Appendix A

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Scoping Summary

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTERS

Scoping comment letters were received from the following governments and government agencies:

- Muckleshoot Indian Tribe;
- Muckleshoot Preservation Program;
- Puyallup Tribe of Indians;
- Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology); and
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT).

Comments from the general public were received by mailed letter, by e-mail, and by hand-written comment sheets and verbally submitted during the public scoping meeting. Approximately 30 scoping comment letters were submitted to the City of Sumner on the proposed project. Some individuals submitted more than one comment letter, and in most cases, each letter contained multiple comments. The following individuals sent comment letters:

- Kathy Hammad
- Sara Hoime
- Mary-Frances Lauridsen
- J. Norris
- Norma J. Parsons
- Renee Rick
- Veronica E. Shakotko
- Tim and Heidi Tate
- Terry Westover
- Orin and Margaret Williams
- Ronald M. Williams

COMMENT SUMMARY

The following sections summarize the comments received during the 30-day public comment period, organized by topic. This summary paraphrases the issues and concerns raised to guide and focus the EIS on areas of potentially significant impacts. The majority of the issues raised pertain to the potential risk associated with toxicity of the chemicals that would be handled at the completed project, and various means by which they could affect people or contaminate natural resources.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS / ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

- Identify all federal, state, and local regulations, including the Washington State Dangerous Waste regulations administered by Ecology that apply to the project.
- The specific types and quantities of chemicals to be stored at, and distributed from, the project site should be fully discussed, including fire and health risks associated with each.
- Describe the potential for the release of vapors and/or gasses from the chemicals stored at the site and the possible short- and long-term impacts to the surrounding communities.
- Describe safety measures designed to prevent the release of harmful vapors and gasses.

- Potential dangerous wastes generated at the project site must be described. What are the regulatory requirements for wastes at the site?
- Would any flammable materials, such as propane or diesel fuel, be stored at the project site?
- Does the project have a Spill Contingency Plan that identifies risks associated with non-compliance and which agencies should be contacted in the event of a spill?
- What are the potential impacts from an accident at the project site? Would these change during different climatic conditions? How large of an area could be affected?
- What are the operating safety procedures, including specific facility design features (e.g., containment berms, alarms, etc.), maintenance, employee training, and public notification and evacuation procedures in the event of an emergency?
- How will incompatible materials ready for shipment be segregated on the project site?
- What emergency equipment, facilities, and/or training will be provided to the City?
- Does Northstar Chemical participate in the Responsible Care® initiative or and other chemical safety associations?
- What is the accident history of similar facilities? What types of accidents occurred? How much area was affected? What were the health effects?
- What would the impact of a natural disaster be on the facility?

EARTH

- How would seismic activity affect the proposed project?
- Does the project include any drilling activities, including development of water wells, monitoring wells, and/or biotechnical soil borings?
- How much clearing, grading, and fill will be required for construction of the project?

AIR QUALITY

- Describe the project's compliance with all Puget Sound Clean Air Authority regulatory requirements.
- What are the monitoring and reporting requirements for the project? What corrective measures are required for non-compliance?
- What would be the impacts of a chemical accident during an inversion?
- Will air quality sensors be included in the project?
- What impact would the increased truck and train traffic have on air quality?

WATER QUALITY

- All streams and wetlands on the site must be identified, including the "piped stream" identified in the SEPA checklist, and evaluated by a qualified fisheries biologist.
- What is the potential for the chemicals stored at and transported to and from the site to adversely affect surface and ground waters, including streams, rivers, floodplains, wetlands, wells, and aquifers? What could be the short- and long-term impacts? What are the regulatory requirements?
- Do test borings or monitoring wells represent conduits to the shallow or deep aquifer in the event of a spill?
- Fully describe the proposed method of stormwater treatment and detention, and identify potential receiving water bodies and hydrologic connectivity to groundwater. The analysis of stormwater impacts should include a description of methods that would be used to keep stormwater separate

from any water that may come in contact with the chemicals stored at the site (e.g., stormwater from containment and transfer areas).

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Identify potential impacts to aquatic life in the event that surface waters are contaminated.
- Will the project require tree removal?
- Will the project affect migratory wildlife?

CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES

- All potential cultural resources and historic structures should be addressed in the EIS.
- Will the project include excavation that alters or removes potential Native American grave sites?

LAND USE

- How does the project comply with the elements of the City's Comprehensive Plan?
- How does the project comply with the City's Town Center Plan?
- Is the project or any planned activity within the City's Shoreline jurisdiction?
- Are there any future plans for the remainder of the property?
- Will the project require reduced buffers?
- Is demolition of any existing structures part of the proposal?

TRANSPORTATION

- Describe the general geographic routes, including surrounding land uses, and schedules which the proposed rail and truck transports would use.
- Describe the types of trucks, trailers, and rail cars that would be used to transport chemicals to and from the site.
- A trip generation and distribution report should be prepared for the proposed project.
- Are there any potential impacts to SR 167?
- Would the project proponent have to contract with rail or truck carriers?
- Would the operation have an on-site fueling station for their trucks?
- How would the additional rail traffic affect the Sounder Commuter train?
- How would the additional rail traffic affect traffic on Fryer Avenue?
- Are there any known structural deficiencies in the railroad bridge that would make it inadequate for the use proposed?
- What are the regulatory and permitting requirements for truck and rail transport of the hazardous chemicals to be located at the project site, including permits, driver training, and maintenance?
- Will trucks transporting chemicals have a safe entrance/exit to the project site?

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

- Will the project require new, or change existing, water rights?
- How much water will the proposed project use? What is the water source?
- Does the project comply with the City of Sumner Water Plan of 2005?
- Would the project affect the use of the aquifer that lies below the project site and vicinity as potable water source?
- What types and sources of power will the proposed project use?

- Will the project require additional police services?

AESTHETICS

- What type of lighting would be used at the project site and how will it impact the surrounding community?

Additional comments and concerns were raised during the scoping process that are not required to be evaluated in an EIS, such as the potential production of sales tax, indemnification and bonding requirements, impacts to property values, and descriptions of corporate affiliations. The principal purpose of the SEPA process is to identify and mitigate impacts to the environment and to assist agencies in making final decisions on a proposal (WAC 197-11-448). SEPA does not require a cost-benefit analysis for weighing the relative merits and/or drawbacks of alternatives (WAC 197-11-450).

Appendix B

Estimated Accident Calculations for the

Northstar Chemical Facility Project

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

ASSUMPTIONS AND STATISTICS:

Accident rate for large trucks transporting hazardous materials[1]	0.32/1 million miles
Percentage of hazmat truck accidents resulting in a spill[1]	15%
Average trip distance traveled for a Northstar Chemical truck[2]	185 miles
Northstar Chemical deliveries per day	9
Number of Northstar Chemical operating days per year (no holidays or weekends)	254 days

[1] Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration accidents statistics for heavy trucks transporting hazardous materials (FMCSA, 2001).
[2] Based on current customer zip code information provided by Northstar Chemical (Northstar Chemical, 2009).

CALCULATIONS:

Average number of miles traveled for Northstar Chemical trucks:

185 miles/delivery **x** 9 deliveries/day **x** 254 days/year **= 422,910 miles/year**

Accident potential for Northstar Chemical trucks:

0.32 accidents/million miles **x** 422,910 miles/year **=** 0.135 accidents/year **= 13.5 percent**

Calculation of the inverse:

1 year/0.135 accidents **= 7.4 years/accident**

Potential for an accident involving a release of chemicals for Northstar Chemical trucks:

0.15 **x** 0.135 accidents/year **=** 0.020 accidents/year **= 2.0 percent**

1 year/0.020 accidents **= 49.3 years/accidental release**

REDUCED SCALE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

ASSUMPTIONS AND STATISTICS:

Accident rate for large trucks transporting hazardous materials[1]	0.32/1 million miles
Percentage of hazmat truck accidents resulting in a spill[1]	15% (0.15)
Average trip distance traveled for a Northstar Chemical truck[2]	185 miles
Northstar Chemical deliveries per day	6
Number of Northstar Chemical operating days per year (no holidays or weekends)	254 days

[1] Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration accidents statistics for heavy trucks transporting hazardous materials (FMCSA, 2001).
[2] Based on current customer zip code information provided by Northstar Chemical (Northstar Chemical, 2009).

CALCULATIONS:

Average number of miles traveled for Northstar Chemical trucks:

185 miles/delivery **x** 6 deliveries/day **x** 254 days/year **=** **281,940 miles/year**

Accident potential for Northstar Chemical trucks:

0.32 accidents/million miles **x** 281,940 miles/year **=** 0.090 accidents/year **=** **9.0 percent**

Calculation of the inverse:

1 year/0.090 accidents **=** **11.1 years/accident**

Potential for an accident involving a release of chemicals for Northstar Chemical trucks:

0.15 **x** 0.090 accidents/year **=** 0.0135 accidents/year **=** **1.4 percent**

1 year/0.014 accidents **=** **74.1 years/accident**

LONG-RANGE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

ASSUMPTIONS AND STATISTICS:

Accident rate for large trucks transporting hazardous materials[1]	0.32/1 million miles
Percentage of hazmat truck accidents resulting in a spill[1]	15%
Average trip distance traveled for a Northstar Chemical truck[2]	185 miles
Northstar Chemical deliveries per day	17
Number of Northstar Chemical operating days per year (no holidays or weekends)	254 days

[1] Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration accidents statistics for heavy trucks transporting hazardous materials (FMCSA, 2001).
[2] Based on current customer zip code information provided by Northstar Chemical (Northstar Chemical, 2009).

CALCULATIONS:

Average number of miles traveled for Northstar Chemical trucks:

185 miles/delivery **x** 17 deliveries/day **x** 254 days/year **=** **798,830 miles/year**

Accident potential for Northstar Chemical trucks:

0.32 accidents/million miles **x** 798,830 miles/year **=** 0.256 accidents/year **=** **25.6 percent**

Calculation of the inverse:

1 year/0.256 accidents **=** **3.9 years/accident**

Potential for an accident involving a release of chemicals for Northstar Chemical trucks:

0.15 **x** 0.256 accidents/year **=** 0.0384 accidents/year **=** **3.8 percent**

1 year/0.0384 accidents **=** **26.0 years/accident**

Appendix C

RMPCOMP and SCREEN3 Modeling Results

RMP*Comp Ver. 1.07
Parameters for Accidental Release

Chemical: Nitric acid (water solution) 67%
CAS #: 7697-37-2
Category: Toxic Liquid
Scenario: Alternative
Quantity Released: 2450 pounds
Release Duration: 10 minutes
Storage Parameters: Tank under Atmospheric Pressure
Hole or puncture area: 1 square inches
Height of Liquid Column Above Hole: 12 inches

Release Rate: 245 pounds per min
Liquid Temperature: 70 F

Mitigation Measures:
Diked area: 180 square feet
Dike height: 2 feet

Release Rate to Outside Air: 0.3 pounds per minute
Topography: Rural surroundings (terrain generally flat and unobstructed)
Toxic Endpoint: 0.026 mg/L; basis: EHS-LOC (IDLH)

--------Meteorologiocal Assumptions for modeling This Scenario---------
Wind Speed: 3 meters/second (6.7 miles/hour)
Stability Class: D
Air Temperature: 77 degrees F (25 degrees C)

```
                                   07/29/09
                                   12:40:24
 ***  SCREEN3 MODEL RUN  ***
 *** VERSION DATED 95250 ***

 Nitric acid spill into diked area

 SIMPLE TERRAIN INPUTS:
    SOURCE TYPE                =        AREA
    EMISSION RATE (G/(S-M**2))  =      .130000
    SOURCE HEIGHT (M)          =       .0000
    LENGTH OF LARGER SIDE (M)   =       4.1000
    LENGTH OF SMALLER SIDE (M)  =       4.1000
    RECEPTOR HEIGHT (M)        =       1.8000
    URBAN/RURAL OPTION         =       RURAL
    ANGLE RELATIVE TO LONG AXIS =      90.0000


 BUOY. FLUX =     .000 M**4/S**3;  MOM. FLUX =     .000 M**4/S**2.

 *** STABILITY CLASS  4 ONLY ***
 *** 10-METER WIND SPEED OF   3.00 M/S ONLY ***

 **********************************
 *** SCREEN AUTOMATED DISTANCES ***
 **********************************

 *** TERRAIN HEIGHT OF    0. M ABOVE STACK BASE USED FOR FOLLOWING
DISTANCES ***

   DIST     CONC          U10M   USTK  MIX HT   PLUME  MAX DIR
   (M)   (UG/M**3)   STAB  (M/S)  (M/S)   (M)   HT (M)   (DEG)
 -------  ----------  ----  -----  -----  ------  ------  -------
    100.   5578.       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    200.   1707.       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    300.   836.8       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    400.   510.8       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    500.   348.1       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    600.   254.4       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    700.   195.1       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    800.   155.1       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
    900.   126.6       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
   1000.   105.6       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
   1100.   91.10       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
   1200.   79.58       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
```

1300.	70.28	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
1400.	62.64	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
1500.	56.28	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
1600.	50.92	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
1700.	46.35	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
1800.	42.42	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
1900.	39.01	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2000.	36.03	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2100.	33.40	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2200.	31.08	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2300.	29.01	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2400.	27.16	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2500.	25.50	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2600.	24.00	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2700.	22.64	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2800.	21.40	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
2900.	20.27	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
3000.	19.23	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
3500.	15.25	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
4000.	12.47	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
4500.	10.45	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
5000.	8.915	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.

MAXIMUM 1-HR CONCENTRATION AT OR BEYOND 100. M:

100.	5578.	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.

****
*** SCREEN DISCRETE DISTANCES ***
****

*** TERRAIN HEIGHT OF 0. M ABOVE STACK BASE USED FOR FOLLOWING DISTANCES ***

DIST (M)	CONC (UG/M**3)	STAB	U10M (M/S)	USTK (M/S)	MIX HT (M)	PLUME HT (M)	MAX DIR (DEG)
25.	.2795E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
28.	.2713E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
30.	.2623E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
35.	.2347E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
40.	.2066E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
45.	.1808E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
50.	.1586E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
60.	.1237E+05	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
70.	9835.	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.
80.	8001.	4	3.0	3.0	960.0	.00	90.

```
   90.   6626.       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.
  100.   5578.       4     3.0    3.0   960.0     .00     90.

     ***************************************
     *** SUMMARY OF SCREEN MODEL RESULTS ***
     ***************************************

 CALCULATION      MAX CONC   DIST TO  TERRAIN
  PROCEDURE      (UG/M**3)   MAX (M)   HT (M)
 --------------  -----------  -------  -------
 SIMPLE TERRAIN    .2795E+05      25.       0.


 ***************************************************
 ** REMEMBER TO INCLUDE BACKGROUND CONCENTRATIONS **
 ***************************************************
```

Appendix D

Transportation Analysis Data

Transpo Group

Highway Capacity Manual, 2000

Signalized intersection level of service (LOS) is defined in terms of the average total vehicle delay of all movements through an intersection. Vehicle delay is a method of quantifying several intangible factors, including driver discomfort, frustration, and lost travel time. Specifically, LOS criteria are stated in terms of average delay per vehicle during a specified time period (for example, the PM peak hour). Vehicle delay is a complex measure based on many variables, including signal phasing (i.e., progression of movements through the intersection), signal cycle length, and traffic volumes with respect to intersection capacity. Table 1 shows LOS criteria for signalized intersections, as described in the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board, Special Report 209, 2000).

Table 1. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

Level of Service	Average Control Delay (sec/veh)	General Description (Signalized Intersections)
A	≤10	Free Flow
B	>10 - 20	Stable Flow (slight delays)
C	>20 - 35	Stable flow (acceptable delays)
D	>35 - 55	Approaching unstable flow (tolerable delay, occasionally wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding)
E	>55 - 80	Unstable flow (intolerable delay)
F	>80	Forced flow (jammed)

Source: *Highway Capacity Manual*, Transportation Research Board, Special Report 209, 2000.

Unsignalized intersection LOS criteria can be further reduced into two intersection types: all-way stop-controlled and two-way stop-controlled. All-way, stop-controlled intersection LOS is expressed in terms of the average vehicle delay of all of the movements, much like that of a signalized intersection. Two-way, stop-controlled intersection LOS is defined in terms of the average vehicle delay of an individual movement(s). This is because the performance of a two-way, stop-controlled intersection is more closely reflected in terms of its individual movements, rather than its performance overall. For this reason, LOS for a two-way, stop-controlled intersection is defined in terms of its individual movements. With this in mind, total average vehicle delay (i.e., average delay of all movements) for a two-way, stop-controlled intersection should be viewed with discretion. Table 2 shows LOS criteria for unsignalized intersections (both all-way and two-way, stop-controlled).

Table 2. Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections

Level of Service	Average Control Delay (sec/veh)
A	0 - 10
B	>10 - 15
C	>15 - 25
D	>25 - 35
E	>35 - 50
F	>50

Source: *Highway Capacity Manual*, Transportation Research Board, Special Report 209, 2000.

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Volume (veh/h)	1	1	165	0	1	795
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	1	179	0	1	864
Pedestrians						
Lane Width (ft)						
Walking Speed (ft/s)						
Percent Blockage						
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	614	90			179	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	614	90			179	
tC, single (s)	7.8	7.9			4.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	4.0	3.8			2.3	
p0 queue free %	100	100			100	
cM capacity (veh/h)	328	816			1365	

Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1	SB 2
Volume Total	2	120	60	289	576
Volume Left	1	0	0	1	0
Volume Right	1	0	0	0	0
cSH	468	1700	1700	1365	1700
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.07	0.04	0.00	0.34
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	0	0	0
Control Delay (s)	12.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lane LOS	B			A	
Approach Delay (s)	12.7	0.0		0.0	
Approach LOS	B				

Intersection Summary			
Average Delay	0.0		
Intersection Capacity Utilization	32.7%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15		

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Volume (veh/h)	1	1	165	0	0	795
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1	1	179	0	0	864
Pedestrians						
Lane Width (ft)						
Walking Speed (ft/s)						
Percent Blockage						
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	611	90			179	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	611	90			179	
tC, single (s)	7.8	7.9			4.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	4.0	3.8			2.3	
p0 queue free %	100	100			100	
cM capacity (veh/h)	330	816			1365	

Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1	SB 2
Volume Total	2	120	60	288	576
Volume Left	1	0	0	0	0
Volume Right	1	0	0	0	0
cSH	470	1700	1700	1365	1700
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.07	0.04	0.00	0.34
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	0	0	0
Control Delay (s)	12.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lane LOS	B				
Approach Delay (s)	12.7	0.0		0.0	
Approach LOS	B				

Intersection Summary			
Average Delay	0.0		
Intersection Capacity Utilization	32.0%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15		

Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT
Lane Configurations						
Volume (veh/h)	4	1	165	0	1	795
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free
Grade	0%		0%			0%
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	4	1	179	0	1	864
Pedestrians						
Lane Width (ft)						
Walking Speed (ft/s)						
Percent Blockage						
Right turn flare (veh)						
Median type			None			None
Median storage veh)						
Upstream signal (ft)						
pX, platoon unblocked						
vC, conflicting volume	614	90			179	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol						
vC2, stage 2 conf vol						
vCu, unblocked vol	614	90			179	
tC, single (s)	7.8	7.9			4.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)						
tF (s)	4.0	3.8			2.3	
p0 queue free %	99	100			100	
cM capacity (veh/h)	328	816			1365	

Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1	SB 2
Volume Total	5	120	60	289	576
Volume Left	4	0	0	1	0
Volume Right	1	0	0	0	0
cSH	373	1700	1700	1365	1700
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.07	0.04	0.00	0.34
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	0	0	0	0
Control Delay (s)	14.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lane LOS	B			A	
Approach Delay (s)	14.8	0.0		0.0	
Approach LOS	B				

Intersection Summary			
Average Delay	0.1		
Intersection Capacity Utilization	32.7%	ICU Level of Service	A
Analysis Period (min)	15		

Appendix E

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Distribution List

Distribution List for the Northstar Chemical Facility Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement

The Draft EIS is being sent to the entities below.

Tribes

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe
Puyallup Tribe of Indians

State/Regional Agencies

Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
Washington State Department of Ecology, Environmental Review Section
Washington State Department of Ecology, Northwest Regional Office
Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
Washington State Department of Transportation
Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

Local

City of Sumner Community Development Department
City of Sumner Public Works Department
East Pierce Fire and Rescue

Libraries

Sumner Pierce County Library

Companies and Organizations

Northstar Chemical
BNSF Railway Company
Union Pacific Railroad

Individuals

Kathy Hammad
Sara Hoime
Mary-Frances Lauridsen
J. Norris
Norma J. Parsons
Renee Rick

Veronica E. Shakotko
Tim and Heidi Tate
Terry Westover
Orin and Margaret Williams
Ronald M. Williams