

1  
2  
3  
4 **BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**  
5 **ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL**

6 In the Matter of:  
7 Application No. 2013-01

8 TESORO SAVAGE, LLC

9 VANCOUVER ENERGY DISTRIBUTION  
10 TERMINAL

CASE NO. 15-001

**PREFILED TESTIMONY OF TYLER  
CLARY FILED BY THE CITY OF  
VANCOUVER**

11 Q: Please state your name, place of employment and title, and address.

12 A: Tyler Clary  
13 Water Engineering Program Manager  
14 Department of Public Works  
15 4500 SE Columbia Wat  
16 Vancouver, Washington, 98664

17 Q: What are your duties within the Department of Public Works?

18 A: I manage a department of engineers and technicians and oversee the design and  
19 construction of water production, treatment, storage, and distribution infrastructure for  
20 the City's municipal water system. I additionally provide oversight for all private  
21 developments that occur within the City's water service boundary ensuring infrastructure  
22 is built according to City water utility standards.

23 Q: Are you familiar with the public water system that would serve the oil terminal project  
that is the subject of this proceeding?

TESTIMONY OF TYLER CLARY - 1

CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
PO BOX 1995  
VANCOUVER, WA 98668  
Tel: (360) 487-8500 Fax: (360) 487-8501

1 A: Yes, on August, 2013, in response to a request from BergerAbam I provided a letter  
2 addressing the availability of water supply to the project site. A copy of this letter is  
3 attached hereto as Exhibit A. The DEIS states that the City provided a letter indicating  
4 that the system is reliable and capable of 3,500 gpm. What the City actually said was “it  
5 is estimated that at least 3,500 gpm of water for fire flow purposes is currently available  
6 in the proposed project area.” This estimate was given for the general project area.  
7 Additional water mains may be required to ensure this flow is available to all locations  
8 within the proposed project boundaries. The City also provided pre-application  
9 comments on the project in June of 2013. These comments were purposefully vague due  
10 to the unknowns of the project and specifically indicate that “looping the water mains  
11 thru the Areas may be required depending on fire flow needed” and “size of pipe depends  
12 on the fire flow required by the Fire Marshal.” We did not indicate required sizes or  
13 specific locations of needed water mains. This will need to be evaluated in detail with a  
14 project this size. These comments appear at pages 35-36 of the pre-application comments  
15 and are attached hereto as Exhibit B.

16 Q. Did you review Appendix B, the Fire Protection Engineering Assessment Report, to the  
17 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this project with respect to the available fire  
18 flow?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What comments do you have on the findings in that document?  
21  
22  
23

1 A. The report comments that that there are “areas of concern” in the reliability of the City  
2 system due to the “weak points.”<sup>1</sup> While I do not agree with all of the analysis of the  
3 “weak points”, I do agree that the 24-inch supply line along NW Lower River Road  
4 which reduces to a 16-inch line in the project site and is a dead-end route is a true weak  
5 point in the City system. We are negotiating an agreement with the Port to fund the  
6 installation of a secondary supply to address this issue and benefit all water users within  
7 the western boundaries of the City’s water system. As of this date, there is no agreement  
8 or design in place to loop the system.

9  
10 The report notes that there needs to be clarification on whether the fire flow capacity for  
11 the facility is adequate.<sup>2</sup> It notes that the comparable California standards would require  
12 a fire flow of 3,000 gpm.<sup>3</sup> It further states that the available flows are too low to operate  
13 the foam sprinkler system at these areas and indicates that auxiliary fire pumps would be  
14 required to supplement the City water supply pressures.<sup>4</sup> The report states:<sup>5</sup>

15 Following is a summary of the results of the hydrant flow testing at each area:

- 16 • Area 200 – Railcar Unloading Facility (assumed values from the City):  
17 Static Pressure = 50 psi (pounds per square inch), Residual Pressure = 20  
18 psi, Flow = 2,500 gpm.
- 19 • Area 300 – Storage Area: Static Pressure = 84 psi, Residual Pressure =  
20 63 psi, Flow = 2,005 gpm
- 21 • Area 400 – Marine Terminal: Static Pressure = 81 psi, Residual Pressure  
22 = 62 psi, Flow = 2,127 gpm

21 <sup>1</sup> DEIS, Appendix B, p. 4-1.

22 <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 2-2.

23 <sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> DEIS, Appendix B, p. 3-5.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

1 Note that although the flow rates and residual pressures appear to be  
2 adequate for standard hydrant distribution and fire department use, they  
3 are too low to operate the foam sprinkler and monitor systems at each  
4 area.

5 Contrary to this statement, the City has not completed a fire flow test in Area 200 and I  
6 am not aware of an “assumed value” being provided to the applicant. The static pressure  
7 represented for Area 200 is also represented inaccurately at 50 psi when it is in fact closer  
8 to 80 psi. The locations of the fire flow tests for Areas 300 and 400 indicated in Figure  
9 3.3 are not accurate. The report notes that the fire flow that the Applicant proposes to  
10 provide through the use of auxiliary fire pumps is:

- 11 • Area 200 – Railcar Unloading Facility – 2,000 gpm at 125 psi
- 12 • Area 300 – Storage Area – 2,500 gpm at 125 psi
- 13 • Area 400 – Marine Terminal – 2,000 gpm at 125 psi

14 The city water system is not capable of providing this level of pressure and fire flow to  
15 these areas without the use of auxiliary pumps. However, using auxiliary pumps could  
16 have a negative impact on the water system. WAC 246-290-230 requires the city to  
17 provide the system maximum day demand plus the required fire flow at a pressure of at  
18 least 20 psi at all points throughout its distribution system. If the Applicant’s fire system  
19 draws on the city’s water system in the amounts indicated, it could result in other  
20 locations within the city’s distribution system falling below the state minimum standard  
21 for pressure during a fire flow. The city has not been provided the plans or design of the  
22 Applicant’s fire suppression system so it is unable to determine what the impact of the  
23 Applicant’s proposal would be.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

DATED this 10 day of May, 2016 at Vancouver, Washington.

  
Tyler Clary