

RECEIVED

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#230

NOV 05 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner,  
Interim Manager  
EFSEC

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL  
October 31, 2013

I am neither in favor or against the proposed Tesoro-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 Tesoro-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 contaminants 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  
Peyette ID 83661