

Appendix 4

Supportable				
Use Category	Possible Uses	Relation to CDF	Description of Use	Why Supportable?
FWP	Log Yard for Export (CSA Analysis pg. 4-2)	Less Intense	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis, though on pg. 4-2, the Weyerhaeuser Log Yard in Longview, Washington is used as an example. The Weyerhaeuser site in Longview hosts both a lumber mill and an export yard. ¹ Based on the proposed title in the CSA Analysis of “Log Yard for Export,” Staff assumes the example category is considering export only.	Staff understands that the example “less intense than the CDF” use of a log yard would be for export only and would not involve EHS, explosive materials, or significant particulate matter emissions. As such, Staff finds that a Log Yard for Export is supportable under the current application package with the recommended conditions of approval.
FWP	Wood Chip Facility (CSA Analysis pg. 5-8)	Less Intense	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis beyond "exports or creates chips onsite" (pg. 5-8).	The CSA Analysis does not directly comment on the permitting requirements for a wood chip facility. However, as this use is an example of a use “less intense than the CDF” (CSA Analysis pg. 5-8), EHS and explosive materials are not expected to be involved. Additionally, no federal or state permits for water or air quality are expected to be relied upon for compatibility. Staff finds that a Wood Chip Facility is supportable under the current application package with the recommended conditions of approval.
DBC	Food Stuff Import or Export with Minimal Processing (CSA Analysis pg. 4-8)	Less Intense	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-8, "The United States imports and exports many different types of food stuff commodities, including rice, corn, barley, wheat, and sugar...Typical activities for food stuff may include loading and unloading from ships, transfer to trucks or trains, bagging or packaging."	Based on the CSA Analysis description, staff does not interpret “minimal processing” to mean any activities that would require the applicant to rely on state or federal water or air quality permitting to demonstrate compatibility. On pg. 5-12 of the CSA Analysis, it is identified under the Applicant’s recommended conditions of approval for uses less intense than the CDF that some dry bulk uses may create fugitive dust, “such as sand, gypsum, or flour...” As the identified use less intense than the CDF is specifically food stuff import or export with minimal processing, staff believe this to be allowable, excluding facilities that would create wheat dust. The issues with uses that create wheat dust are discussed within the staff report, Section 3.B. Staff’s position of support also assumes no further credible objections during the hearing process to potential fugitive dust or other emissions from food stuff. No EHS or explosive materials are anticipated as part of minimal processing. As such, staff finds that Food Stuff Import or Export with Minimal Processing is supportable under the current application package with the recommended conditions of approval.
LBC	Non-hazardous Liquid Bulk Import and Export (e.g. Cooking Oils, Milk, or Juice) (CSA Analysis pg. 4-15)	Less Intense	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-15, "The United States imports and exports many different types of liquid food stuff commodities, including cooking oils, milk, fructose syrup, and juices. These liquid bulk commodities, being edible, are non EHS materials and usually biodegradable. They are often shipped in specialized vessels or ‘flexitanks.’ Typical activities for food stuff may include loading and unloading from ships, transfer to trucks or trains, storage in liquid storage tanks, and packaging."	A non-hazardous liquid bulk import and export facility would be limited to import and export only. Staff understands “minimal processing” to not involve EHS or explosives. Additionally, no federal or state permits for water or air quality are expected to be relied upon for compatibility. The main additional processing expected is packaging. As such, staff finds that a Non-hazardous Liquid Bulk Import and Export facility is supportable under the current application package with the recommended conditions of approval.
NG&DP	Utility Peaker Plant (CSA Analysis pg. 4-22)	Less Intense	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-22, "Port Westward Industrial Park is home to three power generation facilities operated by PGE that run on natural gas. PGE’s Beaver Power Plant (built in the 1970s), Westward 1 (built in 2007) and Port Westward 2 (built in 2014) combine to generate nearly 1,200 megawatts of electricity. According to the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council, Beaver Power Plant and Port Westward 1 are combined cycle power plants, while Port Westward 2 is natural gas fired and used for non-base loads. A battery storage facility has since been approved at the Port Westward Generating Project. The facilities are fed by two pipelines. One pipeline directly from the Mist Underground Storage Reservoir, which is located approximately 13 miles to the SW of the Port as well as the Kelso-Beaver natural gas pipeline that interconnects with the Williams Northwest Pipeline near Kelso, Washington. A combined cycle power plant uses both a gas turbine and a steam turbine to produce electricity from the same source of heat, which increases the efficiency and output. Waste heat from a gas turbine is captured by a heat recover system, which is then used to generate steam. A combined cycle plant can create 50% more electricity than just a gas fired facility."	The Port Westward site hosts three existing PGE power generation facilities, the earliest of which dates back to the 1970s (CSA Analysis, pg. 4-22). The CSA Analysis describes power-generating facilities and why they are less intensive than the CDF, with a recommended 150-foot setback. Staff finds that a lower-intensity power-generating facility is compatible with uses in the Surrounding Area, with the recommended conditions of approval.

¹ <https://www.weyerhaeuser.com/company/contact-us-locations/>

Appendix 4

BS	Non-hazardous Import Facility (e.g. lumber, unitized cargo, automobiles, and machinery) (CSA Analysis pg. 4-29)	Less Intense	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-28, "Breakbulk cargo refers to non-containerized freight, which is typically unitized items, such as wind turbines, larger-scale metal products, bales of paper, vehicles, barrels, drums or casks, or boxes of fruit. It can also involve items that might be shipped as dry bulk but are packaged individually, such as bags of rice, wheat, or sugar." Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-29, "An example of such a facility is the MacMillan Piper Taylor Way Facility located at the Port of Tacoma. Located on approximately 10 acres, the facility features a 100,000 square foot warehouse with facilities for rail and trucks and has the capability to handle food grade items. They include transloading as a service. The facility can handle products such as lumber, unitized cargo, palletized items, automobiles, billets, project cargo, loose cargo, and machinery."	Non-hazardous breakbulk import facilities will be limited to cargo import and export. Staff understands “minimal processing” referenced on pg. 5-32 of the CSA Analysis does not involve EHS or explosives. Additionally, no federal or state permits for water or air quality are expected to be relied upon for compatibility. As such, staff finds that a Non-Hazardous Breakbulk Import facility is supportable under the current application package with the recommended conditions of approval.
----	---	--------------	---	--

Unsupportable Without Further Information				
Use Category	Possible Uses	Relation to CDF	Description of Use	Why Unsupportable?
FWP	Wood Pellet Plant (CSA Analysis pg. 4-1)	CDF	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-1, "A pellet plant typically consists of processing stages such as raw material preparation, pelletizing, cooling and screening, and storage and packaging. The raw material is collected, dried, screened, and ground into uniform particles."	On pg. 4-6, the CSA Analysis notes they expect the CDF to create air quality emissions that would require DEQ permits. As discussed, the CSA Analysis does not address the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. Thus, in Staff’s view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
FWP	Sawmill (CSA Analysis pg. 5-7)	CDF	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis.	The CSA Analysis does not directly comment on the permitting requirements for a sawmill, but on pg. 4-6, the Wood Pellet Plant example CDF is noted to expect that DEQ permits would be required. The sawmill is noted as another example CDF on pg. 5-7. As discussed, the CSA Analysis does not address the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. Thus, in Staff’s view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
FWP	Wood Flooring Manufacturer (CSA Analysis pg. 5-7)	CDF	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis.	The CSA Analysis does not directly comment on the permitting requirements for wood flooring manufacturing, but on pg. 4-6, the Wood Pellet Plant example CDF is noted to expect that DEQ permits would be required. As wood flooring manufacturing is noted as another example CDF on pg. 5-7, and staff understand the manufacturing process involves emissions of air toxins, particularly wood dust (particulate matter) and often chemical treatments, thus DEQ permits are expected. As discussed, the CSA Analysis does not address the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. Thus, in Staff’s view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
FWP	Kraft Pulp Mill (CSA Analysis pg. 4-2)	More Intense	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-2, "The kraft process converts wood products into pulp, which can then be used to make the end product of kraft paper... Typically, the process involves steaming wood chips and then saturating them with white liquor. White liquor is a mixture of sodium hydroxide and sodium sulfide and dissolves lignin and separates cellulose fiber. After saturation, the chips are cooked in the liquor in pressurized digesters. After cooking, there is a recovery process using a boiler to remove liquors and multiple steps to complete the conversion into kraft pulp, including typically blowing, screening, and washing. Byproducts of the process include sulfur compounds, which can cause the distinctive odor sometimes associated with pulp mills, tall oil, and substantial amounts of wastewater requiring treatment."	As noted in the CSA Analysis pg. 4-2 and pg. 5-8, a pulp mill typically involves SQEHS chemicals, which can result in polluted air emissions and discharge water. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the proposed “more intense” than the CDF uses. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff’s view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
FWP	Utility Pole Manufacture (CSA Analysis pg. 5-8)	More Intense	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis beyond "both of which typically have substantial quantities of chemicals classified as EHS as by products or as part of the manufacturing process" (pg. 5-8).	As noted in the CSA Analysis pg. 5-8, a utility pole manufacturer typically involves SQEHS chemicals, which can result in polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the proposed “more intense” than the CDF uses. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff’s view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.

Appendix 4

DBC	Gypsum Wallboard Plant (CSA Analysis pg. 4-8)	CDF	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-8, "Industrial activities include the loading and unloading of dry bulk materials in the form of gypsum ore, outdoor storage, and the processing of ore into wallboard. Broadly speaking, in most plants, a finely ground gypsum ore known as land plaster is fed to a calciner, where it is heated to remove most of the water to form stucco. In the production of wallboard, stucco is mixed with additives such as perlite, starch, fiberglass, or vermiculite and then combined with a water mixture to form a slurry. It is then molded, stiffened, cut, and dried."	On pg. 4-10 and pg. 4-12, the CSA Analysis notes they expect the CDF to create air quality emissions that would require DEQ permits. As discussed, the CSA Analysis does not address the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. The CSA Analysis also does not conclude how proposed buffers would affect the impact of air emissions on surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility. SQEHS and explosive materials are not expected per pg. 5-12 of the CSA Analysis.
DBC	Hydrated Lime Processing Plant (CSA Analysis pg. 5-12)	CDF	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis. Per the EPA, "The production of lime begins with the quarrying and crushing of limestone. The crushed limestone is then converted into lime by heating the limestone in a kiln, a process known as calcination. When limestone is subjected to high temperatures, it undergoes a chemical decomposition resulting in the formation of lime and the emission of CO2. Because calcination is a reversible chemical reaction, the CO2 emitted as a result of the process must be removed to prevent recarbonation. Lime as it exits the kiln is known as quicklime...After quicklime leaves the kiln, it is screened to remove undersized particles. Quicklime can be reacted with water to form hydrated lime. Hydrated lime is produced in a vessel called a hydrator, where a precise amount of water is slowly added to crushed or ground quicklime and the mixture is stirred and agitated." ²	Staff agrees that a hydrated lime processing plant is like the identified gypsum wallboard plant CDF. Given the EPA's description, a hydrated lime processing plant could result in polluted air emissions and potentially discharge water. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the proposed CDF uses. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility. SQEHS and explosive materials are not expected per pg. 5-12 of the CSA Analysis.
DBC	Garnet Processing Plant (CSA Analysis pg. 5-12)	CDF	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis. However, there is an existing garnet processing and recycling plant in Coos Bay, Oregon. A description of their processing was reviewed. Garnet processing typically includes crushing and screening the raw garnet ore, water and centrifugal force to separate high-quality garnet concentrate, magnetic separators to remove impurities, and further screening and grading for correct sizing. ³	Staff agrees that a garnet processing plant is similar to the identified gypsum wallboard plant CDF. According to the description of garnet processing on the GMA website, which owns the Coos Bay plant, staff understand that this process involves particulate emissions. This is also addressed in the 2023 GMA Sustainability report regarding the Coos Bay plant, along with other hazardous air pollutants associated with the drying process. ⁴ The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the proposed CDF uses. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility. SQEHS and explosive materials are not expected per pg. 5-12 of the CSA Analysis.
DBC	Flour Export and Processing Mill	Less Intense or CDF?	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis. Wheat dust concern raised by LUBA in Riverkeeper III on pg. 12. As such, Staff is considering a Flour Export and Processing Mill as an example of a use that could create wheat dust.	Staff understands a flour mill would involve grinding raw wheat material into flour, creating PM emissions (wheat dust) that would require a DEQ permit. This has been extensively discussed in Section 3.A of the staff report. As discussed, the CSA Analysis does not address the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. There is also no direct conclusion as to how proposed buffers would affect the level of impact air emissions would have on surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
DBC	Import, Export, or Processing of Extremely Hazardous Materials (e.g. Lead Concentrates, Sulfur, Nickel Ore) (CSA Analysis pg. 4-8)	More Intense	No detailed description in the CSA Analysis beyond "Although the day-to-day processing and handling of these commodities may not look substantially different from the handling of grain or gypsum, the potential compatibility externalities for extremely hazardous dry bulk materials are different. Specifically, should spills occur or cleanup be necessary, the externalities would be expected to be greater for an EHS material. It is expected that uses in this category would have SQEHS present" (pg. 4-8).	As noted in the CSA Analysis pg. 5-12, a DBC that is more intense than the CDF typically involves SQEHS materials, which can result in polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the proposed "more intense" than the CDF uses. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.

² https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2024-06/ria_lime_manufacturing_neshap_final_2024.pdf
³ <https://gmagarnet.com/en/americas/our-operations>
⁴ <https://6363151.fs1.hubspotusercontent-na1.net/hubfs/6363151/GMA%20Sustainability%20Report%202023/GMA%20Garnet%20Group%20Sustainability%20Report%202023.pdf>

Appendix 4

LBC	Ethanol Processing Facility (CSA Analysis pg. 4-14)	CDF	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-14, a fermentation biomass facility ethanol processing facility involves "A dry-mill plant grinds corn into flour and ferments it into ethanol with co-products of distillers grains and carbon dioxide. A wet-mill plant separates the corn into its components and converts the starch into ethanol with co-products of corn gluten feed, corn gluten meal, and corn oil. The operations of an ethanol processing plant involve various steps, such as pretreatment, hydrolysis, fermentation, distillation, dehydration, denaturing, and co-product recovery. The pretreatment step prepares the feedstock for hydrolysis by removing impurities and increasing its surface area. The hydrolysis step converts the starch or cellulose into sugars by using enzymes or acids. The fermentation step converts the starch or cellulose into sugars by enzymes or acids. The fermentation step converts the sugars into ethanol by using yeast or bacteria. The distillation step separates the ethanol from the water and other components by using heat and pressure. The dehydration step removes the remaining water from the ethanol by using molecular sieves or membranes. The denaturing step adds a small amount of gasoline or other substances to the ethanol to make it unfit for human consumption."	Ethanol processing may involve EHS as noted on pg. 5-18 of the CSA Analysis, which can result in polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the CDF use. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
LBC	Petroleum Storage and Refining (CSA Analysis pg. 4-15)	More Intense	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-15, "Generally, the oil refining process consists of the following broad steps: Separation: Crude oil is heated and separated into different fractions based on their boiling points. The lightest fractions, such as liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) and gasoline, rise to the top of the distillation tower, while the heaviest fractions, such as fuel oil and asphalt, settle at the bottom. Conversion: The heavier fractions are further processed into lighter and more valuable products by using methods such as cracking, reforming, alkylation, and isomerization. These methods break down or rearrange the hydrocarbon molecules in the oil using heat, pressure, catalysts, or hydrogen. Treatment: The final products are purified and blended to meet specification for quality and performance. Some of the treatment processes include desulfurization, hydrotreating, sweetening, and stabilizing. These processes remove impurities such as sulfur, nitrogen, oxygen, metals, and water from the oil products." Final products typically include LPG, gasoline, jet fuels, diesel, heating oils, fuel oils, asphalts and liquid sulfur.	As noted on pg. 5-18 of the CSA Analysis, petroleum storage and refining typically involves SQEHS chemicals, which can result in polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the proposed "more intense" than the CDF uses. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
NG&DP	Liquefied Natural Gas (CSA Analysis pg. 4-22)	CDF	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-22, "Broadly speaking, an LNG facility receives natural gas via a pipeline, removes impurities from the gas, and liquefies the gas for storage or export. When the gas first arrives, it must be purified to remove materials such as water, carbon dioxide, sulfur compounds, and other materials. After the removal impurities, the natural gas will consist of primarily methane and some ethane. This purified gas is then cooled to -260 degrees Fahrenheit in a heat exchanger using a mixed refrigerant. By cooling the gas, it is converted into a liquid form that is much more compact. This now liquified natural gas can be stored in specialized cryogenic tanks and exported or transported to other internal markets."	Liquefied Natural Gas involves EHS, noted on pg. 4-24 of the CSA Analysis, and explosive materials, noted on pg. 5-25 of the CSA Analysis. As such, these facilities can result in polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the CDF use. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
NG&DP	Ammonium Nitrate Fertilizer Plant (CSA Analysis pg. 4-29)	More Intense	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-23, "Ammonium nitrate is created by neutralizing nitric acid with ammonia. All ammonium nitrate plants produce an aqueous ammonium nitrate solution through the reaction of ammonia and nitric acid in a neutralizer. Most of this ends up as a solid product, which can be created via multiple methods, such as prilling, granulation, pastillation, or crystallization. Ammonium nitrate is flammable, potentially explosive, can produce large quantities of heat, gas, and pressure when decomposed, and a strong oxidizer."	An ammonium Nitrate Fertilizer Plant would have flammable and potentially explosive materials, pg. 5-25 of the CSA Analysis. It is also noted that a use more intense than the CDF may also have SQEHS on site, pg. 4-26 of the CSA Analysis. As such, these facilities can result in polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the use more intense than the CDF. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
BS	Breakbulk Imports with Additional Processing (e.g. SteelScape) (CSA Analysis pg. 4-29)	CDF	Per CSA Analysis pg. 4-28, "Breakbulk cargo refers to non-containerized freight, which is typically unitized items, such as wind turbines, larger-scale metal products, bales of paper, vehicles, barrels, drums or casks, or boxes of fruit. It can also involve items that might be shipped as dry bulk but are packaged individually, such as bags of rice, wheat, or sugar." An example of additional processing would be SteelScape, "Like other breakbulk uses, the company imports a breakbulk product, in this case steel coils. Thereafter it performs additional treatment to create coated metal products. The steps include a pickle line, cold rolling, metallic coating and painting. Cold rolling is a process performed at room temperature by passing steel through rollers that apply mechanical stress and cause strain hardening. A pickle line is a part of the finishing process of flat rolled steel in which oxides and scale are removed by an acid bath.	While the breakbulk cargo import and export is not expected to create any potential air quality or water quality pollution, additional processing activities may involve EHS. The described example facility, SteelScape, involves processes that may involve EHS, such as the acid bath or zinc metallic coating. The CSA Analysis notes, on pg. 5-32, that it will not rely on SQEHS or explosive materials. Nevertheless, these facilities may lead to polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge due to the processing involved. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the CDF use. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality

Appendix 4

			According to the company's website, the metallic coating used at SteelScape is a mixture of aluminum and zinc." (CSA Analysis, pg. 4-29).	are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.
BS	Extremely Hazardous or Explosive Materials Handling (e.g. batteries, bleach, or other explosives) (CSA Analysis pg. 4-29)	More Intense	The CSA Analysis points to an example to describe this use, on pg. 4-29, "The Beaver Ammunition Storage Depot Point was established on the present location of Port Westward when a terminal and dock at Port Westward were constructed in 194s. The depot served as a shipping point for ammunition needed in both the Second World War and the Korean War. Products included both TNT and chemical ammunition. After the Second World War, unused ammunition was unloaded at the Depot and distributed across the country. Other potentially EHS containing items include things such as batteries, bleach, or explosive materials."	Extremely Hazardous or Explosive Materials Handling, as titled, will involve EHS and explosive materials. As such, these facilities will likely result in polluted air emissions and contaminated water discharge. The CSA Analysis relies on state and federal water quality and air quality permitting to justify the acceptability of the more intense than the CDF use. However, the CSA Analysis does not examine the levels of emissions allowed by DEQ regulations or other state/federal agencies in relation to the vulnerabilities of surrounding uses and natural resources. No other methods of controlling air emissions or water quality are recommended that conclusively demonstrate compatibility. Thus, in Staff's view, the applicant impermissibly deferred demonstrating compatibility.