section 10 Permit Issued in 1971 for a two wing dock. One wing (South) built and became operational in 1972.
- Arco (BP predecessor) was issued a second Section 10 Permit in 1996 to construct originally planned North Wing.
- Permit extension was granted in 2000 and North Wing was constructed and has been in operational since 2001 with capability for loading refined product only.
- Permit challenged for inadequate environmental analysis and Magnuson Amendment analysis.
Magnuson Amendment

The Amendment’s intent is to restrict crude oil “tanker traffic in Puget Sound.”

To determine compliance with the Amendment the DEIS examines the following three questions:

1. Is it physically possible for the new platform to handle crude oil today?
2. Is it physically possible to modify the new platform such that it could handle crude requiring additional permitting?
3. Did the modification authorized by the permit increase the potential berthing capacity of the terminal for tankers carrying crude oil?

These questions are addressed in Magnuson Amendment Discussion (DEIS Appendix H)
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Written comments must be postmarked and/or received by the Corps no later than August 6, 2014.

Mail Comments to:
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Regulatory Branch
Olivia Romano, Project Manager
Post Office Box 3755
Seattle, Washington 98124

Send e-mail comments to:
olivia.h.romano@usace.army.mil