From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Emilie Marlinghaus <emagen@bendbroadband.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 11:05 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 31, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

I chose to move to the Northwest more than eight years ago and currently call Bend, OR my home. Part of what attracted be to this area was its natural beauty and history of a strong conservation and environmental ethic. It was with considerable dismay that I greeted the news of the proposed Tesoro Savage project which would transport an astonishing 360,000 barrels of one of the most corrosive and toxic substances on earth, dilbit oil, per day by rail through one of the most beautiful natural areas on Earth, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its potential impact on the Columbia River Gorge. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must all be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreational resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Emilie Marlinghaus
753 SW Silver Lake Blvd
Bend, OR 97702-1584

From: borsope@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 11:52 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

My name is Pam Borso. I live in Custer WA.
I am greatly concerned about the long term effects on the water system that will result from so many more large vessels navigating the waters to get to the terminal in Vancouver.

Please study the impact of this increased traffic with regard to water, plant and animal populations and especially the invasive species brought.

Please study the impact and plans for any potential spills as a result of this increased vessel traffic.

Thank you,

Pam Borso
P O Box 154
Custer, Wa 98240

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Walter frye <plymouth1940@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 1:05 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 31, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Mr. Walter frye
11301 NE 48th Ave
Vancouver, WA 98686-4412

From: Vernon Huffman <vernonhuffman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 1:27 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Dear Governor Inslee, Mr. Posner, and Washington EFSEC,

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

•The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
•The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
•The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
•The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application. Please seek testimony from James Hansen, NASA Climate Scientist, if you have any doubt the project must be denied. It will take courage and creativity to save humanity from extinction. Please exhibit those traits.

From: Steve Cheseborough <chezztone@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 2:26 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Petroleum application

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Thank you for taking public comment regarding the Tesoro Savage Petroleum proposal.
I urge you to recommend NO on this proposal.
I will not repeat the many excellent, well-researched and well-reasoned arguments against it that dozens of speakers made at the recent hearing at Clark College in Vancouver.
I will ask you to consider all those arguments, and to realize that those speakers all volunteered their time and effort to prepare speeches and attend the hearing. They spoke not out of any self-interest, but out of love and respect for the entire community and indeed the entire planet.
The people in favor of the proposal (although they did not speak at the hearing), on the other hand, want it only because they stand to make huge profits from it. They want the profits even at the cost of damaging the community, the river and the planet.
This is a clear case of the interests of the many vs the profits of the few. If government at any level, including your council, exists for any reason, certainly it is to protect the public from assaults by dangerous individuals.
Please act wisely and correctly in this matter. Thank you.
Steve Cheseborough
North Portland, OR

From: kibbey@kibbeyrock.com
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 4:45 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: siting process for oil refinery in Vancouver

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Please do not allow this pollution to happen to our city of Vancouver. I own a home on Lincoln Ave and Algona Dr. Both locations would experience devaluation of property to say nothing of toxic chemicals.

Thank you,
Kibbey Rock
32 B Algona Dr.
Vancouver, WA 98661

Kibbey Rock, Independent Consultant Arbonne Int. www.kibbeyrock.myarbonne.com. for great skincare that works.

From: Tom Nelson <tomnelson67@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 5:38 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council regarding the Tesoro Savage oil terminal plan.

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Some of us have had the experience of having a brilliant idea too late. An idea that would have made a difference. I had that experience recently. I had gone to Gaiser Hall to listen to the testimony before the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council regarding the Tesoro Savage oil terminal plan. The idea that I had was, I wonder how many of the people who gave testimony against the proposed project voted for the legalizing of recreational marijuana? The spark that started this thought was the testimony of a red shirted speaker who I have seen in the past at Esther Short Park with a clipboard asking for signatures to bring this issue to the voters. I have talked to him on many occasions and am confident that he, along with the majority of voters in the state voted for the legalizing and the sale of marijuana. He was the eloquent speaker who stated in his speech that he is a science teacher. The moderator of the testimony asked that only hand signs be used to express approval or

disapproval of speakers testimony. This request was ignored on occasion when the testimony given was strongly approved as when. The red shirted science teacher's eloquent statement received a loud and boisterous applause. This led me to to the assumption that many people in the audience thought like him. I know that assumptions are often wrong! But my point is it appears to me that some people believe that smoking marijuana is an acceptable risk to your lungs and brain! An oil terminal is not?

I have heard that 99% of what we worry about never happens. I like this approach to life for the most part. The testimony by the red shirts at the hearing focused on the negative only. I do not believe that this is a healthy view of the risks we are all confronted with dally! I will never know how accurate my assumption is but I do know I will accept the risk of an oil terminal over the known risk of marijuana to lungs and brain. Possibly, those who cannot accept risk, should. I was going to suggest that they use marijuana to relax, but I cannot, nor will I, suggest the use of a known health hazard to lungs and brain! Risk of the unknown is something that we all have to deal with. Take off the red shirts and learn to relax, take a deep breath

of fresh air There is a lot of it!

A point of clarification is needed regarding my references to the redshirts. The anti progress people show up at these hearings dressed in red teeshirts. I am not sure why they chose the color red but I have a suspicion. I have been told several times by them that the teeshirts are made in America! I like that fact.

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Brian Mohr <somethingmohr@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 8:36 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 31, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Mr. Brian Mohr
3016 SE Cesar E Chavez Blvd
Portland, OR 97202-1615

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Jan McCreary <cascabel@gilanet.com>
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 6:06 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 1, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jan McCreary
PO Box 3042
Silver City, NM 88062-3042

Docket EF-131590

RECEIVED

NOV 05 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#230

Mr. Stephen Posner,
Interim Manager
EFSEC

October 31, 2013

I am neither in favor or against the proposed Tesor-Savage oil terminal but would like a complete analysis of the direct and indirect plus cumulative impacts.

Following are my comments on Port of Vancouver Tesor-Savage Terminal scoping. Please include in your analysis:

Port of Vancouver site:

1. The effect of the proposal on Federal Threatened, and Endangered wildlife and plant species. Determine direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to species and to their habitat. Determine affect of an oil spill on these species.

2. The effect of proposal on state listed sensitive and rare species and fish, game and nongame species. Direct, indirect and potential cumulative impacts to species and their habitat. Determine potential affect of oil spill on species.

3. The effect on historical cultural resources including use by native Americans, early explorers and settlers.

4. What is the potential risk and effect of earthquake on soils liquefaction), port infrastructure, ships and railcars (damage, flooding, fire and human safety)? Site is @80 miles east of the high risk large Cascadia fault and there are faults in the Vancouver area related to the down dropped Willamette Valley. How will the port (berms, oil tanks, pipes and tank cars storage) be designed to withstand and minimize the risks of potential seismic activity. What would be effect to the Columbia River of a major spill into the waterway due to an earthquake?

5. What would be the effect on air quality of fumes from loading oil into storage tanks and on ship? Will oil fumes be detected or smelled off site from loading operations into storage tanks or ship tanks? What means are there to minimize this?

6. The effect on air quality of diesel exhaust from locomotives, vehicles and ships on the port site. Will exhaust be detected off site due to increase trains and ships? Will tier 3 & 4 exhaust requirements for locomotives allow for reduction in potential of emissions as new locomotives replace older locomotives and the potential use of natural gas by BNSF as an alternative to diesel fuel. Use of natural gas could cause a reduction in CO2 over time.

7. Provide a rating of the toxicity/ explosive potential for crude oil compared to other crude and refined oils to provide an index of risk that can be used to evaluate alternatives. Develop mitigation.

8. How will storm water be managed on the port site to prevent oil and other contaminates from entering the watershed?

9. Describe the spill contingency plan, spill response plan and equipment location at the port to contain oil spills during ship loading.

Off site.

1. Prescribe that new DOT 111 tank cars be used to transport crude oil to the Vancouver Port. Describe how use of new DOT 111 cars reduce the potential for a spill compared to older DOT 111 cars that are inadequate.

2. Describe the degree that port activities may create a noise nuisance to the surrounding community i.e. port activities, trucks and trains.

3. To what degree will the port development require increase services from the community i.e. fire department, water treatment, hospital, security, traffic improvement, recreation, property values and schools?

4. Describe the effect of increased train traffic on railroad crossings and road traffic near the port and through communities along the route to the port. Describe traffic delays, noise increases (engines, horns) and effect on property values, human safety.

5. Do the railroads have spill contingency plans and spill response plan and equipment located in keys locations along the route? What about potential for water pollution associated with the Port of Vancouver, and rail transfer.

6. What affect will increased ship traffic have on Columbia River Ship and barge traffic? Is the proposed number of ships reaching river capacity. Describe any changes in air and water quality along the Columbia from river mouth to Vancouver port resulting from increase ship traffic due to this project.

7. Will the port expansion lower property values on lands adjacent to the port due to visuals, noise, and traffic increase or oil fumes?

8. Will infrastructure improvements to the port also handle increase exports beyond that of oil shipment?

9. What will be the affect on tribal fishing rights, commercial and recreational fisheries within the lower Columbia River to Astoria?

10. What will be the direct and indirect affect on public health in Vancouver and along the communities of the rail route due to shipment of oil?

Cummulative effect of this project

1. Proposed coal and oil train traffic to western Washington plus current rail traffic. How many trains will pass through communities in Washington and other locations and what would be the effect. What would need to be mitigated? What affect would trains have in delaying road traffic and would trains reduce air quality. Would there be increased risk of oil spills from use of Old DOT 111 tank cars that are not up to date? Would a sealant be used to keep coal dust from blowing off cars en route to reduce potential air quality degradation in combination with oil train movements. It assumed that sprayers would hose down the car dumpers with water that is then recycled to keep down dust at terminals.

2. Current ship and barge traffic (Grain, lumber, windmills) on lower Columbia plus ships and barge traffic from proposed coal terminal at Longview and near Rainer OR.

3. What affect would shipment of oil from the lower Columbia River have in adding to or changing CO2 output and other emissions globally. Is the oil from the port of Vancouver just replacing oil from other sources or is it additive?

Yours Truly

Floyd Gordon

104 Hill Place
Payette ID 83661

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of SHARON LEE <tekashch@juno.com>
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 4:41 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 1, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Ms. SHARON LEE
2277 NE Baron Ct
Bend, OR 97701-6606

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Judy Anderson <jjantiques@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, November 01, 2013 10:42 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 2, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Judy Anderson
74015 Cougar Mt. Rd.
Cottage Grove, OR 97424-9234

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of j roberts <coconutcarousel@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 02, 2013 2:45 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 2, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Mr. j roberts
11924 NE Russell St
Portland, OR 97220-1755

Docket EF-131590 Tesoro Savage CBR Scoping Comment #234

From: Thom McConathy <thommcconathy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 02, 2013 7:05 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Scoping for oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver
Attachments: To.docx

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

To : EFSEC process :

From: Thom McConathy Friends of the Vancouver Lake Lowlands
1017 NE 107 street, Vancouver, WA. 98685,
RE : Scoping for Savage energy oil shipping facility Proposed for the Port of Vancouver
I would like to submit two issues that I would urge to be addressed in this process.
1. I question whether the Port of Vancouver and DOE within their present political/institutional frameworks are capable of responsibly able to monitor and regulate a complex highly toxic tenant like the proposed Savage energy facility based on past performance as indicated by their actions toward Pacific Coast Shredder at the same port .
The Port allowed Pacific Coast Shredder for many years and multiple millions of gallons of highly Polluted Stormwater to pour untreated into the Columbia river from its trans shipping facility. Only because I and other Water Stewards passing on the Columbia during a rain storm witnessed this highly polluted stormwater the color of dark urine pouring off the dock into the Columbia did we complain to the Port of Vancouver and The Washington Department of Ecology. We in effect were ignored and saw that both the Port and DOE would do nothing therefore we sought and found a collection of Clean water act Attorneys to represent us. Some 5 years ago we won this law suit and as a part of this settlement we were allowed to tour/inspect these facilities to assure ongoing compliance.
As of July of this year I contacted the Port and requested access as assured by this settlement and as of today 4 months latter I am still trying to reasonably visit the site without recourse to our original Attorneys even though regular inspection is allowed by our settlement.
The port is not open even though it is a public entity. We understand that issues of security are inherent in these facilities but some form of oversight for the public trust needs to be allowed for. DOE and the port have failed repeatedly with regard to Pacific Coast Shredder alone without taking into consideration the many other failings of these two agencies. Public inspection must be allowed.

To : EFSEC process :

EFSEC@utc.WA.gov

From: Thom McConathy Friends of the Vancouver Lake Lowlands

1017 NE 107 street, Vancouver, WA. 98685,

RE : Scoping for Savage energy oil shipping facility Proposed for the Port of Vancouver

I would like to submit two issues that I would urge to be addressed in this process.

1. I question whether the Port of Vancouver and DOE within their present political/institutional frameworks are capable of responsibly able to monitor and regulate a complex highly toxic tenant like the proposed Savage energy facility based on past performance as indicated by their actions toward Pacific Coast Shredder at the same port .

The Port allowed Pacific Coast Shredder for many years and multiple millions of gallons of highly Polluted Stormwater to pour untreated into the Columbia river from its trans shipping facility.

Only because I and other Water Stewards passing on the Columbia during a rain storm witnessed this highly polluted stormwater the color of dark urine pouring off the dock into the Columbia did we complain to the Port of Vancouver and The Washington Department of Ecology. We in effect were ignored and saw that both the Port and DOE would do nothing therefore we sought and found a collection of Clean water act Attorneys to represent us. Some 5 years ago we won this law suit and as a part of this settlement we were allowed to tour/inspect these facilities to assure ongoing compliance.

As of July of this year I contacted the Port and requested access as assured by this settlement and as of today 4 months latter I am still trying to reasonably visit the site without recourse to our original Attorneys even though regular inspection is allowed by our settlement.

The port is not open even though it is a public entity. We understand that issues of security are inherent in these facilities but some form of oversight for the public trust needs to be allowed for. DOE and the port have failed repeatedly with regard to Pacific Coast Shredder alone without taking into consideration the many other failings of these two agencies. Public inspection must be allowed.

Docket EF-131590 Tesoro Savage CBR Scoping Comment #235

From: Ken Rone <ken.rone@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 2:13 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: Bumpus, Sonia (UTC); gaudeamus@earthlink.net
Subject: Tesoro Savage Project,. Application No. 2013-01, Docket No. EF-I 3 15 90.

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

I am **Kenneth Rone.**

My address is:
11508 NW 43rd Ct,
Vancouver WA, 98685

My request is to include in the Public Record these comments on the **EFSEC Scoping Document:**

NOISE: . The pubic crossing across the BNSF/UP/Amtrak corridor for the Felida Moorage (NW 123rd street) is 1700 feet from my house. My bedroom is 350 feet from the track. The UTC regulations require all trains to sound their horns approaching crossing. This regulation places the commencement of the horn signal adjacient to my property and that of my residential neighbors.The proposed project will cause a substantial increase in the number of trains sounding horn signals at this crossing.

For trains that approach public crossings at grade with engine in front, the signal starts not less than 15 seconds but not more than 20 seconds before reaching the crossing. If movement is 45 mph or greater, signal starts at or about the crossing sign, but not more than 1/4 mile before the crossing if there is no sign. The horn signal is prolonged or repeated until the engine completely occupies the crossing(s). While there are many sources of noise from trains (high-pitch screeching, idling engines; moving cars, etc.), horn sounding is the most significant. Federal rules governing the blowing of locomotive engine horns require that engineers of all trains sound horns for at least 15-20 seconds at **96-110 decibels** (dB) at all public crossings. Decibels in the range of 80-105 are labeled extremely loud, whereas those above 105 are dangerous. Decibels are logarithmic, meaning that 100 decibels is ten times as loud as 90, 110 decibels is ten times as loud as 100, and so on. While impacts to quality of life from repeated loud noise are self-evident, chronic noise exposure has proven adverse health effects, including impaired sleep and cognitive function, and cardiovascular effects. **To mitigate these effects the council is requested to direct the proponent to fund and implement "silent crossings" at all at grade crossings within Clark County where the "unit trains", loaded or unloaded, involved in supplying to the proponent's terminal will operate.**

GLARE: Facilities such as petroleum terminals, refineries, gravel pits, mines and grain silos are notorious for their careless use of area lighting. Engineers design for illumination levels of 100 lumens within all areas that employees COULD be expected to operate. The result is all lights remain on during all non-daylight hours. This practice not only wastes energy, it impacts the environmental balance (both for nocturnal and non nocturnal species) and the enjoyment of views, view corridors, and the outdoor and indoor enjoyment peaceful viewing. Operators seem to feel that if a light is provided, they are not doing their job if that light is not illuminated. I have been told this is for safety of the public and the employees. That premise is as ridiculous as the technology is obsolete. Engineers can easily design personnel motion detectors or RFID detectors to activate the lighting along the path

and in the area of human movement providing all employees the safe lighting mandated by OSHA (and other regulators) as the person conducts their work surrounded by a full halo of area lighting. Technology also provides "instant on" lighting (florescent or LED for example) that is energy efficient, eliminating their argument that lights need time to ramp-up to full luminosity. **The Council is requested to direct the proponent to install such instant-on technology using LED fixtures as a condition of the permit approval.**

PROPERTY VALUE: A new study examining Los Angeles neighborhoods supports the notion that home values decrease as nearby rail traffic increases at a rate can be calculated. Whereas property value is injured by the actions of the proponent, **the Council is requested to direct the proponent to compensate me for this illegal taking as guided by the study cited**. See http://econ.ucsd.edu/~mfutch/pdfs/FutchJMP2011.pdf

Kenneth Rone

Docket EF-131590 Tesoro Savage CBR Scoping Comment #236

From: Willis Cheryl <cherylwillis@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 5:58 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver's existence

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

I am TOTALLY against the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.
I might be able to change my mind if we were talking about 500,000 jobs for the Vancouver citizens but we are talking about 150 jobs. Washington State should be concerned about protecting Vancouver's 170,000 citizens and not the money bags of two oil companies. The Northwest is Green: concerned about the quality of air, water, soil, animals and citizens. This project undermines our values and is a slap in our face just for the cooperations.
WAKE UP WASHINGTON STATE, remember who we are and avoid such a project with Tesoro Savage.
REMEMBER YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE WHEN THERE'S AN EXPLOSION AND THOUSANDS OF LIVES ARE AFFECTED!!!
Thank you,
Cheryl M. Willis
510 Lexington Way
Vancouver, WA 98664

From: desiree tullos <desiree.tullos@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 04, 2013 9:54 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: public comments regarding Tesoro Savage Energy Distribution Terminal
Attachments: Tesoro Savage export terminal comments_20131104.docx

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Dear Mr. Posner,

Please see my attached comments regarding the Tesoro Savage Energy Distribution Terminal.

Thank you.

Warm regards,
Desirée

Stephen Posner, Interim EFSEC manager
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
PO Box 43172, 1300 S Evergreen Park Dr. SW
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

November 04, 2013

Dear Mr. Posner,

I am writing to offer strong opposition to the Tesoro Savage Energy Distribution Terminal proposed for Vancouver, WA. I am not writing on behalf of any group or organization, but instead as an engineer, a scientist, and a citizen with deep concerns regarding this facility. I have reviewed the materials available at the EFSEC website, and would like to highlight my key concerns regarding the environmental impacts associated with the project:

- An average of 360,000 barrels of crude oil will arrive every day from the Midwest. The carbon emissions associated with burning this large volume of oil will have important impacts on the climate, ecosystems, and liveability of the PNW.
- Crude oil received by rail will be unloaded on site, stored temporarily, then loaded onto marine vessels at the Project site. I worked at a rail yard when I was an engineering consultant on the East coast. I saw firsthand how these multiple transfers can lead to small, but regular spills that cumulatively can have measurable impacts on surface and groundwater quality. Furthermore, the increased potential for an accident during one of the transfers is a risk that we should not accept for the Columbia River.
- The site is large, at 41 acres and 38,500 linear feet of pipeline, and impacts sensitive areas, including the Columbia River waterway and offsite wetlands.
- Existing marine terminal must undergo in and overwater construction and modifications. While I expect that contractors will observe in-water work periods, the underwater construction can still generate significant and irreversible impacts to aquatic organisms and their habitat, as has been demonstrated at other projects.

Given that the lead agency determined that the project is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment, I hope you will reconsider any compromise. Directly, this project should not be permitted, as the risk and impacts to environmental and human health are large, unnecessary, and irreversible. Thank you for considering my comments.

Warm regards,
Desirée Tullos, Ph.D., PE
desiree.tullos@gmail.com
Citizen of Benton County, Oregon
Associate Professor of Water Resources Engineering

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Jan Castle <jancastle@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 12:54 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 5, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. Future consumption should be analyzed in the EIS; my understanding is that it is declining. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed. Factored into the analysis should be the propensity for the DOT 111 cars, commonly in use for oil transport, to explode on derailment. Recent examples of this are last summer's derailment in Lac-Megantic, Ontario, last month's derailment in Alberta, and the 2009 derailment in Cherry Valley, Illinois.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jan Castle
16181 Parelius Cir
Lake Oswego, OR 97034-4673

From: Jacob V. Brown <jvbrown@princeton.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 1:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Testimony regarding Tesoro/Savage scoping

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

To the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
ATTN: Stephen Posner, interim EFSEC manager

My name is Vahid Brown, and I'm a long-time resident of Portland, OR and a PhD candidate at Princeton University. For five years I worked at the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point and am an internationally recognized expert on al-Qa'ida and international terrorism. I have also followed the science on climate change very closely since the 1990s. In my professional judgment, fossil fuel-driven climate change poses a far greater threat to Americans - and indeed to life on Earth - than al-Qa'ida or terrorism ever has or will. This proposed oil terminal itself represents a greater such threat.

The science regarding anthropogenic climate change is unequivocal. The level of unanimity in the scientific community that the climate is changing in perilous ways and that that change is driven first-and-foremost by our fossil fuel consumption is rare. Ninety-seven percent of the scientists who study these issues agree on these points. And the disastrous effects of climate change are not theoretical or looming in a distant future. The World Health Organization estimates that already climate change causes over 150 thousand deaths worldwide each year. Today there are already tens of millions of climate change refugees worldwide - people displaced by environmental dangers and disruptions due to climate change. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), by 2050 we will be counting climate refugees in the hundreds of millions. In Alaska, where the rate of warming has been twice that in the lower 48 states, 80 percent of Alaskan native communities are threatened with dispersal due to flooding and erosion caused by global warming. That's 184 American communities facing, right now, the loss of their homes, villages, and towns, many of which are already being evacuated, all because of the CO2 we are putting into the atmosphere.

The scientific community has also concluded that, already, fossil fuel-driven climate change is causing extreme weather events to be larger, more destructive, and more frequent. To cite one example of such climate change-fueled events, Hurricane Sandy killed at least 286 people. I was there, in central New Jersey at the time, in the epicenter of that storm, and can personally attest to the unprecedented devastation it wrought. Yet by contrast, in the 12 years since the 9/11 attacks, by my count around 40 people have been killed in the US in incidents that could be described as terrorism, using a very broad definition of that term. So a single extreme weather event, fueled by our continued expansion of CO2 emissions, killed about 7 times as many Americans as over a decade of terrorist attacks. Clearly, it is not terrorists we need to be worried about: it is the devastation brought about by our burning of fossil fuels, which this terminal would serve to vastly expand.

The proposed oil export terminal will reportedly have the capacity of putting 380,000 barrels of crude oil a day into the market to be burned. That's equivalent, according to the EPA's calculators, to just under 133 thousand tons of CO2 going into the atmosphere every day, from this facility alone. That's over 48 million tons of CO2 going into the atmosphere a year. That is a major and significant - and totally unacceptable - escalation of the greatest threat to life on earth that we face today. This is not hyperbole - it is a scientifically established fact. Any argument that says that the facility would not have a net effect on overall CO2 emissions - either because the oil would ultimately be exported by other means, or that the exported oil would simply be meeting present, static demand - is categorically absurd. In 2011 the International Energy Agency concluded that increasing CO2-intensive infrastructure lock-in "will be the single factor most likely to produce irreversible climate change." The Tesoro-Savage facility represents a massive widening of the aperture for global CO2 emissions, a "lock in" of new fossil fuel infrastructure that will significantly expand the annual carbon load in the atmosphere for years to come if it's allowed to be built.

And this is to say nothing of the very real risks of spills and accidents, of the contamination of the Columbia River and catastrophic impacts to its surrounding ecology. So, even if nothing goes wrong - and something always goes wrong - this terminal represents a dire threat to our community and to the world. It is a crime to provide material support to terrorist

groups. Permitting this terminal would be far worse. If you have children, as I do, and if you care about life on this planet, I urge you to do the right thing. Tell Governor Inslee to reject this proposed facility.

Sincerely,
J Vahid Brown
Portland, Oregon

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Judith Lienhard <lienjud@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2013 5:55 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Blue Category

Nov 5, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S.
Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on Gorge resources and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.
RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Ms. Judith Lienhard
4455 SW 94th Ave
Portland, OR 97225-2567