KALAMA MANUFACTURING AND MARINE EXPORT FACILITY
SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
SCOPING DOCUMENT
JANUARY 2015

Introduction:

Northwest Innovations Works, LLC – Kalama (NWIW) proposes to develop and operate a natural-gas-to-methanol production plant and storage facilities on approximately 90 acres at the Port of Kalama. Natural gas will be delivered to the methanol plant via a new transmission pipeline lateral, extending approximately three miles through unincorporated Cowlitz County and the City of Kalama. Methanol will be transferred via a pipeline across Port property from the plant storage area to a deep draft marine terminal on the Columbia River including a new dock and dredging.

NWIW and the Port are preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to document probable adverse impacts from construction or operation of the project, determine whether these impacts are significant, and discuss mitigation that may be proposed. The pipeline lateral is also undergoing separate review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will prepare an environmental assessment of the new pipeline and associated facilities. See 79 FR 76319.

The Port of Kalama and Cowlitz County are SEPA Co-Lead Agencies. The first step in the EIS process is the scoping process. The Port and the County recently completed the EIS scoping process as required by SEPA, the State Environmental Policy Act. Scoping allows members of the public to provide the lead agencies with information about what the project would mean to the community. Scoping also allows regulatory agencies an early opportunity to provide information about the jurisdictional issues likely to apply to project. This Scoping Document has been prepared to summarize and share the results of that effort, including decisions that have been made about the analysis to be addressed in the Draft EIS.

The Scoping Process:

To start the scoping process, the Port and the County issued a Determination of Significance/Scoping Notice on October 31, 2014. The DS/Scoping Notice requested public and agency comments on the proposed content of the EIS, as well as on alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, and licenses or other approvals that may be required. The lead agencies utilized "expanded scoping" (WAC 197-11-410) for this process. The scoping period extended from November 7 through December 8, 2014. To alert the public to the SEPA process and to request scoping comments, the lead agencies followed legal notice requirements to issue the Determination of Significance and public scoping notice for the project. The DS/Scoping Notice was advertised in the Longview Daily News, and on the Port's

website. A project-specific SEPA website was created and maintained to provide information about the project, scoping of the EIS, and environmental review under SEPA (http://kalamamfgfacilitysepa.com/).

The scoping notice was mailed to 206 members of the public, affected tribes, and agencies with jurisdiction and published in the Department of Ecology's SEPA register on November 6, 2014. In addition, the Port mailed approximately 3,110 postcards about the scoping meeting to citizens within the Port district. An additional 286 email notifications were sent to citizens, agencies, and interest groups who had previously expressed an interest in the project.

During the scoping period the lead agencies held a public scoping meeting on November 20, 2014 where information was provided about the proposal and the public was invited to provide written comments either at the meeting, and via mail, email or via the project SEPA website comment form after the meeting. Twelve letters were received via email or regular mail during the scoping period. No comments were submitted via the website form. Fifty-four written comments submitted by twenty-nine individuals were received at the scoping meeting.

Draft EIS Alternatives

Methanol plant site alternatives:
During the scoping process, the Port and the County considered two off-site alternatives representing a range of impacts for the methanol plant site. The first site "East Port" is a 113 acre Port-owned site north of the Kalama River and east of Interstate 5 within the City of Kalama. The second site "West Port" is a privately-owned 154-acre site that is south of Oak Street, west of Interstate 5, adjacent to the Columbia River, and within Cowlitz County. Based on potential impacts to wetlands, construction impacts, ownership and lease issues, the "West Port" site was eliminated from further analysis. The draft EIS will include an analysis of the "East Port" site as an alternative site for the methanol production plant.

Marine terminal alternatives:
During the scoping process, the Port and the County considered on- and off-site alternatives for the marine terminal. The draft EIS will consider alternatives to the marine terminal which include the use or expansion of existing off-site port facilities and on-site design alternatives for the dock structure.

Pipeline lateral alternatives:
As noted above, the pipeline lateral is undergoing separate environmental review under NEPA. The draft EIS will present alternatives analyses and environmental information based on the FERC environmental assessment.

"No Action" Alternative:
The No Action Alternative required by SEPA will be evaluated in the DEIS, and will consider environmental impacts if there were no project proposal.

Scoping Comments and Content of the Draft EIS:

The attachment to this document provides a full summary of all comments received during the scoping period. The summary does not include statements of opinion about the proposal that were included in scoping letters or comment cards, but includes those comments or concerns that are relevant to the EIS scoping process.

The Port and the County have reviewed all of the comments received about the project. As a result of that review and based on information available at this time, the Port and the County have decided that no significant changes are needed to the elements of the environment that will be addressed by the Draft EIS. NWIW and the Port will evaluate the following elements of the environment in the Draft EIS: Earth (Geology & Soils, Seismic Events); Air (Emissions); Water (Water Quantity and Quality); Plants and Animals (Terrestrial Species, Aquatic Species); Energy and Natural Resources; Environmental Health (Noise, Potential Releases of Toxic or Hazardous Materials, Emergency Response); Land Use (Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Consistency, Parks and Recreation, Light and Glare, Aesthetics, Archaeological Resources); Transportation (Vehicle Traffic, Waterborne Traffic) Public Services; Utilities; and Socioeconomics. The analysis of these elements may be further refined as work on the EIS proceeds. The scoping comments are being used to develop the alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS.

Because similar projects are being proposed at other locations in the Pacific Northwest, a request that a programmatic EIS be prepared was raised in the scoping comments. The lead agencies have determined that a programmatic EIS is not appropriate because these other proposals are not a single course of action, need not be implemented simultaneously, are not interdependent parts of a larger proposal, and do not depend on the larger proposal as their justification or for their implementation. WAC 197-11-060(3)(b). Further, the lead agencies are choosing not to undertake an optional analysis of these other similar proposals in the DEIS. WAC 197-11-060(3)(c). Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposal will be evaluated in the EIS.

Next Steps:

The environmental consultant now will prepare the EIS for the project. The next document available for public review will be the Draft EIS, anticipated to be published in mid-2015 (actual date to be determined). With publication of that document, a public comment period will begin. At least one public hearing will be held during this comment period. Notice of that public hearing and the public comment period will be posted in the Longview Daily News, on the Department of Ecology's SEPA Register, and will be sent directly to all parties who submitted scoping comments, affected tribes, agencies with jurisdiction, and those who have specifically asked to receive notices about the project. Notice will also be posted on the project-specific SEPA website and the Port's website.

At the close of the Draft EIS comment period, NWIW and the Port will proceed with preparation of the Final EIS document. Once the Final EIS is complete, state and local permitting agencies can make their permit decisions. There will be additional opportunities for public and agency comment during many of the permit processes.

For further information and updates about the SEPA review process for the Kalama Manufacturing and Marine Export Facility proposal, please visit http://kalamamfgfacilitysepa.com/

1. **General comments; Project Description; Alternatives**

Comment	Source of Comment:
The EIS should identify alternative configurations to avoid and minimize potential impacts associated with the new overwater structure and new dredging activities. Alternative overwater structure designs and dredging scenarios should be evaluated to avoid and minimize impacts to habitats and species migration, including decking and piling materials, number of pilings, artificial lighting, and other considerations.	DNR
The Port must consider a "no-action" alternative, alternate locations for the proposed infrastructure, and smaller proposals at various locations.	NEDC
Describe MMBTU of raw natural gas required to produce 5000MT/day. Describe constituents of natural gas. What percent of raw stock is captured in the reaction with catalyst? Describe where other components go in the streams, to flare, to water/sewer, heat load. Describe the catalyst.	SC
Will NWIW consider a gas route along the river to Longview and tie in to the Cascade Natural Gas system? Will the pipeline be extended to Oregon? Will the Port take gas from this lateral to LNG shipments?	SC
What is the anticipated MRP of the lateral pipeline branch? Pigging site location? Anticipated line pressure at block valve to methanol plant?	SC
How about upgrading the Port's gas line and the Astoria lateral with a larger line instead?	JM

2. General comments – cumulative and indirect impacts; relationship to other projects

Comment	Source of Comment:
The project would be constructed on one of the Port's existing disposal sites for dredged material from the federal navigation channel. The EIS should describe where dredged material would be placed and stockpiled in the future and whether the Port would continue to receive dredged material deposited by the USACE if the project is approved.	DNR
Although the project proposes to generate small amounts of vessel traffic on the Columbia River, the EIS should analyze vessel traffic to determine potential, cumulative impacts when considering traffic associated with existing and future plans proposed by other entities. The analysis should incorporate the most recent vessel tracking data for the Columbia River, including any projected increases in vessel traffic from this proposal, other proposed dock users, and other vessel traffic transiting through the Columbia River. The EIS should evaluate multiple alternatives for reducing potential collisions and conflicts, including routes, operations, and traffic control.	DNR
The impacts of NW Innovation Works' three proposals together should be considered. A programmatic EIS should be considered.	NEDC
Consider the indirect impacts of plastic products washing up on Pacific	NEDC

Northwest shorelines.	

3. Government approvals or permits needed

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should identify and /or provide further details on any necessary expansion of pipeline, or other infrastructure that may be utilized to support the proposed project. Necessary expansions of pipelines, or other infrastructure should be listed in full detail and options identified that avoid and minimize impacts to state-owned aquatic and upland habitats, and water quality. If expansions are necessary, the proponent should coordinate with DNR prior to expanding any crossings onto state-managed lands to determine whether a use authorization may be required. The EIS should identify measures to avoid and minimize potential, adverse impacts.	DNR
Construction of the project will require a Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and coverage under the Industrial and Construction Stormwater General Permits. If process wastewater discharges are produced, they may be subject to an individual National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for industrial discharges including thermal and toxic pollutant discharges.	ECY
Contact us for details about space and permitting considerations for an electrical power substation.	CPUD

4. Natural Environment – Earth

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should address how the proposed dredging regimes would impact the aquatic environment. How much aquatic land would need to be dredged, how often would dredging occur, and where would this additional dredge material be placed? Would an increase in the number and size of vessels and need for deep turnaround or queuing areas affect the need to dredge additional areas?	DNR
The EIS should analyze adverse impacts of waves and prop scour generated by large vessels docking at the facility and tugs assisting with docking on sediment transport, bank erosion, and attached aquatic vegetation.	DNR
What is the likelihood that the project will require shoreline armoring in the future, due to operations, climate change, sea level rise, or other reasons, and how would impacts be mitigated?	DNR
The EIS must disclose the direct and indirect impacts of dredge spoil disposal, as well as cumulative impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future dredge spoil disposal actions.	NEDC
Concerns about tremors due to plant operation.	BD
Will the facility be supported by concrete cast piles or auger cast piles? What seismic standard will be utilized?	SC

5. Natural Environment - Air

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should describe potential air quality impacts that may affect surface waters. What is the potential for vapors associated with loading and unloading cargo to be discharged into the atmosphere and being deposited into surface waters? What is the potential for air pollution from normal tanker engine operations to be deposited into local surface waters?	DNR
Increased ship activity has the potential to impact sediment quality. Diesel burning by vessels can create greenhouse gases, polycyclic hydrocarbons and dioxins, which can contribute to localized sediment contamination in the area through atmospheric deposition, especially if diesel fuel is burned while the ships are idling at the terminal. The EIS should analyze the cumulative impacts of engine exhaust from the cargo vessels, tugs, and upland machinery operations, and the potential for pollutants to enter the Columbia River from atmospheric deposition, from vessel machinery, or loading operations.	DNR
The EIS should include a discussion of greenhouse gas emissions from project construction and operations of the facility.	ECY
The impacts of any air emissions authorized under a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit must be considered.	NEDC
The EIS must include emissions from marine vessels when engaged in active loading and unloading operations.	NEDC
Address how the facility will degrade the visual quality of the region.	NEDC
Consider how this facility will impact Washington's ability to achieve its renewable portfolio standard of 15% renewable by 2020 and all cost-effective conservation. The EIS must consider the impacts of this proposal on the state of Washington's and the nation's attempts to combat global climate change.	NEDC
How many tonnes of CO2 will be emitted compared to tonnes of methanol produced?	DD
Consider all production plant emissions, including GHG, in the context of local air shed. Identify all current and proposed project emissions from other industries and from local transportation (marine, rail, highway).	DD
Concerns about operational odors.	BD. SS!
Are there vents from the methanol storage tanks and ship loading? Is the gas flared? If gas is emitted to the atmosphere, what are the volumes?	SC
Concerns about air quality impacts of the proposal.	JM, SS1, DK, RB
Climate: concerns about rising sea levels. No riprap seawall on the site.	GW

6. Natural Environment - Water

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should include a characterization of the source, quality and quantity, and potential impacts of all stormwater runoff generated by the projects that may enter state waters, whether treated or untreated. How would contaminated stormwater runoff be prevented from entering surface waters? The EIS needs to identify a monitoring regime adequate to confirm design assumptions. What are the cumulative impacts of stormwater, other pollutants, and any other wastewater discharges generated by the projects, when considering all other stormwater and wastewater discharges into Columbia River?	DNR
The EIS should discuss ballast water management and examine impacts from potential discharges into the riverine and estuarine environment. Management of ballast water should be consistent with the Washington State Ballast Water Management Act.	DNR
The EIS should evaluate water resources for this proposal, including existing water right permits.	ECY
Describe the full range of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to water quality.	NEDC
Concerns about Columbia River turbidity, water temperature, chemistry changes.	BD
Will water quality in other rivers (Kalama) be affected?	SS!

7. Natural Environment - Plants and animals

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should analyze whether alternative berthing times and seasonal restrictions may be needed to ensure that cargo vessel and tug operations do not adversely affect the spawning, rearing, and migratory behavior of salmon, eulachon, sturgeon, Pacific Lamprey, and other species that utilize the proposed project area.	DNR
The facility description states that methanol would be stored in non-pressurized storage tanks with a total capacity of approximately 200,000 metric tons and 3-6 ships will be filled each month. The EIS should describe where these vessels would bunker and where they would berth/anchor should delays occur and address the following questions. What is the risk that vessels waiting to be loaded would negatively impact habitat What mitigation measures are planned to minimize risk?	DNR
How would aquatic vegetation and habitat be affected by changes in wave energy, sediment transport, or substrate?	DNR
The EIS should analyze the potential impacts that could occur from periodic dredging, construction and operation of overwater structures, berthing of	DNR

large ships, and associated activities in the nearshore area that could potentially disrupt species foraging behavior and migration patterns. Proposed project activities in the nearshore may negatively affect aquatic habitat and species listed under the Environmental Species Act, as well as their prey, including prop wash (substrate scour), methanol and bunker fuel spills, marine mammal strikes, disruption of nearshore currents, and shading impacts to littoral vegetation. The EIS should analyze how vessels and barges propose to navigate or dock at the proposed facility, and how adverse impacts of the proposed alignment and vessel operations on eulachon, salmon, marine mammals, riverine and estuarine vegetation, and other biological resources and species would be mitigated. What are the potential impacts of additional vessel traffic at the project site on these species and their habitats?	
The EIS should identify potential, adverse impacts on storage and transport of methanol and risk of release from vessels calling on this facility on shorebirds and their habitat, with special emphasis on spill prevention and response to prevent harm to shorebirds.	DNR
The EIS should analyze adverse impacts during construction of the wharf and trestle, and any future maintenance, repair, and replacement, from the presence of barges or other vessels used for construction. How would construction, design, and materials ensure avoidance of impacts to biological, chemical, and physical habitats, including, but not limited to: fish and wildlife, sediment transport, benthic habitats, and aquatic vegetation? How would barge presence be limited in duration to mitigate adverse impacts, including shading, and noise?	DNR
The EIS should analyze impacts of any increase in lighting installations or time periods associated with project operations on aquatic species. A study should be conducted to investigate the potential changes in species abundance and dominance resulting from increased prey access under artificial lighting and address ways to reduce or eliminate any identified impacts.	DNR
The EIS should analyze the amount of shading at each depth that would be generated by the new overwater structure and moorage of vessels. What are the potential, adverse impacts of shading on aquatic resources, including migrating fish?	DNR
The EIS should analyze any potential for dock installation, dredging, marine terminal operations, shading of overwater structures, and vessel scouring of sediments on riverine and estuarine vegetation or other benthic habitats. How would impacts to riverine and estuarine vegetation during construction or operations from dredging, displacement, shading, burial, and scour be avoided?	DNR
The EIS should analyze the potential for the project to introduce invasive species to the ecosystem and how any potential, adverse impacts would be	DNR

mitigated to prevent introduction. If an invasive species is found to occur on a vessel associated with the project, what actions would be implemented to prevent spread of the species into riverine and estuarine waters?	

8. Built Environment - Environmental Health; potential releases such as toxic or hazardous materials

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should analyze the increased risk of spills that may occur during cargo loading and offloading or through vessel collisions that may result from the increase in vessel traffic in the river and at the river's mouth.	DNR
The EIS should describe spill prevention and response plans. What response measures, such as deflection response plans, are in place to ensure timely response to spills to avoid impacts to sensitive habitats and species? What are the risks of spills associated with vessel traffic maneuvering and queuing? What damage assessment strategies would be in place to properly measure, quantify and compensate for unavoidable toxic and chronic impacts?	DNR
Would vessels refuel at or near the site? The EIS should address the potential, adverse impacts of any fueling activities, potential spills, and the handling of sewage and gray water from calling vessels.	DNR
If contamination is suspected or discovered during any redevelopment activity, the potentially contaminated media must be tested. If contaminated, Ecology's Report Tracking system Coordinator at the Southwest Regional Office must be notified.	ECY
Storage tank containment and capacity should be disclosed in the EIS.	NEDC
Assess the risks to fish and wildlife from vessel spills and accidents.	NEDC
Examine direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of building and operating the facility and pipelines, including loss of life, property destruction and damages, and wildfires from an explosion.	NEDC, DD
Concerns about risk of natural gas leaks, methanol production, and risk of explosion.	BD
Describe the spill recovery plan beyond containment berms to the ship. How to do you recover spilled methanol, verify quantities spilled, and report to Ecology?	SC
Concerns about toxins in the air, water, and soil and cancers in people and animals.	CGD

9. Built environment – Environmental Health - Noise:

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should analyze the amount of noise likely to be generated during construction, future repair, maintenance, and replacement, and how the project would avoid impacts to aquatic species.	DNR
The EIS should analyze the amount of noise that would likely be generated	DNR

during operation at full capacity. Both periodic and cumulative impacts of noise generated from this project on eulachon migratory and spawning behavior, salmon, sturgeon, marine mammals, shorebirds, and other species, during operation of the proposed terminal should be examined. How would any changes in noise be monitored over time to assure there are no adverse impacts to eulachon and other species?	
Concerns about operational noise.	BD
What is the predicted decibel profile of the plant to Kalama and Pleasant Hill property owners? Will there be cooling towers with fans, compressors, vacuum pumps, or other disruptive equipment?	SC
Can the noise be designed to go up?	JM
Concerns about impacts of noise from the plant on wildlife.	IM

10. Built Environment - Land and Shoreline Use; critical areas; employment; relationship to existing land use plans

Comment	Source of Comment
Per Washington State Department of Natural Resources' 2004 Liquefaction Susceptibility Map of Cowlitz County, Washington, the projects are proposed in an area with moderate to high liquefaction susceptibility. What measures would be taken to avoid spills or overflows associated with earthquakes? DNR recommends the EIS analyze the potential for geologic hazards at the site using the following methodology: a) Identify both shallow and deep-seated landslide hazards using DNR's GIS Statewide Landslide database and then create a site-specific geologic map. In areas with no existing landslide inventory, create a shallow landslide database using historic aerial imagery and other spatial data in a GIS. b) Evaluate riverbank sloughing and subaqueous landslide hazards using bathymetry or similar DEM data. c) Identify potentially unstable slopes using DNR's Shalstab model or other comparable slope stability modeling program in a GIS. d) Identify slope hazards associated with slope modification or vegetation removal at construction areas. e) Evaluate earthquake hazards including earthquake-induced ground failures. f) If dredging for port access, identify potential hazards to adjacent beaches and bluffs from loss of subaqueous buttressing, and g) Address increased risk of inundation resulting from climate change and sea level rise.	DNR
How much repeat work is required to move ahead with the 24" gas line vs. the 16" line planned for the Timber Rock route? Will Williams start over and look at all the previous routes considered?	SC
What are Homeland Security Administration requirements for this project?	SC

How will Kalama residents be protected from terrorists?	
Will there be many more people moving into the area?	CGD

11. Built environment – Light and Glare; Aesthetics; Recreation

Comment	Source of Comment
Concerns about tall plant structures, flare tower, steam and fog obstructing view, litter	BD
Will the plant look like the Longview we see from Kalama?	RB
Are operational light levels arbitrary, preferred, or mandated?	BD
I would like to see improved recreational access and walking trails adjacent to the site. Will public access be maintained?	JB, FP, JC
I would like the easement extended from Meeker Drive to edge of I-5 for public access to wetlands. Keep the swamp for permanent wildlife viewing with possible multi-use trail.	GW
Could the street lights point down? Or don't use very many.	JM

12. Built Environment - Historic and cultural preservation

Comment	Source of Comment
The EIS should analyze impacts of construction and operations (including future maintenance, repair, and replacement) on cultural resources and tribal use of aquatic lands.	DNR
No cultural resource surveys have been conducted on the full project area to date. A survey of the project area should be conducted by a professional archaeologist prior to construction. DAHP will need to see the original cultural resources survey report in addition to the summarized part of the survey that will become part of the EIS.	DAHP

13. Built Environment - Transportation

Comment	Source of Comment
The facility description states that methanol would be stored in non-pressurized storage tanks with a total capacity of approximately 200,000 metric tons and 3-6 ships will be filled each month. The EIS should describe where these vessels would bunker and where they would berth/anchor should delays occur and address the following questions. What is the risk that vessels waiting to be loaded would negatively impact shipping lanes or increase risk of collision?	DNR
The project description states that the new overwater structure would be shared with other uses, but these uses are not specified. The EIS should analyze whether the number of potential vessel trips at maximum capacity considering various vessel sizes and types, and the future uses. Please clarify	DNR

what "other users" might use the terminal and/or any other part of this facility and what product they would potentially load/offload at the terminal. The design analysis should address possible configurations that would be required to accommodate maximum projected volumes, including any possibility that methanol shipment may become the sole use of this facility in the future.	
The EIS should include a detailed vessel traffic analysis and assessment of marine traffic management needs within and outside of the Columbia River. The analysis should provide information on vessel drift, ballast water management, frequency of entry, egress, and moorage time anticipated for the different types of vessels and sizes of vessels, and their potential impact on aquatic natural resources. It should be based on the most recent United States Coast Guard vessel tracking system data for the region, including existing or projected traffic from adjacent industrial facilities, upstream shipping terminals, and nonindustrial vessels. The study should evaluate multiple alternatives for reducing potential incidents.	DNR
The proposed facility will bring additional tanker traffic into the Columbia River system, and its potential impacts in the overall vessel traffic profile should be considered in the EIS.	ECY
Consider direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of increased vessel traffic in the Columbia River.	NEDC
Concerns about construction traffic and road damage on Mt. Pleasant Road, Highway 99, and Kalama River Road. Who is responsible for road damage, repair, maintenance?	BD
Will loaded ships require a river pilot?	SC
Will methanol be loaded by truck or rail for domestic consumption?	SC

14. Built Environment – Public Services

Comment	**Source of Comment**
The EIS should describe potential fire risk associated with the project. Would the on-site fire station be staffed with personnel full time? Would there be sufficient personnel with sufficient training and equipment to respond to and manage a spill at the facility in upland and marine environments?	DNR
The EIS should address risks and identify local emergency responders' ability to manage a hazmat incident at the facility.	ECY
Contact us for details about space and permitting considerations for an electrical power substation.	CPUD
How will our volunteer fire department be able to handle a major emergency at the plant?	CGD

15. Economic issues; cost-benefit analysis; other issues

Comment	Source of Comment
Consider true costs, in terms of levelized costs of the plant, including likely future carbon taxes.	NEDC
Consider any resulting induced growth as an indirect impact of the facility.	NEDC
There is economic harm and risks due to environmental impacts of the project.	DD
There is economic harm due to taking and property devaluation along pipeline route.	DD
Is there sufficient insurance for accident scenarios?	DD
What financial assurances can be obtained to handle eventual problems?	BD
Beyond money spent for installation, what financial benefit will the plant provide in trade for its impacts?	BD
I support the project due to economic impacts, jobs, and/or increased revenues to local government.	SW, ST, DL, LB, DN, DW, DS, TB, CD, BF, MB, BC, SS2, RO, MS, KJ, JE, DG, BS, KC
Who are the primary investors in NWIW?	SC
We should find better partners than the Chinese and/or Chinese corporations.	PM

Commenter Codes:
CPUD - Cowlitz PUD
DN – Dale Navotny
LB – Linda Black
DL – Don Lemmons
ST – Stephen Taylor
SW – Spencer Wiggins
BC2 – Brian Davern
DD – Diane Dick
NEDP – Northwest Environmental Defense Center/Columbia Riverkeeper
DNR – Washington Department of Natural Resources
ECY – Washington Department of Ecology
DAHP – Washington Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation

SC – Stu Card
JB – Jim Bain
DW – David White
DS – Dave Stark
CGD – Connie & Gordon Dean
TB – Travis Brinkman
IM – Irene McNelly
KC – Kimberly Cole
RB – Richard Bauer

GW – Gary White
CD – Christina Daniels
JC – Joseph Connelly
BF – Bill Fashing
DK – David Knepper
SS1 - Sandy Singleton
MB – Michael Bridges
BC1 – Bob Carroll
GW – Gary Wallace
SS2 – Shannon Stull
RO – Ryan ONeil
PM – Phillip Massey
MS – Mark Smith
KJ – Kevin Jones
JE – Jay Evanston
DG – Dan Guglielmo
FP – Fred Pleger
JM – J. Meigs
BS – Bernie Schockelt