

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy

A. BACKGROUND

1. **Name of proposed project, if applicable:** *Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy (Strategy)*

2. **Name of applicant:** Port of Seattle

3. **Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:**

Barbara Cole
Port of Seattle, Environmental Review and Permitting
P.O. Box 1209
Seattle, WA 98111
(206) 728-3326
E-mail: SEPA.p@portseattle.org

4. **Date checklist prepared:** November 26, 2007

5. **Agency requesting checklist:** Port of Seattle (POS SEPA No: 07-11)

6. **Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):**

A decision by the Port of Seattle Commission on whether to adopt the *Strategy* is expected in early 2008.

7. **Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.**

No other plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with the *Strategy* is expected.

8. **List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.**

- *Puget Sound Maritime Air Emissions Inventory*. April 2007. Prepared by Starcrest **Consulting Group, LLC**.
- *2005-2006 British Columbia Ocean-Going Vessel Emissions Inventory*.
- *British Columbia Lower Mainland Land-Based Emission Inventory and Lower Fraser Valley Emission Inventory (in progress)*

9. **Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.**

There are no known applications pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting *Strategy*.

10. **List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.**

Adoption of the *Strategy* is an action of the Port Commission and requires no other regulatory approvals or permits. The Port of Tacoma (POT) Commission will also be reviewing the draft *Strategy* for adoption in early 2008. The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority (VFPA) expects to begin

their stakeholder consultation process in the spring or summer of 2008 and present it to their Board for approval in the fall of 2008. The *Strategy* is intended to establish performance measures and serve as a guide to decrease air emissions.

- 11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.**

Background

Air quality in the vicinity of Northwest ports currently meets US ambient air quality standards as well as Canadian air quality objectives and standards. However, fine particulate standards have recently been tightened in the US, which are expected to bring several areas of Puget Sound out of attainment. In addition, the Canada Wide Standards include provisions for continuous improvement and keeping clean areas clean. The Port of Seattle, Port of Tacoma, and Vancouver Fraser Port Authority (the Ports) are committed to improving maritime, port-related emissions and see substantial environmental, economic, and social benefits associated with further air quality improvements.

The *Strategy* proposes to reduce maritime port-related emissions that affect air quality and climate change in the Pacific Northwest by adopting a collaborative strategy led by the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma in Washington State and the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority in British Columbia. The purpose of the *Strategy* is to reduce diesel and greenhouse gas emissions in the region by achieving early reductions in advance of, and complementary to, applicable regulations. In addition, the *Strategy* sets performance measures or targets that build on the success and momentum of current emissions reduction initiatives, and suggests a range of practical actions the Ports and their industry stakeholders may choose from to achieve those targets. Use of performance measures also encourages ongoing innovation as an alternative to mandated solutions, which may not be the most effective choices in the future.

In creating the *Strategy*, the Ports worked together with regulatory agencies including Environment Canada, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) and the Washington Department of Ecology. These agencies support this collaborative approach, believing that working cooperatively is the best way to achieve significant air emissions reductions as early as possible. The success of this effort hinges on the following qualities of the three Ports: 1) All three ports make significant economic contributions to the region, 2) All three ports have plans and expect significant investments for continued development, and 3) All three ports are committed to continuing to improve the environment, public health, and the regional economy by reducing their impacts on air quality and climate change. The *Strategy* addresses emissions reductions with shared performance measures or targets, while allowing each port to implement its own specific and appropriate emission reduction actions. The Ports intend to engage others with maritime, port operations in supporting the goals of the *Strategy*.

Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy (Strategy)

The goal of the *Strategy*¹ is to reduce air emissions from current and future port and other maritime-related operations in the Pacific Northwest through specific strategies and actions within each category of port operation. In addition, all future port development would be defined in terms of “green” growth, emphasizing reduced emissions and long-term sustainability. The

¹ Draft Northwest Ports Clean Air Strategy. Prepared for Port of Seattle, Port of Tacoma and Vancouver Fraser Port Authority by Ross and Associates. November 8, 2007 Draft.

Ports are committed to working with their tenants and stakeholders to implement these, and other actions, during construction of new terminals and facilities. Performance measures are included for each sector and progress will be tracked relative to the 2005 Puget Sound Maritime Air Emissions Inventory, which will serve as the baseline for the *Strategy*. The initial emphasis of the *Strategy* is on the three major ports in the region, taking into account each port's unique development plans and emissions reduction opportunities with a focus on continuous improvement. The actions identified in the *Strategy* are meant to address three primary emissions reduction objectives:

- 1) Reduce maritime and port-related air quality impacts on human health, the environment, and the economy,
- 2) Reduce contribution to climate change through co-benefits associated with reducing air quality impacts, and
- 3) Help the Georgia Basin – Puget Sound airshed continue to meet air quality standards and objectives.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The geographic area covered by the Strategy includes shoreline, marine, and upland areas within the Georgia Basin/Puget Sound Airshed (See Figure 1). In general, the marine areas include the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the greater Puget Sound area, the Strait of Georgia, Haro Strait, Boundary Pass, Rosario Strait, and other relevant regional waterways. The uplands include rail yards, railways, and freight corridors within the Georgia Basin/Puget Sound Airshed that are used for the transportation of port-related cargo.



Figure 1. Map of Georgia Basin-Puget Sound Airshed

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____.**

As a programmatic document, the *Strategy* does not include information concerning specific site descriptions. In general, port areas include uplands along the shoreline and shoreline areas.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**

As a programmatic document, the *Strategy* does not include information concerning specific slopes. In general, port areas include slopes that are typically steepest along the shoreline, with relatively narrow structurally stabilized slopes.

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.**

As a programmatic document, the *Strategy* does not include information concerning soil types. In general, much land in port areas is comprised of fill in former shoreline or shallow water/tideland/marsh area. Fill materials come from a wide variety of sources, including materials from regrades and from waterway dredging. Sands, gravels, and silts are variously present.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**

The Puget Sound region is situated in a moderately active earthquake region where the Juan de Fuca plate is thrust beneath the North American plate along the toe of the continental slope (Galster and Laprade, August 1991). The Uniform Building Code (1997 Edition) places the Puget Sound area within Seismic Zone 3, which indicates significant seismic risk.

Liquefaction zones are also found within the study area. In particular, filled former shoreline and nearshore aquatic areas are subject to liquefaction due to earthquake shaking. Local government districts implement specific development controls in liquefaction-prone areas.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

No filling or grading is proposed as part of the *Strategy*.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.**

No erosion is expected to result from the *Strategy*.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?**

Most of the sites in developed port areas are currently covered with impervious surfaces (streets, parking areas, terminal yards, etc.) or buildings. Exceptions are recreational public use areas or other landscaped areas.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth if any:**

No measures are expected to be necessary for the *Strategy*.

2. Air

- a. **What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.**

This programmatic review does not identify any air emissions that would result from the *Strategy*. The goal of the cooperative strategy is seek to reduce emissions.

- b. **Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.**

There are no off-site sources of emissions or odor that would affect the *Strategy*.

- c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:**

The Ports have identified a performance measures for each section as a goal and means of measuring success where possible in the *Strategy*. Following each performance measure listed below, a core “menu” of emissions reduction activities is suggested in the *Strategy* for implementation over both a short (by 2010) and long (by 2015) term timeframe.

Performance Measures for Ocean Going Vessels

By 2010: Reach the equivalent particulate matter (PM) reduction of using distillate fuels with maximum sulfur content of [0.5%] for hotelling (vessels at dock or at anchor) auxiliary engine operations. For all home-ported cruise ships, use of fuels with a maximum sulfur content of 1.5% in hotelling engine operations or use shore power.²

By 2015: For all ships, inclusive of cruise vessels, compliance with performance measures that the International Maritime Organization (IMO) adopts and in accordance with the IMO schedule. The United States has submitted a proposal to the IMO that calls for the equivalent emissions reduction that would result from use of 0.1% sulfur fuel and calls for a circa 80% reduction in nitrogen oxides (Nox) emissions in defined coastal areas.³ The Ports support a flexible approach similar to the US EPA proposal to the IMO that would allow use of technology or a combination of technology and cleaner fuels to reach the proposed standards. If new IMO performance measures that are substantially similar to the US IMO proposal are not in force by 2015, the Ports agree to continue to work towards meeting these goals, recognizing that technology and fuel availability could affect the ability of vessel operators to achieve this goal.

Performance Measures for Cargo Handling Equipment

By 2010: Reach the 2010 EPA regulatory requirements equivalent PM reduction of using Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) or a biodiesel blend with an equivalent sulfur level, together with the fleet-wide equivalent of Tier 2 and Tier 3 engines, which have identical emissions standards for PM.⁴ Promote early implementation of the requirements between now and 2010.

By 2015: Reach a fleet-wide equivalent of Tier 4 engines, which have 90% lower PM emissions than the current Tier 2 and 3 engines, or purchase of the cleanest available equipment options at time of scheduled capital upgrades.

² Note that the majority of cruise ships, which do not have auxiliary engines, burn less than 1.5% S fuel in all their engines all the time. In addition, four out of seven cruise ships docking at the Port of Seattle are using shorepower; and the Vancouver Port Authority is working towards implementing shore power for cruise vessels by 2009.

³ Review of MARPOL Annex VI and the NOx Technical Code: Development of Standards for NOx, PM, and SOx, submitted by the United States to IMO sub-committee on Bulk Liquids and Gases, February 2007, available online at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/seca/imo07b.pdf>, last visited on 5/7/2007.

⁴ Tier 2 and 3 standards are 0.15 g/hp*hr for most CHE. See Table 1.1 in US EPA's *Final Regulatory Impact Analysis: Control of Emissions from Nonroad Diesel Engines*, August 1998, available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/nonroad-diesel/fri1998/nr-ria.pdf>, last visited on 5/10/2007.

Performance Measures for Trucks

By 2010: Reach the equivalent PM emissions level of 1994 or newer heavy-duty truck engine model year through vehicle purchase or by using approved retrofit packages to be identified in 2008.

By 2015: Eighty percent of heavy-duty drayage trucks will reach the equivalent PM emissions level of 2007 or newer engine model year through vehicle purchase or by using approved retrofit packages to be identified in 2008. This is an interim objective on the way to the goal of 100% of heavy-duty drayage trucks by 2017.

Rail

The short- and long-term goals for the rail sector require a commitment by the Ports to actively work with their partner railways in a joint effort to implement currently available, cost-effective technologies; to explore new technologies as they become available; and to work to increase operational efficiencies, especially as port volume increases.

Since railways are not direct tenants or customers of ports, setting a performance measure for this category of port activities is difficult. For the long term, the Ports support reducing PM emissions from all new locomotive engines by 90%. The US EPA's Proposed April 2007 Locomotive and Marine diesel Engine Rule aims to achieve these reductions. In the interim, the Ports and air agencies have identified a list of activities as potential ways to reach an agreed upon standard once in place. Many of the actions are currently underway via demonstration projects in this region or elsewhere in North America. Railways, similar to the other sectors, have demonstrated that they are making efforts for emissions reduction and are encouraged, via the *Strategy*, to continue and accelerate this trajectory.

A short-term goal for rail transportation is an agreement by the end of 2008 between the major port railways (Union Pacific (UP) and BNSF Railway Company in Washington State and Canadian National (CN), Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR), and British Columbia Railway Company (BCRC) in British Columbia), the Ports, and the air agencies in which these entities agree to work together to reduce diesel emissions from this sector. The purpose of this agreement is to establish performance measures and operational best practices for reducing emissions from switching locomotives and cargo handling operations at designated port rail yards.

Harbor Vessels

The Ports and the air agencies recognize harbor vessels (including ferries, commercial vessels, tugs, and pleasure craft) are also a source of emissions and therefore, actions should be taken to reduce emissions in this sector. However, the Ports have little or no authoritative control over harbor craft, making port generated commitments to act difficult to implement. With air agencies taking the lead for this category, they and the Ports agree to create and implement an outreach to work directly with the owners and operators of harbor craft to help raise awareness and support implementation of emissions reductions. With a focus on engine retrofits and the use of cleaner fuels, the air agencies and Ports agree to encourage and help implement pilot projects. In addition, the Ports recognize the independent efforts by the Washington State and British Columbia Ferries to reduce emissions, and encourage the continuation of these actions.

Port Administration Provisions

The Ports and the air agencies recognize that while most emissions come from equipment that the Ports do not operate themselves, they have administration-related emissions, diesel or otherwise, that can be reduced. Some examples of what some or all of the Ports are doing to reduce these emissions include:

- Use of cleaner technology or alternative fueled vehicles;
- Employee programs to facilitate sustainable commuting options;

- Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification for buildings; and
- Energy audits and implementation of feasible improvements.

3. Water

a. Surface

- 1) **Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

The geographic area covered by the *Strategy* includes the land and salt waters within the Georgia Basin/Puget Sound Airshed. In general, the marine areas include the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the greater Puget Sound area, the Strait of Georgia, Haro Strait, Boundary Pass, Rosario Strait, and other relevant nearby waterways.

- 2) **Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

Seaport facility improvements or development actions typically involve work in the shoreline zone.

- 3) **Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

No fill or dredge is proposed as part of the *Strategy*.

- 4) **Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

No surface water withdrawals or diversions are proposed.

- 5) **Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

None of the sites in the study area are known to lie within a 100-year floodplain.

- 6) **Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

No discharge of waste materials to surface waters is proposed as part of the *Strategy*.

b. Ground:

- 1) **Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

The *Strategy* does not anticipate the need for any ground water withdrawal or discharge to groundwater.

- 2) **Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

No waste material is proposed to be discharged as part of the *Strategy*. If implementation of the *Strategy* results in increased water impacts, appropriate environmental review and practices will be initiated.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 1) **Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

The proposal does not anticipate changes in water runoff or stormwater practices.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

No waste materials are expected to enter ground or surface waters as part of the *Strategy*.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

No measures are expected to be necessary as part of the *Strategy*. If implementation of the *Strategy* results in increased water impacts, appropriate environmental review and practices will be initiated.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

A variety of vegetation can be found at the different port sites including those below:

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other: ornamentals**
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- shrubs: Himalayan blackberry**
- grass**
- pasture**
- crop or grain**
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other**
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, non-native milfoil, other**
- other types of vegetation: marine algae & phytoplankton**

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

No vegetation is proposed for removal or alteration as part of the *Strategy*.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Threatened or endangered plant species may exist within the geographic study of the *Strategy*.

Although not a threatened or endangered species, the Washington State Hydraulic Code (WAC 220-110-250) designates kelp beds as saltwater habitats of special concern because of the valuable function they serve in the developmental history of fish and shellfish.

d. Proposed use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

No measures are expected to be necessary as part of the *Strategy* as plants are not anticipated to be impacted.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

There are a variety of birds and animals in the port areas including the following:

- birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other: falcon, osprey, resident and migratory waterfowl**
- mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: harbor seals, rodents, small mammals**
- fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other: bottom fish; sole, rockfish, cod**

Numerous birds are present in or near the study area including migratory and resident species. It is important to note that birds listed for protection, including peregrine falcons, are observed in the study area.

Numerous resident and migratory marine and anadromous species of fish are common in the study area. Also common in the study are diverse populations of marine, estuarine, and freshwater aquatic vertebrates.

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

On May 24, 1999, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) formalized the listing of Puget Sound Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). This species is found in the study area. The Green/Duwamish System supports an

abundant run of hatchery Chinook and a relatively large run of naturally spawning Chinook salmon. There are two stocks of Chinook in the Green/Duwamish system: Green/Duwamish summer/fall Chinook and Newaukum Creek summer/fall Chinook. Spring Chinook is occasionally found in the Green River, but it is not known if these fish constitute a self-contained run.

Adult Chinook could be present in Elliott Bay from mid-June to mid-October. Sub-adult Chinook could be present during any season of the year. The bulk of juvenile outmigration to the Duwamish estuary occurs between May and early June, although small numbers of juveniles begin to arrive in the upper estuary in April. The peak of the run at Terminal 91 appears to be 15 to 20 days later than in the upper estuary.

The US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) announced the listing of Coastal-Puget Sound bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) as threatened on October 28, 1999. Bull trout could occur in its anadromous form in the project area. However, the state department of Fish and Wildlife does not monitor bull trout in the Green/Duwamish system because they do not believe to spawn within the system. Bull trout found in the Duwamish estuary and Elliott Bay are believed to migrate into the area from other river systems.

Bald eagles were delisted from Threatened status on June 28, 2007 in the lower 48 states.

The National Marine Fisheries Service listed Steller sea lions as a threatened species in December 1990. There are no known breeding colonies in Washington State.

National Marine Fisheries Service has received petitions requesting the listing of a number of additional marine species. They are currently reviewing the available information for some of these to determine if a proposed listing is warranted.

Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) were listed as an endangered species on June 2, 1970. Use of Puget Sound by humpback whales is rare. Similar to Stellar sea lions, humpback whales are opportunistic feeders and might occasionally enter Puget Sound in pursuit of prey. However, also like Stellar sea lions, they are likely to avoid areas of significant human activity (Pacific International Engineering and Pentec Environmental, 1999), and thus are not expected to be present in the vicinity.

Puget Sound Orca whales (*Orcinus orca*) were listed under the federal Endangered Species Act as an endangered species on November 12, 2005. Known officially as the Southern Resident killer whales, they are usually found in northern Puget Sound around the San Juan Islands, but individual whales have been known to occasionally stray into the southern reaches of the Sound.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Some waters in the port areas are important migratory routes for anadromous salmonids.

The Puget Sound area is a part of the Pacific Flyway. Birds that inhabit the area vary seasonally due to migrations. Elliott Bay and vicinity are frequented by migratory waterfowl that over winter in the Puget Sound area.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

No measures are expected to be necessary as part of the *Strategy*.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

At present, it is not possible to detail the energy requirements associated with potential actions that may result from the *Strategy*. It is possible that increases in energy needs may be required to provide infrastructure for air emission reduction techniques such as cold-ironing (shore power).

For the most part energy used in Seaport operations are from petroleum fuels, biodiesel and electricity which are used to move goods and passengers, as well as provide light and space

heating. The *Strategy* includes activities encouraging use of clean sustainable energy sources and energy efficiency strategies. The *Strategy* emphasizes four main categories of actions for reducing emissions from port-related activities: use of cleaner fuels, development of better engines and technology to work in concert with the cleaner fuels, more efficient operations, and innovative thinking around the ways in which a specific port or other maritime activity might be carried out. This document is a framework of what the Ports of Seattle, Tacoma, and Vancouver believe needs to be achieved in order to operate sustainably and outlines the pathways, activities, and commitments needed to get there.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.**

No impacts to potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties are anticipated to result from *Strategy*.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:**

All future Port development, regardless of the *Strategy*, would be required to comply with the Washington State Energy Code and local energy codes. In addition, some of the Ports have their own Energy Conservation Policy, which instructs program managers and design staff to include for conservation measures over and above Energy Code requirements that can be implemented in a cost-effective manner. The *Strategy* encourages identification and implementation of technologies and strategies to conserve energy by all the affected sectors.

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

No environmental health hazards are expected as part of the *Strategy*.
Public health benefits are expected to result from reduced air emissions.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

No special emergency services are expected to be required as part of the *Strategy*.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

No measures are expected to be required as part of the *Strategy*.

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic equipment, operation, other)?**

No noise is expected to affect the *Strategy*.

- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.**

No noise is anticipated to be created or associated with the *Strategy*.

- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:**

No measures are expected to be required as part of the *Strategy*.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?**

This programmatic document does not specify particular sites or actions. The uses of port land typically range widely and may include uses such as: public parks, retail and commercial establishments, manufacturing and heavy industry, cargo terminals, tank farms, intermodal rail facilities, marinas, fishing vessel moorage and maintenance, cruise ship terminals, and grain terminals. Residential areas may be adjacent to some port properties.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

The port areas are not known to have been the site of significant agricultural use during the past eighty years.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Numerous structures are located within the typical port areas including warehouses, offices, restaurants, manufacturing buildings, shipways, cargo piers, grain terminal silos, cargo transfer machinery, and streets and bridges.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

No structures are proposed for demolition at this time as part of the *Strategy*.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The *Strategy* encompasses a large region with separate local, state and federal jurisdictions. Each port site includes a variety of zoning classifications.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The *Strategy* encompasses a large region with separate local, state and federal jurisdictions. Each port site includes a variety of comprehensive plan designations.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

The *Strategy* includes three district port jurisdictions. Each port site includes a variety of shoreline shore land designations.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Each port site includes a variety of environmentally sensitive areas including liquefaction-prone soils, potential slide areas, riparian corridors and wetlands.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

Use of the *Strategy* does not anticipate any change in number of residents or workers.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

No displacement of workers is expected as a result of the *Strategy*.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

No measures are expected to be needed as a result of the *Strategy*.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

The *Strategy* is intended to be consistent with existing and projected land uses and plans.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

No housing is proposed as a result of the *Strategy*.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

No housing would be eliminated as a result of the Strategy.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

No measures are expected to be needed as a result of the Strategy.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

Structures may result as part of the *Strategy* implementation. However, it is not possible to determine at this time what future structures may be needed as there are no specific plans for structures at this time.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

No views are anticipated to be altered or obstructed as a result of the *Strategy*.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The *Strategy* does not include the potential for light or glare impacts.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No light or glare is expected as a result of the *Strategy*.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

No existing off-site sources of light or glare are expected to adversely affect the.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

Numerous recreational activities take place within or near the port study areas. This programmatic document does specify particular sites.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No displacement of existing recreational uses is anticipated as a result of the *Strategy*.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

This programmatic document does not specify particular sites.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

This programmatic document does not specify particular sites.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

No impact to resources is expected as a result of the *Strategy*.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The study area includes many public streets and highways.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Port site areas are served by public transit.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

The proposal does not involve parking spaces.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

No changes to roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets are proposed.

e. Will the project use (or occur in immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

The *Strategy* study area is in vicinity of existing water, rail, or vehicle transportation.

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

As a programmatic document, the *Strategy* does not include information concerning future traffic volumes or vehicle trips associated with new development. Project-specific environmental review would address this issue.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*. The *Strategy* notes that there are a number of planning-related and project implementation actions which the Ports agree to work on with regional transportation entities and air agencies to obtain further emissions reductions within this sector. These actions include identification of improvements with the objective of moving freight on roads and rail facilities more quickly and efficiently.

15. Public Services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

The *Strategy* would not result in an increased need for public services.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*.

16. Utilities

c. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other: storm sewer.

Electricity

Water

Sanitary sewer

Storm drainage

Telephone

Commercial solid waste collection service

Types and capacity of available utilities differ at sites within the study area.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity that might be needed.**

It is anticipated that changes in the existing utility routes or levels of service may be required for some air emission control projects.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: Matthew Blinstrub

Date Submitted: November 26, 2007

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON-PROJECT ACTIONS

(Do not use this sheet for project actions)

The *Strategy* describes a programmatic, non-project approach to reducing air emissions. Future, at present undetermined, actions with the potential for reducing air emissions will undergo specific environmental review, as appropriate.

The responses to Items D (1) through (6) below draw from the environmental checklist, Items A, Background, and B. Environmental Elements, above and focus on elements of the *Strategy* as it pertains to potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Adoption of the *Strategy* is expected to result in positive air quality effects. To the extent that projects are implemented as a result of *Strategy* policies, impacts from those projects would have the potential to decrease the likelihood of emissions to air.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Please see discussion under Section 2. Air

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Adoption of the *Strategy* would not directly result in impacts on plants, animals, fish, or marine life.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Adoption of the *Strategy* may result in positive effects on energy or natural resources coincident with reductions in air emissions.

The plan may increase the use of alternative energy options such as electricity, biofuels and natural gas. Examples include the use of shore power or electricity for ships while in port, operation of cargo handling equipment with biodiesel, and hybrid vehicle technologies. The *Strategy* encourages more efficient use of energy.

Please see discussion above under Section 6. Energy and Natural Resources.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

Projects envisioned by the *Strategy* would make use of energy efficient equipment.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Adoption of the *Strategy* would not directly result in adverse effects on environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection. The *Strategy* is intended to result in cleaner air in the region including environmentally sensitive areas and areas designated for governmental protection.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

No impact to land and shoreline use is expected as a result of the *Strategy*.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy* because the *Strategy* is intended to be consistent with existing land and shoreline use.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

No increased demands on transportation or public services and utilities is expected as a result of the *Strategy*. The plan could increase the use of alternative energy options such as electricity and natural gas. At the time such strategies would be considered utilities would be consulted.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

No measures are expected to be necessary as a result of the *Strategy*.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The *Strategy* is intended to be consistent with local, state, and federal laws and requirements for protection of the environment.