Luster, Tom

From:

Hellwig, Raymond

3ent:

Thursday, May 11, 2000 4:48 PM

To:

Fitzsimmons. Thomas

Cc:

Luster, Tom; Ehlers, Paula; White, Gordon; Hart, Curt; Groves, Nancy; Pastore, Dianne:

Alkire, Bill

Subject:

Meeting with Mic Dinsmore, POS, Wes Ulman, (PSRC?) and the Governor re SeaTac

Apparently, at the request of Mic Dinsmore of the Port, Martha Choe, CTED, has arranged for a meeting next week between the Governor, Wes Ulman (?), and Mr. Dinsmore. The meeting will happen at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday the 16th, somewhere in Seattle. Not knowing how well informed you might be regarding the purpose of this meeting, I thought it might help if I pass along what I know about a possible agenda, and some relevant information.

It's very likely the meeting is campaign related, but according to conversations I have had with Gerry O'Keefe, Elizabeth Leavitt at the POS, and John Savage, an AD reporting to Martha Choe at CTED, the meeting agenda will probably include: a.) an opportunity for the Port to once again convey the importance of the 3rd runway project to this region, and their need to better understanding of Ecology's timetable for decision making — perhaps the POS will offer suggestions on how to expedite the decision e.g., keep Ecology from expanding issues in an unreasonable manner [of course we are managing this concern and at the same time being comprehensive in our review]); and, b.) to discuss whether or not the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) resolution approving the SeaTac expansion has any deadlines associated with it (hence the attendance of Wes Ulman?).

Regarding our "timetable": as mentioned in previous SeaTac update messages, we continue work through numerous issues and move forward with our review of the Port's proposal(s). Significant issues revolve around the King County review of the POS stormwater management plan, the aquatic resource management plan, as well as potential indirect and cumulative impacts from 3rd runway related projects e.g., the temporary 509 access road. On several occasions, the POS has underestimated the time and effort needed to address regulatory requirements linked to these issues.

Our working relationship with the POS remains generally open and positive, however some of the deliverables submitted by the POS continue to be inadequate and/or untimely. This has had a significant adverse impact on our ability to review the proposal(s) within the timeframe Port officials were hoping for. We have made this project a major workload priority for more than two years now, and we are also anxious to reach a decision point, but we are in need of complete and accurate information. Our review needs to be comprehensive to accommodate our environmental objectives. Also, runway opponent groups continue to carefully scrutinize our review process as well as monitor oversight of the SeaTac and Maury Island gravel studies approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor.

We are meeting with the POS in the a.m. on the 16th to discuss the status of several key issues and identify steps we need to take to resolve outstanding ones.

About the PSRC resolution deadline: you will recall Tom Luster's message from the other day indicating that his
research with Steven Kyle at the PSRC essentially resulted in finding this to be a non-issue. The PSRC board will
update/refresh the regional plan under which the SeaTac resolution rests, but outside of expected steps the POS
needs to take with the Highline School District and other interested parties, there are no deadlines on the horizon for
the runway project(s).

Tom, if the involved parties should make a last minute change in plans, and request a representative from our agency, I am more than happy to attend this meeting and provide perspective on behalf of the agency.

Thanks,

Ray

166 1-182002 Fitzsimmons

DOE 6/8/00 **0443**