

---

**From:** Kalb, F E Skip <F.Kalb@BNSF.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:00 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Project  
**Attachments:** 20131217221359.pdf

**Categories:** Red Category

Thank you for the opportunity to submit the attached scoping comment letter regarding the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Project.

Skip Kalb | Director Strategic Development | BNSF Railway Company | [skip.kalb@bnsf.com](mailto:skip.kalb@bnsf.com) | ☎ 817-867-6133/Cell: 817-271-3057



F. E. "Skip" Kalb, Jr.  
Director  
Strategic Development

BNSF Railway Company  
P.O. Box 961051  
Fort Worth, TX 76161-0051  
2650 Lou Menk Drive, 2<sup>nd</sup> Fl.  
Fort Worth, TX 76131-2830  
817-867-6133 Office  
817-352-0376 Fax  
817-271-3057 Cell  
Email: Sklp.Kalb@bnsf.com

December 17, 2013

To: Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

Re: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Project

We are writing in response to project scoping for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Project. If the project is approved, BNSF Railway Company anticipates that it is likely to serve the facility as a rail carrier.

Certain parties have suggested that the geographic scope of analysis under NEPA should extend well beyond the project area in order to address the effects of train traffic in localities throughout Washington State or even other states. BNSF believes that such a scope would not provide EFSEC with information that would help it to make a decision on the merits of this project or analyze or communicate the effects of this project on the citizens of Washington. Instead, to analyze rail impacts, EFSEC should rely on the Washington State Rail Plan, a document being completed by the Washington Department of Transportation under federal regulations. Per federal and state law, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) must develop a state rail plan, which serves as a strategic blueprint for the state's rail transportation system. This State Rail Plan is a single plan that meets all the federal and state requirements, is integral to the WSDOT's rail program, and is consistent with other state and regional transportation planning documents. As such, the state rail plan should be incorporated into the permit for rail impacts. [For more information, please see <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Rail/staterailplan.htm>].

It should be noted that the rails that will serve this project already exist, and any impacts from being near an active rail line are already present and well-known. BNSF operates approximately 32,500 miles of track in 28 states and two Canadian provinces. This includes a number of rail lines, and BNSF retains the right to operate over some lines that are owned and/or controlled by other railroads. Possible routes thus include BNSF rail lines and other lines that may provide more convenient transportation options. Which route a train will take on a given day depends not only on convenience or distance, however, but also on the numerous variables listed above. While BNSF strives to provide reliable, exceptional rail transportation services, these diverse and complex factors do not allow for complete certainty or predictability. Therefore, the route a particular train will take or how many trains any route will need to absorb is speculative, and not subject to precise prediction. In Washington State, BNSF operates three east-west routes that provide network flexibility and fluidity. It would be impossible to know with any certainty what the increase would be for any particular community in Washington State, and again, those

communities built around rail are already aware of the general impacts of rail on their communities. For the reasons outlined in the next paragraph, to attempt to guess at which routes would be used for any particular commodity would be unduly speculative.

BNSF rail volumes are made up of 22 different traffic segments that can vary significantly because they are all influenced by changing customer needs, market demand, economic conditions, etc. These factors play out across our entire system, which, again, includes 32,500 route miles of track in 28 states and two Canadian provinces. Our customer demands, which are extremely diverse, are subject to the same complex factors as those driving the economy; one traffic segment may experience significant growth while another traffic segment is in decline. For example, in June 2013, volumes for half of the industry's traffic segments were down, while the other half was up. Likewise, BNSF's overall carload volumes during the same month showed similar mixed results. This variability in demand creates considerable uncertainty with respect to the timing and volume of future transportation of specific commodities. In Washington, BNSF has adequate capacity in the near and long term to accommodate current and future growth. Several independent studies predict that rail traffic will increase over time, and this is independent of the proposed Tesoro/Savage project. BNSF's access to marine terminals in British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest is one of the primary reasons we anticipate rail volumes to grow over the long term. The economy and the marketplace are the key drivers of changes in freight volumes.

While we do expect rail volumes to continue to grow, as we have done in Washington and the rest of our network for years, we will continue to invest in capacity improvements to accommodate all of the growth in our freight business when the traffic levels justify the expansion. A vibrant freight rail system is critical for a state like Washington where one in four jobs is tied to trade and the ports. Rail, which remains the most environmentally friendly way to move large volumes of freight on land, helps foster economic growth and connects Washington with important markets in the U.S. and around the world.

BNSF funds virtually all of its capacity improvements for freight rail. In Washington State, BNSF plans to invest an estimated \$125 million on maintenance and rail capacity improvement and expansion projects this year. BNSF's 2013 capacity enhancement projects in Washington include construction of two receiving and departure tracks nearly 7,000 feet long at BNSF's Delta yard in Everett and expanding BNSF's automotive distribution facility at Orillia to support growth in new automobile traffic. BNSF will also continue a significant track maintenance program in Washington, which will include nearly 2,800 miles of track surfacing and undercutting work, the replacement of about 175 miles of rail and 110,000 railroad ties.

The planned capital investments in Washington are part of BNSF's record 2013 capital commitment of \$4.3 billion. The largest component of the capital plan is spending \$2.3 billion on BNSF's core network and related assets. BNSF also plans to spend approximately \$1 billion on locomotive, freight car and other equipment acquisitions, many of which will serve Washington. The program also includes about \$200 million for positive train control and \$800 million for terminal, line and intermodal expansion and efficiency projects. Unlike other modes of transportation, U.S. freight railroads use their own private dollars, not tax dollars, to build and


maintain their freight rail networks. Since the year 2000, BNSF has invested more than \$42 billion to improve and expand its freight rail network.

As a common carrier, BNSF is obligated by federal law to provide reasonable accommodation for all regulated products, including crude oil. We are committed to safely transporting all of the commodities we carry. Over the last four years, BNSF has only averaged a total of 12 leaks in shipments resulting from a derailment (accidental releases). In addition, the industry as a whole has decreased hazmat train accident rates by 91 percent since 1980 and in 2012, set new overall safety records continuing a string of safety achievements reaching back decades. BNSF is continuously improving safety when it comes to transporting crude oil and other hazardous materials. Every day, across our system, we are inspecting tracks, locomotives, and cars carrying crude oil and other hazardous liquids. Even with our excellent safety record, we understand that accidents can happen at any time and in any location.

BNSF's system and local emergency response plans help us ensure we are prepared for emergencies. BNSF also leads the industry in the development of geographical response plans (GRPs) to ensure the most rapid and efficient response capability to remote locations with sensitive environmental receptors. To enhance the effectiveness of the GRPs, BNSF stages spill response equipment in the areas covered by the plans. BNSF maintains a 215-member internal hazmat emergency response team whose members are located at 58 locations throughout our system. In addition to our internal response capabilities, BNSF also leverages a network of experienced and professional emergency response contractors and hundreds of their personnel to ensure the timeliest and effective response capabilities. BNSF also maintains and stages specialized emergency response and spill equipment including fire protection trailers across our network. In order to protect the environment and our BNSF hazmat response team, as well as to ensure our team responds appropriately to crude oil incidents, BNSF has established a Crude Oil Response Playbook. This playbook outlines the types of crude oil we handle, their characteristics and how to respond safely and effectively to a crude oil releases including incidents that result in a fire or impact bodies of water.

BNSF is more than happy to provide further information on our safety statistics, our proactive stance on safety, our impressive hazardous materials handling and response programs, and how we work with the communities we serve. However, we believe that increasing the geographic scope of analysis would not allow EFSEC to gain insight into these issues.

Sincerely,

  
F. E. Kalb, Jr.

(UTC)

---

**From:** merrittregna@gmail.com on behalf of Regna Merritt <Regna@oregonpsr.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:12 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility Comments on proposed Tesoro project  
**Attachments:** OPSR comment on proposed Tesoro project 12.17.2013-2.pdf

**Categories:** Red Category

Please see attached letter with comments.  
Thank you.

--

--

Regna Merritt  
Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility  
812 SW Washington Street, Suite 1050  
Portland, Oregon 97205  
C: 971.235.7643  
[regna@oregonpsr.org](mailto:regna@oregonpsr.org)  
[www.oregonpsr.org](http://www.oregonpsr.org)  
Find us on [Facebook](#)



December 17, 2013

c/o efsec@utc.wa.gov

RE: Deny the Proposed Tesoro Savage Pipeline-on-Wheels Project

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

Please accept these comments submitted on behalf of Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) and our 1,500 health professionals and advocates. Guided by the values and expertise of medicine and public health, Oregon PSR works to protect human life from the gravest threats to health and survival by striving to end the nuclear threat, to advance environmental health, and to promote peace.

Based on the huge potential for negative local and global impacts stemming the proposed Tesoro project, we invoke the Precautionary Principle and urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's proposal. In the absence of such a denial, we 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.

Public health, safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. We request that, at a minimum, the EFSEC assess:

- Potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond;
- Increased risks to drinking water supplies near the Port of Vancouver;
- Increased risk to drinking water supplies all along the transportation corridor;
- Increased response time of emergency personnel due to length and frequency of oil trains in Vancouver and all along the transportation corridor;
- Increased risk of lung, cardiac and neurological disease from diesel emissions related to the project;
- Increased health care costs associated with above;

- Increased risk to non-oil business and commercial interests competing for space and time on rail tracks;
- Increased risk of harm to aquatic life and endangered salmon in the waters of the Columbia River and all along the transportation corridor;
- Increased risk to passenger rail travel and traffic;
- Increased risk of climate change - to include assessment of climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave;
- High risk of storage failure for those tanks located within and/or near the 100-year flood plain;
- Increased risks of negative cumulative impacts from the combination of proposed coal trains and proposed oil trains;
- Increased financial risk to local, state and federal taxpayers who will be forced to pay the majority of costs relating to improvement of rail infrastructure associated with this project; and
- Increased financial risk to local, state and federal taxpayers who will pay emergency responders and others to clean up spills and hazardous waste associated with this project.

After carefully considering the public health, safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with this proposed project, we respectfully request that you deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Regna Merritt      Campaign Director, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility

Susan Katz, MD      President, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30403

UTC)

---

**From:** Tim and Brenda <bctm@fidalgo.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal from Skagit Audubon Society  
**Attachments:** Public Comment for Docket Number EF-131590 from Skagit Audubon Society - read only.doc  
**Categories:** Red Category

Dear Mr. Posner,

We are attaching scoping comments from Skagit Audubon Society for Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The same comment letter is inserted in this message below.

Thank you.

Timothy Manns Conservation Chair Skagit Audubon Society	Philip Wright President Skagit Audubon Society
---	--

Public Comment for Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

From:  
Skagit Audubon Society  
P.O. Box 1101  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

To:  
Mr. Stephen Posner, EFSEC Interim Manager  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
P.O. Box 43172  
1300 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W.  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

Via e-mail at: [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov)

Dear Mr. Posner:

I am submitting this letter of public comment for Docket No. EF-131590 on behalf of Skagit Audubon Society, the National Audubon chapter based in Skagit County, Washington. Most of our chapter's over 200 families live in Skagit County. All share an interest in birds and other wildlife and the habitats and environmental quality on which they depend.

As residents of a county with two oil refineries, one of which already receives crude oil by rail, we are particularly interested in the ramifications of these changes in industrial activity in Washington. In the

comments below we focus on some particular concerns with the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal along the Columbia River. We request that you conduct a full assessment of all the many direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project not only at the terminal site but from the points of origin of the crude oil or bitumen all along the rail routes to the terminal and along the shipping routes from there to refineries in the U.S. or abroad.

While we share with many people a well-founded concern about the potential for explosions as rail tank cars traverse heavily populated areas, we focus here on potential impacts on the natural environment. Many members of Skagit Audubon moved to the Pacific Northwest because of the variety and quality of its natural areas and the wildlife and plants they support. These things are the very basis of the state's retirement and tourism economies which employ many thousands of people. Oil spills, explosions, blocked rail crossings, increased diesel exhaust, and more all have potential to severely disrupt and even destroy portions of this existing economy.

#### Proximity to important wildlife areas

We note that although the location for the proposed Tesoro Savage Terminal is a previously impacted industrial site, it is closely bounded by the Columbia River and the extensive wetlands of Shillapoo Wildlife Area, most immediately the Vancouver Lake Wetland Complex of that public reserve. Just upstream is the restored wetland of the Columbia River Wetland Mitigation Bank and not far downstream is Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge. Across the river are significant wetlands in Oregon. While the proposed, already highly impacted terminal site supports little wildlife, these areas in its close vicinity plus the Columbia River and wildlife refuges and parks further downstream are important to sandhill cranes, shorebirds, and a wide variety of other birds in addition to significant mammal, fish and plant species. As just one example, we note the following statement from Appendix H.1, p.37, of the project proponents' application: "The Vancouver Lake Lowlands area is the sole example of a sandhill crane staging area in the U.S. that is adjacent to a major metropolitan area (Littlefield and Ivey 2002)." As ships or barges loaded with oil at the proposed terminal proceed downriver and then along the coast to terminals not disclosed in the permit application, or perhaps someday overseas, they will pass many other environmentally significant areas where oil spills would be truly catastrophic. Because of the drastic impacts which spills from the oil trains, at the terminal, or from the ships and barges would have, the EIS must have a broad scope including all potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of spills at the proposed terminal and from its related operations.

#### Significant information missing from the submitted permit documents

For a sufficient EIS to be prepared, the applicant will need to provide important details missing from the Tesoro Savage application. In the cover letter, application, and JARPA, the wording "principal purpose" and "primarily" imply the applicant has not completely described the proposed project. If what is stated is only the principal or primary purpose of the proposed project, what are its other purposes? On behalf of Washington's citizens, who you serve, it is clearly important to require complete information about the project's full intent and purpose before any further consideration of the permit application.

#### Diesel emissions

As important as they are, in this letter we are not addressing the public health aspects of the proposed project because we are confident others have done that. However, we do want to express our concern about the impacts of locomotive diesel emissions along the rail routes and diesel emissions from oil ships and barges at the terminal and en route from there to their as yet undisclosed destinations. We request that the EIS fully consider all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of these diesel emissions on birds and mammals.

#### DOT-111 Rail tank cars and potential for spills and explosions

Spills from DOT-111 tank cars, particularly those not meeting what we understand to be newer standards, are a particular concern. As is the case here in Skagit County, rail cars carrying oil have the potential for derailing and spilling into waterways and wetlands at many points between the oil's source and the proposed terminal.

The potential impacts of these spills on fish, wildlife, and plants along all potential rail routes must be thoroughly studied in the EIS. One possible, partial mitigation is to require that all oil or bitumen-carrying rail cars supplying this terminal meet the newest and highest standard to lessen the possibility of puncture or explosion.

#### Oil spill preparedness fund

Current law taxes crude oil arriving by ship or barge to fund oil spill preparedness but exempts oil delivered by rail from this tax. This does not make sense given the potential for spills from rail cars and from the barges and ships which would be carrying the rail-delivered crude oil down the Columbia from the proposed terminal. As mitigation, the law should either be expanded to include taxation of rail-delivered crude, or the companies benefitting financially should voluntarily contribute an equivalent amount to the fund. Alternatively, their financial liability for clean-up should be set sufficiently high to cover 100% of clean-up costs for all possible spills and emergency response to all possible catastrophes such as explosions.

#### Spills at the terminal and later

The EIS must thoroughly evaluate the potential for spills at the facility itself during all seasons of the year, under all river conditions, and with all types of vessels, including both ships and barges, to which the crude oil or tar sands bitumen might be transferred. The EIS also needs to carefully consider the potential harm from spills due to shipping accidents or other events along the Columbia River, where there are numerous national wildlife refuges and other environmentally sensitive areas, along the outer coast, and in such areas as the Straits of Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound along with the bays and islands to its north, where some of the crude may be bound. The scope of the EIS must include an assessment of the risks and impacts of spills on migratory and non-migratory waterfowl and shorebirds all along the way. If full disclosure by the permit applicants discloses intent to eventually export crude oil overseas from the proposed terminal, potential impacts on birds, marine mammals, and fish along those shipping routes must also be thoroughly studied. If the applicant is not forthcoming with a clear and complete statement of the ultimate intent of the proposed project, a sufficient EIS is not possible and the permit application should be denied without further attention.

#### Invasive marine species

Increased shipping means increased potential for introduction of invasive aquatic species with potential catastrophic impact on Washington's economy and environment. Please include in the EIS a full assessment of all of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of increased shipping related to the proposed project on the introduction of invasive marine species. There should be a detailed explanation of required steps to avoid such introductions by deliberate or accidental ballast water release or hull fouling of ships or barges carrying crude from the proposed terminal.

#### Noise impacts and site geology

It is clear in the project application that construction of the proposed terminal would involve a prolonged period of loud noise from construction activity such as pile driving (some of it presumably necessitated by the inadequate nature of site soils and susceptibility to liquefaction during earthquakes - - a dubious place to be transferring oil and siting oil tanks). The EIS must thoroughly assess the effects of construction-related noise as well as noise from terminal operations on birds and mammals both at the site and within the large area which such sound would reach, according to the project application.

#### Climate change and ocean acidification

Along with Governor Inslee and our other fellow Washington citizens whose thinking is reality-based, we are concerned about climate change and ocean acidification from combustion of fossil fuels here and everywhere. We do not want Washington State to be any more involved than is unavoidable in facilitating the extraction of crude oil or oil from tar sands, its transportation by rail and ship, its refining, and its ultimate burning here or in other counties. The climate change and ocean acidification impacts to Washington State from combustion of the crude oil transferred at the proposed terminal would be significant and must be addressed in the EIS. Additional

carbon dioxide emissions attributable to this crude oil are estimated at about 59.6 million metric tons annually, the equivalent impact on greenhouse gas pollution of 12 million cars.

Cumulative impacts of all oil and coal transportation proposals

It would be unrealistic to review the Tesoro Savage Terminal without regard to other crude oil and coal transportation projects proposed for Washington whether involving rail or ships or both. The cumulative environmental impacts of these proposals must be part of the thorough EIS we want to see for the terminal proposed for Vancouver, Washington.

In light of the incomplete information provided by Tesoro and Savage and the many complex and important questions related to the environment as well as human safety, quality of life, and economic stability which this terminal project prompts, we request that you select the no action alternative as the preferred. This project is not good for Washington State or its citizens and should not proceed.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and your attention to our comments and suggestions. We look forward to your thorough evaluation of all direct, indirect, and cumulative adverse environmental impacts of this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Philip Wright  
President  
Skagit Audubon Society

Timothy Manns  
Conservation Chair  
Skagit Audubon Society

---

No virus found in this message.

Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

Version: 10.0.1432 / Virus Database: 3658/6429 - Release Date: 12/17/13

Public Comment for Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

From:  
Skagit Audubon Society  
P.O. Box 1101  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

To:  
Mr. Stephen Posner, EFSEC Interim Manager  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
P.O. Box 43172  
1300 South Evergreen Park Drive S.W.  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

Via e-mail at: [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov)

Dear Mr. Posner:

I am submitting this letter of public comment for Docket No. EF-131590 on behalf of Skagit Audubon Society, the National Audubon chapter based in Skagit County, Washington. Most of our chapter's over 200 families live in Skagit County. All share an interest in birds and other wildlife and the habitats and environmental quality on which they depend.

As residents of a county with two oil refineries, one of which already receives crude oil by rail, we are particularly interested in the ramifications of these changes in industrial activity in Washington. In the comments below we focus on some particular concerns with the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal along the Columbia River. We request that you conduct a full assessment of all the many direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project not only at the terminal site but from the points of origin of the crude oil or bitumen all along the rail routes to the terminal and along the shipping routes from there to refineries in the U.S. or abroad.

While we share with many people a well-founded concern about the potential for explosions as rail tank cars traverse heavily populated areas, we focus here on potential impacts on the natural environment. Many members of Skagit Audubon moved to the Pacific Northwest because of the variety and quality of its natural areas and the wildlife and plants they support. These things are the very basis of the state's retirement and tourism economies which employ many thousands of people. Oil spills, explosions, blocked rail crossings, increased diesel exhaust, and more all have potential to severely disrupt and even destroy portions of this existing economy.

#### Proximity to important wildlife areas

We note that although the location for the proposed Tesoro Savage Terminal is a previously impacted industrial site, it is closely bounded by the Columbia River and the extensive wetlands of Shillapoo Wildlife Area, most immediately the Vancouver Lake Wetland Complex of that public reserve. Just upstream is the restored wetland of the Columbia River Wetland Mitigation

Bank and not far downstream is Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge. Across the river are significant wetlands in Oregon. While the proposed, already highly impacted terminal site supports little wildlife, these areas in its close vicinity plus the Columbia River and wildlife refuges and parks further downstream are important to sandhill cranes, shorebirds, and a wide variety of other birds in addition to significant mammal, fish and plant species. As just one example, we note the following statement from Appendix H.1, p.37, of the project proponents' application: "The Vancouver Lake Lowlands area is the sole example of a sandhill crane staging area in the U.S. that is adjacent to a major metropolitan area (Littlefield and Ivey 2002)." As ships or barges loaded with oil at the proposed terminal proceed downriver and then along the coast to terminals not disclosed in the permit application, or perhaps someday overseas, they will pass many other environmentally significant areas where oil spills would be truly catastrophic. Because of the drastic impacts which spills from the oil trains, at the terminal, or from the ships and barges would have, the EIS must have a broad scope including all potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of spills at the proposed terminal and from its related operations.

#### Significant information missing from the submitted permit documents

For a sufficient EIS to be prepared, the applicant will need to provide important details missing from the Tesoro Savage application. In the cover letter, application, and JARPA, the wording "principal purpose" and "primarily" imply the applicant has not completely described the proposed project. If what is stated is only the principal or primary purpose of the proposed project, what are its other purposes? On behalf of Washington's citizens, who you serve, it is clearly important to require complete information about the project's full intent and purpose before any further consideration of the permit application.

#### Diesel emissions

As important as they are, in this letter we are not addressing the public health aspects of the proposed project because we are confident others have done that. However, we do want to express our concern about the impacts of locomotive diesel emissions along the rail routes and diesel emissions from oil ships and barges at the terminal and en route from there to their as yet undisclosed destinations. We request that the EIS fully consider all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of these diesel emissions on birds and mammals.

#### DOT-111 Rail tank cars and potential for spills and explosions

Spills from DOT-111 tank cars, particularly those not meeting what we understand to be newer standards, are a particular concern. As is the case here in Skagit County, rail cars carrying oil have the potential for derailling and spilling into waterways and wetlands at many points between the oil's source and the proposed terminal. The potential impacts of these spills on fish, wildlife, and plants along all potential rail routes must be thoroughly studied in the EIS. One possible, partial mitigation is to require that all oil or bitumen-carrying rail cars supplying this terminal meet the newest and highest standard to lessen the possibility of puncture or explosion.

#### Oil spill preparedness fund

Current law taxes crude oil arriving by ship or barge to fund oil spill preparedness but exempts oil delivered by rail from this tax. This does not make sense given the potential for spills from rail cars and from the barges and ships which would be carrying the rail-delivered crude oil down the Columbia from the proposed terminal. As mitigation, the law should either be expanded to

include taxation of rail-delivered crude, or the companies benefitting financially should voluntarily contribute an equivalent amount to the fund. Alternatively, their financial liability for clean-up should be set sufficiently high to cover 100% of clean-up costs for all possible spills and emergency response to all possible catastrophes such as explosions.

#### Spills at the terminal and later

The EIS must thoroughly evaluate the potential for spills at the facility itself during all seasons of the year, under all river conditions, and with all types of vessels, including both ships and barges, to which the crude oil or tar sands bitumen might be transferred. The EIS also needs to carefully consider the potential harm from spills due to shipping accidents or other events along the Columbia River, where there are numerous national wildlife refuges and other environmentally sensitive areas, along the outer coast, and in such areas as the Straits of Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound along with the bays and islands to its north, where some of the crude may be bound. The scope of the EIS must include an assessment of the risks and impacts of spills on migratory and non-migratory waterfowl and shorebirds all along the way. If full disclosure by the permit applicants discloses intent to eventually export crude oil overseas from the proposed terminal, potential impacts on birds, marine mammals, and fish along those shipping routes must also be thoroughly studied. If the applicant is not forthcoming with a clear and complete statement of the ultimate intent of the proposed project, a sufficient EIS is not possible and the permit application should be denied without further attention.

#### Invasive marine species

Increased shipping means increased potential for introduction of invasive aquatic species with potential catastrophic impact on Washington's economy and environment. Please include in the EIS a full assessment of all of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of increased shipping related to the proposed project on the introduction of invasive marine species. There should be a detailed explanation of required steps to avoid such introductions by deliberate or accidental ballast water release or hull fouling of ships or barges carrying crude from the proposed terminal.

#### Noise impacts and site geology

It is clear in the project application that construction of the proposed terminal would involve a prolonged period of loud noise from construction activity such as pile driving (some of it presumably necessitated by the inadequate nature of site soils and susceptibility to liquefaction during earthquakes - - a dubious place to be transferring oil and siting oil tanks). The EIS must thoroughly assess the effects of construction-related noise as well as noise from terminal operations on birds and mammals both at the site and within the large area which such sound would reach, according to the project application.

#### Climate change and ocean acidification

Along with Governor Inslee and our other fellow Washington citizens whose thinking is reality-based, we are concerned about climate change and ocean acidification from combustion of fossil fuels here and everywhere. We do not want Washington State to be any more involved than is unavoidable in facilitating the extraction of crude oil or oil from tar sands, its transportation by rail and ship, its refining, and its ultimate burning here or in other counties. The climate change and ocean acidification impacts to Washington State from combustion of the crude oil transferred at the proposed terminal would be significant and must be addressed in the EIS.

Additional carbon dioxide emissions attributable to this crude oil are estimated at about 59.6 million metric tons annually, the equivalent impact on greenhouse gas pollution of 12 million cars.

Cumulative impacts of all oil and coal transportation proposals

It would be unrealistic to review the Tesoro Savage Terminal without regard to other crude oil and coal transportation projects proposed for Washington whether involving rail or ships or both. The cumulative environmental impacts of these proposals must be part of the thorough EIS we want to see for the terminal proposed for Vancouver, Washington.

In light of the incomplete information provided by Tesoro and Savage and the many complex and important questions related to the environment as well as human safety, quality of life, and economic stability which this terminal project prompts, we request that you select the no action alternative as the preferred. This project is not good for Washington State or its citizens and should not proceed.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and your attention to our comments and suggestions. We look forward to your thorough evaluation of all direct, indirect, and cumulative adverse environmental impacts of this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Philip Wright  
President  
Skagit Audubon Society

Timothy Manns  
Conservation Chair  
Skagit Audubon Society

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30404

(UTC)

---

**From:** Dave Miller <davem98607@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 10:57 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments  
**Attachments:** VancouverCrudeOilTerminalComments.docx; BodyMapTo20131102.xlsx; BodyMap2To20131102.jpg; BodyMapTo20131102Pareto.pdf; BodyMapTo20131102.kmz  
**Categories:** Red Category

Please accept the attached scoping comments for the environmental impact of the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal, Vancouver, WA.

Regards,

Dave Miller  
Camas, Washington  
[davem98607@yahoo.com](mailto:davem98607@yahoo.com)


My name is Dave Miller. I have lived in Camas Washington since 1990. Email [davem98607@yahoo.com](mailto:davem98607@yahoo.com)

I would like to speak for the wildlife and habitats of the gorge, especially the wildlife of the Steigerwald Lake, Franz Lake and Pierce National Wildlife Refuges, where I volunteer.


My concerns:

- o Wildlife are frequently killed by trains at the Pierce Refuge:









- I have done GPS surveys along the tracks at the Pierce refuge. In just 2-1/2 miles I found the remains of at least 45 large animals killed by trains – mostly elk, but also deer, raptors, coyotes, etc. Here are some [photos of the carcasses](#). I have attached a Google Earth .kmz file which contains the locations of all the carcasses. If you click on each placemark, you will find a web link to a photo of the remains at that spot. I have also attached a spreadsheet with details on each set of remains. I used this spreadsheet to create the .kmz file.
- From the data and photos I have collected, it appears that wildlife:
  - Cross the tracks frequently. There are dozens of game trails at the Pierce refuge which cross the tracks. We set up a trail camera at one of these crossings to gather some data on how often they cross.
  - Travel down the railway. Some of the carcasses are not near any crossings, which leads me to believe that animals were walking down the tracks when they were killed. E.g. in the 7/29/2012 survey we found a group of 5 elk apparently killed at the same time, away from any major game trail.
  - Are attracted to grain that spills from the railroad cars. I have seen fairly large grain spills on the tracks, and have seen birds eating the grain. The grain is probably attracting other animals as well, some of which are getting killed by train collisions. Here are some [photos of birds eating spilled grain](#).

- o Increasing train traffic will also increase the amount of wildlife killed by trains.



- This project would increase the crude oil car traffic through the gorge refuges from about 120 cars per day to 1246 cars per day -- more than **10 times** the current crude oil traffic. The coal export terminal projects will increase coal car traffic from about 87 coal cars per day to about 2,417 coal cars per day. If this oil terminal project and all of the coal terminal projects are approved, there will be a total of about 3,664 oil and coal cars per day passing through the gorge refuges -- almost **18 times** the current oil and coal car traffic. And of course there are additional freight and passenger trains using the tracks. More trains means more wildlife killed by trains.

- Increased train traffic will impede or stop wildlife migrations.
  - This amount of train traffic will mean that there will be a train on the tracks most of time. This will prevent wildlife from migrating across the tracks like they do currently. The tracks will in effect become a **1200 mile long wall**.
- Silt runoff
  - In my GPS surveys at the Pierce National Wildlife Refuge I have noticed that every time it rains, there is a large amount of silt in the puddles and streamlets along the edge of the railroad bed, probably due to vibration from the trains. This silt enters the waterways of the refuge. Here are some [photos of silt runoff at the Pierce Refuge](#). I would not be surprised if this silt is “fly ash”, injected into the railroad bed as a ground stabilizer (see for example [Collie Fly Ash Stabilises Major Rail Project in WA](#)). It is certainly a similar color to fly ash.
- Cumulative effects
  - The cumulative impacts of ALL of these oil and coal train proposals should be considered together – not each one individually. It is the cumulative effect that will most harm wildlife in the gorge and along the entire route.
- Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge
  - Reading the application it seems clear that the facility will emit a large volume of pollutants into the air, via “flare stacks”, “marine vapor combustor units”, and/or “thermal oxidizers”. These are flowery terms for giant flaming towers used to burn off excess crude oil vapors:




Flare stack at oil terminal in Flotta, Scotland.

- The Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge is located 6.2 miles downriver/downwind from the terminal site. What will be the impact of all these emissions on the Ridgefield refuge? What will migrating birds make of a huge plume of flame and smoke in the middle of their migration route?
- The Shillapoo Wildlife Recreation Area is even closer – just 1.5 miles downriver/downwind.
- Vancouver Lake is also an important wildlife area. It is only 0.5 mile from the terminal site.

Additional information:

- Here are some [photos of wildlife on the tracks at the Pierce Refuge](#).
- There are a lot of [5 gallon and 55 gallon drums dumped](#) along the edge of the railroad bed at the Pierce Refuge.

Row Labels	Count of species
Cervus canadensis	21
Cervus canadensis or Odocoileus hemionus	10
Unknown	9
Odocoileus hemionus	2
Canis latrans	2
Unknown raptor	1
Cathartes aura	1
Didelphis virginianus	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>47</b>







Image USDA Farm Service Agency

Imager, Date: 9/25/2011 lat: 45.628490°

# Wildlife Killed by Trains at Pierce NWR

## from surveys March 2012-November 2013



(UTC)

---

**From:** john griffith <jpgriff54@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:40 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

john griffith  
735evansrd  
sequim, WA 98382

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Norman.S.Richardson@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:01 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Norman Richardson

(UTC)

**From:** Robert.l.boothroyd@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:14 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from California and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Robert Boothroyd

(UTC)

---

**From:** Donna Watson <Donna\_Watson2000@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Donna Watson

95833

(UTC)

---

**From:** larner9598@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:19 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Vancouver, Washington, oil terminal project

To the members of the Washington Energy Facility Sit Evaluation Council,

**Please, please approve the subject oil terminal project.**

I have been reading arguments against this project for quite some time and have yet to be convinced that this oil terminal will be bad for Vancouver. People who don't want the oil terminal to be built in Vancouver seem to most often site instances of accidents involving oil. It isn't possible to avoid all accidents, but that doesn't mean that a project of this magnitude should not be built. It seems to me that the people who call themselves "progressives" are not in favor of progress at all; in fact, they seem to be in favor of going backwards.

I think the oil terminal project will be wonderful for Vancouver. I have lived in Vancouver for almost 20 years.

Thank you for your consideration.

Debbie Larner  
11306 NE 36th Avenue  
Vancouver, WA 98686  
(360) 576-8173

(UTC)

---

**From:** john.b.stubbs@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:21 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from California and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
John Stubbs

UTC)

---

**From:** Roland Schmidt-Bellach <rschmidtbellach@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:24 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Roland Schmidt-Bellach

TOL2B0

(UTC)

---

**From:** Heather Murawski <Kitten98055@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:42 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Heather Murawski  
17929 w spring lake dr se  
Renton, WA 98058

(UTC)

---

**From:** Richard Heggen <tubegeek@nventure.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:46 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

The entire scope of carbon emissions and the resulting impact on the climate must be addressed for this significant proposal. As an alternative, clean renewable energy should be evaluated to compare the impacts each type of energy.

Thank you.

Richard Heggen  
6444 Five Views Rd  
Tacoma, WA 98407

**From:** Sharon S <shar792@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:51 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Sharon S

60453

JTC)

---

**From:** Carolyn Boatsman <c.boatsman@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:52 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Carolyn Boatsman  
3210 74th AVE SE  
Mercer Island, WA 98040

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Stephen Hauschka <Shauschka@clear.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:05 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Stephen Hauschka  
1821 E McGraw St  
Seattle, WA 98112

(UTC)

---

**From:** Lesley McCormmach <Imm@bmi.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:22 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Lesley McCormmach  
1021 Valencia Street  
Walla Walla, WA 99362

(UTC)

---

**From:** Reuben Robison <reubenrobison@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:37 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Reuben Robison

98133

UTC)

**From:** sgoodman@grahamdunn.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:05 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of Washington and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The proposed project will receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries to offset or replace foreign imports and declining production in Alaska and California. This crude oil will be refined in US refineries to help meet the everyday needs of residents and businesses along the US West Coast – including those of the state of Washington. In short, it helps with America's energy security and will bring economic benefits and valuable jobs to our local communities.

As a resident, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. As such, I would request that the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis be purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Risks caused by earthquakes
- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Protection of Columbia River water quality and fish and wildlife resources
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility and have a dampening effect on transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Vancouver, Clark County and the state of Washington.

This balanced approach is consistent with SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Steve Goodman

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30420

Docket EF-131590

(UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Cathy Dormaier  
<clcathy@foxinternet.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

Thank you for helping us save our communities and our environment.

Sincerely,

Ms. Cathy Dormaier  
42108 200th Ave SE  
Enumclaw, WA 98022-8536

UTC)

---

**From:** Robin Clark <dwc95672@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:23 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Robin Clark  
P.O. Box 122  
Rescue, CA 95672

**From:** Audrey Adams <audrey55@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:46 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Audrey Adams  
10939 SE 183rd Ct  
Renton, WA 98055

**From:** Michael McLeod <mmcleod121@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:49 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I therefore respectfully ask that you fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the analysis of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts and the health of our communities, including:

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia River, the Pacific Coast and Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Michael McLeod  
4225 SW 314th Place  
Federal Way, WA 98023

(UTC)

---

**From:** Caitilin Terfloth <cterfloth@sasktel.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:05 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Caitilin Terfloth

S7N1H8

(UTC)

---

**From:** Joyce Levy <parisrain1@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:17 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590; Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Joyce Levy

46077

---

**From:** Joyce Levy <parisrain1@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:17 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Joyce Levy

46077

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Joyce Levy <parisrain1@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:18 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee 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 the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along 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.

Thank you.

Joyce Levy

46077

**From:** Fran Post <franpost254@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:32 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

This is such a terrible proposal, bad for the environment, a major safety risk, disruptive for the communities these trains would roll through. As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Fran Post  
254 Woodland Ave  
254 Woodland Ave  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

**From:** Penny Derleth <penny.derleth@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 10:04 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Penny Derleth  
PO Box 421  
Deer Park, WA 99006

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30430

Docket EF-131590

UTC)

---

**From:** Mark Darienzo <markdari@pacifier.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 10:24 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Proposed Vancouver Tesoro Savage Oil Terminal

Proposed Vancouver Tesoro Savage Oil Terminal. The Project Application Number is 2013-01, Docket Number EF-131590

Please deny this oil terminal.

Thanks

Mark Darienzo

Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** Daniel Swink <drswink@pacifier.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 10:59 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Daniel Swink  
PO Box 61884  
Vancouver, WA 98666

---

**From:** Carolyn Gastellum <ecgastel@wavecable.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:13 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a member of the larger community of Washington, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal from mining the tar sands to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

It is essential that the scoping of this proposal assess impacts to public safety and the free flow of all emergency vehicles to include police, fire and medical emergency responders. What effect would one environmental catastrophe have on any community such occurred in Canada recently and what economic impact would that create for all industries dependent on a clean environment? What impact would this have on fishing, the marine environments that may be affected, the food chain, the tourist activity dependent on a healthy ecosystem and any other enterprise that requires clean water? These activities deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Carolyn Gastellum  
14451 Ashley Place  
Anacortes, WA 98221

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sunrise omahoney <s.h.omahoney@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:22 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** proposed oil terminal

I am writing to ask that:

- The safety access issues are thoroughly evaluated. I would hate to see a person have a heart attack on one side of the tracks and not be able to get help because of a long train going past. The increase in the number of trains only increases this risk
- The true question of will this proposed project stop at just a terminal and not turn into a refinery in the future
- The numbers of other oil refineries and rail car accidents are evaluated when looking at this proposal
- The long term viability of oil is examined. How long will it last and what are the environmental impacts of the decision to move forward if it does?
- The true cost the community is paying for this risk--air quality, safety, water quality and more...
- The multitude of environmental risks we will take on--not just emergency but in the everyday operation of the project
- The possible alternative projects that could be brought in--for example a solar company that could add an alternative energy source to our community not like oil which will only take from the grid

Please reject this project based on that it is not an environmentally sound project.

Please when doing the EIS look at the cumulative, local very close neighbors, Vancouver neighborhoods that are within the blast zone for air quality and on a global level--when it comes to climate change and the direction I would hope we as an earth, country, state and neighborhood could start to take seriously. We cannot live like this forever we need to take a serious look at what choices we are making when it comes to where we live.

Please do not let this come to the community I love and to my kid's lungs and more if there is an explosion.

Sunrise O'Mahoney

1924 Grant St, Vancouver WA 98660

(UTC)

---

**From:** Jeffrey Hill <toysattic@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:24 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- \* The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- \* The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- \* The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- \* The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- \* The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- \* Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- \* Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Jeffrey Hill  
PO BOX 841  
PO Box 841  
Deer Park, WA 99006

**From:** Dave Shehorn <david.shehorn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:32 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Oil Terminal in Vancouver

What is Heavy oil? It is heavier than water, if spilled near water, it sinks to the bottom. Tar sands oil and shale oil, are both, heavy oil -- that is the type of unrefined oil being transported from the upper Midwest: Wyoming and the Dakota states.

There are lots of inherent dangers for the long distance transport of heavy oil by train.

Heavy oil is often "thinned" by adding diluent agents -- refinery byproducts that are not commercially viable for other economic benefit -- "trash" petroleum distillates with various viscosities and properties. Typically, these would be lighter than water.

In an accident, we would be contaminated top and bottom at the Columbia River, devastating the favorable environmental conditions necessary for aquatic life.

Let the producing states build refineries near the oil source, and use the refined products in the Midwest, shipped and distributed by Midwest pipelines -- it's economically the right thing to do for the country.

From a Department of Energy study: "Volumes of proprietary data and feasibility studies exist within major companies for producing heavy oil, yet only a limited amount of data is available in the public domain."

==== Dave =====

(UTC)

---

**From:** Ann Mitchell <mitchellannk@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:48 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Vancouver Washington Oil Terminal project

Hi,

I am a downtown Vancouver resident and I totally oppose this project. I object to it because of the safety risk( i.e. Anacortes), Torsoro /Savage has one of the worst safety records! The increased air pollution and noise pollution this project would generate is unacceptable. Also the risks of explosions, spills, derailments and decreasing the livability of this area is unacceptable.

Concerned Resident,  
Ann Mitchell

(UTC)

**From:** Sunrise omahoney <s.h.omahoney@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:11 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Vancouver, WA oil terminal

For the record:  
Sunrise O'Mahoney  
1924 Grant St.  
Vancouver, WA 98660

Dear EFSEC team,  
I am writing in regards to the proposed oil terminal in Vancouver, WA.

I want to start off by saying I completely support the City of Vancouver's EIs recommendation. They asked for a study that pretty much covered all my questions and concerns. The recommendation asks for a comprehensive and cumulative assessment which is critical when looking at a project to this degree. I cannot say more than they already said on the technical, safety and mostly the environmental concerns and questions.

On a personal level, I live in the outlying neighborhood from the Port and not that far from the tracks south of the Port. I am in the Hough neighborhood. I live here with my 2 daughters (9 and 16). I am strongly opposed to the proposed project. I hear people for it talk about the jobs it will bring. I counter that question with, what number of jobs is worth the potential environmental disaster we could face and the everyday environmental risk we in this community will take on. I am seriously concerned about the air quality my family, friends and neighbors will have to live with. As an Executive Director of an environmental nonprofit that works on cleaning our local watershed, I do not see how this will benefit our local waters in any way. Again, I defer to the City of Vancouver when they raise questions about how this could impact our waters.

I hope that the EIS will include a cumulative evaluation of the impacts of this project and extend the reach of the study to outside of just the immediate vicinity of the Port. There are many residences along the rail lines in Vancouver and before that will be taking on the risk as well. In addition to that, there are many of us a couple neighborhoods in that will take on the air quality issues related to having an oil terminal, especially of this size and capacity.

Please, please say no to this project. I cannot see how this is an environmentally sound project in any way and I do not want to raise my family near it and would hate to have to move because of it.

I imagine this is not looked at as seriously, but it is time to say no to fossil fuels and this is a great place to start. I hope the study looks at the global ramifications of fossil fuel impacts. They are not sustainable and are only promoted under the guise of bringing in jobs when really it is fed by money. I am afraid of how little the environment is taken into consideration. I am very appreciative of the EFSEC process and glad that it has to go through this process.

I hope that all the questions the City of Vancouver has asked will be addressed. I want to add one piece and that is the environmental justice component. The neighborhoods closest to the Port are some of the lowest income neighborhoods in Vancouver. I find it offensive that they would consider bringing something in so close to this part of community.

Thank you for taking the time to read the massive number of comments. I know I did not give a lot of reasons I am against it and to reiterate, I did so because I support the questions raised by Vancouver and they said it very well.

Thank you,  
Sunrise O'Mahoney

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Duane Underwood <duane2@shaw.ca>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 18, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Duane Underwood  
350 NW Polk Ave  
Corvallis, OR 97330-6488

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Adele Cramer  
<adelecramer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 18, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Adele Cramer  
1825 Se Minter Bridge Rd, #35  
Hillsboro, OR 97123-5132

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Natalia Policelli  
<policellin@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 18, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Natalia Policelli  
5617 SE Reedway St  
Portland, OR 97206-5548

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30441

UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Colleen Wright <colwright@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Colleen Wright  
4160 Chapman Way  
Lake Oswego, OR 97035-5565  
(503) 908-1757

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Carlos Guerra <clguerra43@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Carlos Guerra  
2311 NE 181st Ave  
Vancouver, WA 98684-0739  
(949) 837-4576

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lana Worley  
<ljworley@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Lana Worley  
205 N Garden St  
Bellingham, WA 98225-5815

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Olga Kachook  
<olgakachook@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Miss Olga Kachook  
4228 174th Pl SW  
Lynnwood, WA 98037-7400

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Carol Trotter <caroltrtr@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Carol Trotter  
40797 Savola Ln  
Astoria, OR 97103-8622  
(510) 566-8798

(UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stella Day  
<stellacday@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Stella Day  
4714 Willis St  
Bellingham, WA 98229-3498  
(360) 305-5436

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Susan Haynes <asiatravelers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Susan Haynes  
711 Skamania Landing Rd  
Stevenson, WA 98648-6141  
(509) 427-4060

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Michael Haynes <asiatravelers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Michael Haynes  
711 Skamania Landing Rd  
Stevenson, WA 98648-6141  
(509) 427-4060

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Sally Ford <sford00@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Sally Ford  
741 E 18th St  
The Dalles, OR 97058-2877

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Terry Andrews <ridebuzz@charter.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Terry Andrews  
94500 Meyers Rd  
Gold Beach, OR 97444-9640

UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Zeri Bishop <avittion@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Zeri Bishop  
14806 SW Scholls Ferry Rd  
Apt X201  
Beaverton, OR 97007-9207  
(832) 620-8640

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30452

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Wesley Mcmurrian <wesmcm@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Wesley Mcmurrian  
4068 148th Ave NE  
Redmond, WA 98052-5165

(UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Cynthia Calkins <bluewhalenw@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Cynthia Calkins  
17526 149th Ave SE Unit J1  
Renton, WA 98058-8846

(UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Susie Irvine  
<smaximos@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Dr. Susie Irvine  
9320 Ohop Valley Ext Rd E  
Eatonville, WA 98328-9019

(UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of John Nikkel <jnikl@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. John Nikkel  
2306 NE 51st Ave  
Portland, OR 97213-2510

**UTC)**

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Darci Shaver <darcishaver@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Darci Shaver  
2221 N Alberta St  
Portland, OR 97217-3508

**UTC)**

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Maurita Bernet <mbernet@fslf.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Maurita Bernet  
116 8th Ave SE  
Little Falls, MN 56345-3539

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jon Sequeira <jonsequeira@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jon Sequeira  
1107 31st Ave S  
Seattle, WA 98144-3216  
(401) 281-9137

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jan Fisher  
<sparkil@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jan Fisher  
2436 NE Iris Way  
Bend, OR 97701-8197  
(541) 219-2401

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jason Morris <canada.morris@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jason Morris  
13411 NE 182nd Ave  
Brush Prairie, WA 98606-7114  
(360) 852-4666

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tristan Francis <tristan.d.francis@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 6:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Tristan Francis  
4720 SE 72nd Ave  
Portland, OR 97206-4467  
(503) 899-5689

**(UTC)**

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Maggie Turner <maggiet@worldstar.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Maggie Turner  
980 SW Briar Ln  
Portland, OR 97225-6332

UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Sandra Joos <joosgalefamily@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

I have grave concerns about the proposal to transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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,

Dr. Sandra Joos  
4259 SW Patrick Pl  
Portland, OR 97239-7202  
(503) 274-8803

(UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Carolyn Boatsman <c.boatsman@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Carolyn Boatsman  
3210 74th Ave SE  
Mercer Island, WA 98040-3419

(UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of gary wharton <hippygary@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Gary Wharton  
2416 NE 99th St  
Vancouver, WA 98665-9028  
(360) 573-7388

UTC

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sandy Robson <dbsrcl@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sandy Robson  
7446 Seashell Way  
Blaine, WA 98230-9681

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mitch Miller  
<madmarmot@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mitch Miller  
3720 Pine Creek Ln SE  
Lacey, WA 98503-8020  
(360) 915-8254

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Karen Kovalik <karenkovalik@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Karen Kovalik  
7 Hillshire Dr  
Lake Oswego, OR 97034-7374  
(503) 636-3024

(UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dean Willett <greg164@centurytel.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

it is not a matter of if but when an oil tanker spill occurs on our waters or a train derailment ruins our land and then it will be too late, Washington's greatest treasure will be destroyed. Please stop this poorly thought out plan from occurring and stop giving in to corporate greed..

Sincerely,

Mr. Dean Willett  
9522 132nd St NW  
Gig Harbor, WA 98329-7050  
(253) 444-7373

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Char McCain <char73@live.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Char McCain  
213 E 12th St  
Port Angeles, WA 98362-7813  
(360) 565-8039

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Robert Burger  
<bobgreenpeaceman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Burger  
408 SW Monroe Ave Apt 604  
Corvallis, OR 97333-7219  
(541) 752-6683

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of John Nelson <joteg@gorge.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. John Nelson  
524 W 3rd Pl  
The Dalles, OR 97058-1308

(UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Sharon Sullivan <shane1902ladies@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

An oil tanker train wreck at some point in the Gorge is not "if" it is "when". There will be an oil tanker train wreck in the Gorge which will effectively destroy the Columbia River Gorge. The Gorge is ranked #6 in the world for scenic beauty.... in the WORLD! It must be protected from greedy corporations who care not about environmental damages.

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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Sharon Sullivan  
2022 N Willamette Blvd  
Portland, OR 97217-4405  
(971) 570-5878

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30474

**(UTC)**

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Julianna Guy <juliannaguy@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Julianna Guy  
4559 El Dorado Way Unit 226  
Bellingham, WA 98226-1222  
(360) 738-8466

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30475

Docket EF-131590

**(UTC)**

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Christine Lawton, IBEW #48 [Mrs. L. O. Gordon] <gordono6@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

I'm concerned the Oil Trains to Longview will go through the Gorge and Vancouver, also. Is that possible? How many more trains aren't we hearing about, if that's the case?

Also, concerned because the East Coast has already turned down the same deal- Are they just more savvy than we?

I also wonder what the 200 hundred new jobs will include, surely that must cover derailments, new fire/explosion protection, oil spill abatement in the river, etc. And who will end up paying for these 200 more jobs!!!

Will the trains locally be the unattended power units to shuttling around our Vancouver Yard?

Best Regards,  
Christine Lawton, IBEW #48

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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Christine Lawton, IBEW #48 [Mrs. L. O. Gordon]  
710 NW Sluman Rd  
Vancouver, WA 98665-7404

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jeff Kastroll <kjeffrey7@qwest.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

I know you will receive several copies of this petition. I want to add my name to this petition and let you know i do NOT want the Pacific Northwest ports to become potentially lethal ports for exportation of oil

Thank you for your concern

Sincerely,

Mr. Jeff Kastroll  
PO Box 1357  
Ashland, OR 97520-0046  
(541) 488-8904

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Robert Burger  
<bobgreenpeaceman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Burger  
408 SW Monroe Ave Apt 604  
Corvallis, OR 97333-7219  
(541) 752-6683

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jennifer Calvert <jennifercalvert@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jennifer Calvert  
1318 S Mica Park Dr  
Spokane Valley, WA 99206-3122  
(509) 536-3839

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of C Gainer <redwing-9@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. C Gainer  
4500 Palatine Ave N  
Seattle, WA 98103-6397  
(206) 781-9098

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lesley McCormach <Imm@bmi.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Don't bring polluting petroleum products into the Northwest.. The Northwest has such truly valuable environment.  
Don't conflate the Northwest with petroleum. Leave us clean and healthy.

Sincerely,

Ms. Lesley McCormach  
1021 Valencia St  
Walla Walla, WA 99362-1355

JTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mitchell Johnson <mmitchell548@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Mitchell Johnson  
4425 NE Wygant St  
Portland, OR 97218-1645  
(503) 460-9064

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Linda Wiseman  
<wiseman.strategies@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Linda Wiseman  
724 E 32nd Ave  
Spokane, WA 99203-3112

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30483

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stacy Parr  
<stacy\_parr@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.  
Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Stacy Parr  
18004 83rd Ave NE  
Kenmore, WA 98028-1857  
(310) 829-3001

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jamie Kitson  
<jamie.kitson@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jamie Kitson  
3006 Nassau St  
Everett, WA 98201-3925

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Charles Fornia <cmfornia@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Charles Forna  
12220 E Gibson Rd Apt 3  
Everett, WA 98204-8698  
(425) 259-4201

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Ted Light <lighttb@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:40 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Ted Light  
612 SE 48th Ave  
Portland, OR 97215-1721  
(503) 265-8534

**(UTC)**

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Nora Regan <norarn51@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Nora Regan  
1331 Olympic Ave  
Port Townsend, WA 98368-4039  
(360) 385-3369

**(UTC)**

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jane Stevens  
<janehartwellstevens@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jane Stevens  
900 university st  
Seattle, WA 981017878

(UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dean Smith <deansmith4@me.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I live 3 blocks from the BNSF tracks. My neighbors and I are already very much affected by these trains--noise all night, diesel fumes, vibrations that we can feel three blocks away. With the oil trains we also have fire to fear.

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Dean Smith  
3007 Federal Ave  
Apt 1  
Everett, WA 98201-3978  
(425) 328-9979

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jenny Sweeney <mizjenny@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:46 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jenny Sweeney  
3891 NE Alameda St  
Portland, OR 97212-2819  
(503) 288-6444

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sally Mackey  
<sallynmnmac@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 8:45 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sally Mackey  
2127 SW 162nd St  
Burien, WA 98166-2654

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#30492

(UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Brian Nappe <bnap1@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:10 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

I have asthma and I live in Stevenson WA in the Columbia River Gorge. the Tesoro project would adversely affect me personally. The air in the Gorge is already very bad from the coal fired power plants at the east end of the Gorge which blow westward funneling through the Gorge whenever the wind is from the east which is most days from Fall to Spring. 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 are likely health effects on people who live in or visit the Gorge?  
What method will be used to clean the exhaust from the railroad train engines (and/or tugboat engines) which will add to the already unhealthy air in the Gorge. If you do not believe the air is bad then read up on it, it is dangerous many days each year for asthma sufferers!

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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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 Nappe  
PO Box 885  
Stevenson, WA 98648-0885

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of John Goeckermann <misterg@wizzards.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:10 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

ONE SMALL FENDER-BENDER ACCIDENT THAT STOPS JUST ONE OF THESE HUGE LONG TRAINS COULD DISRUPT TRAFFIC FOR DAYS AND DAYS, AND START A BACKUP SNARL OF TRAIN TRAFFIC EVEN IN GOOD WEATHER ---- BUT WHEN YOU ADD BAD WEATHER TO THIS BAD PROPOSAL, YOU HAVE A HUGE DISASTER WAITING TO DESCEND ON LOCAL TRAFFIC UP AND DOWN THE LINE; THIS IS A STUPIDLY BAD IDEA, ALL FOR THE PROFITS OF A FEW WHO ARE WILLING TO DESTROY A WORLD TREASURE SO THEY CAN SUCK THEIR GREEDY TAINTED BLOOD. DISGUSTING! HAVE YOU NO CARE FOR CLEAN AIR AND CLEAN WATER???? BLOODSUCKING GREEDHEADS!!!

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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. John Goeckermann  
Hugo Road  
Grants Pass, OR 97528

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Chad Stemm <meristem@clear.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:10 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Chad Stemm  
4505 NW Washington St  
Vancouver, WA 98663-1254

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Joshua Berger <josh@plazm.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:10 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

This is a lose-lose scenario if I have ever seen one. The people of the Northwest lose because of the pollution during transportation and the potential for accident. The rest of the world loses when this stuff is shipped over to China or where-ever to be burned without sufficient environmental regulation. The only winners are the corporations who are trying to make a buck pillaging the lands for profit instead of investing in clean energy. You have the power to point things in the right direction. Deny this permit.

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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Joshua Berger  
1123 SE 36th Ave  
Portland, OR 97214-4302  
(503) 239-4252

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Kathleen Jones <fox2bravo@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:10 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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.

Please do not place Tesoro's profits above the protection of the unique environment of the Columbia Gorge and the safety and quality of life of its residents. Like many other current proposed energy projects that want to use Washington and Oregon as a way to the ocean, the project has nothing to do with energy independence and everything to do with profit through exporting. Tesoro doesn't care about the Northwest and will use us as they see fit in order to make the greatest possible profit. It would be unconscionable to allow such a volume of dangerous train traffic to take over the Gorge.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Kathleen Jones  
2051 Crest Dr  
Lake Oswego, OR 97034-2717

**UTC)**

---

**From:** elsons@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:12 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

December 17, 2013

Stephen Posner, EFSEC Interim Manager  
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
P.O. Box 43172  
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner:

We have been residents of Vancouver, Washington for thirty years and we currently live just five miles from the Port of Vancouver and the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

We fully support the development of the Terminal and we urge the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis to be limited to and purposefully focused on the proposed facility. We believe that the scope of the EIS is appropriately limited to the potential impacts that are directly related to the facility's design and operation.

As Vancouver residents we absolutely believe that comprehensive review of the Terminal's safety and environmental plans and potential impacts are extremely important. The EFSEC should examine site-specific impacts related to the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement including: earthquake risks; spill prevention and spill response requirements to protect the environment; compliance with both state and federal air quality emission standards; protection of Columbia River water quality, as well as fish and wildlife resources; local transportation infrastructure and public services impacts; and an overall facility design that meets all relevant safety standards.

However, we also strongly believe that conducting a SEPA EIS that extends beyond site-based facility impacts is inappropriate and unwarranted. Further, it would actually dilute what should be a comprehensive primary focus on this facility and may well create the unintended consequence of negatively impacting the transport of other commodities.

It is clear that many individuals and organizations advocating a significantly expanded scope of review are seeking to use this process to dramatically, if not fatally delay the development of the Vancouver Terminal. A primary reason stated by many of those who seek the significantly expanded scope of review is to accomplish a goal which is far broader than appropriately considered in this process: to eliminate the Terminal as a means to combat global warming.

While the need to address global warming is important, using an expanded scope of review to detrimentally impact the development of this Terminal is a misplaced objective. As the Council is well aware, the proposed Terminal is being built to receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries, which will offset or

replace foreign imports and declining production in Alaska and California. Establishment of the Terminal will help facilitate the transport of crude oil from the Bakken region to U.S. refineries for domestic consumption to replace foreign oil and the decline of U.S. production in other regions.

We lived through the oil embargo of the 70's and have seen other such threats due to international policy disagreements and conflict, while we have faced an increasing reliance on foreign oil. However, the exciting and important development of domestic oil reserves that can be aided by the Vancouver Terminal will help ensure America's energy security while bringing economic benefits and valuable jobs to our State and local community. The transport of crude by rail to the Terminal project at the Port of Vancouver will be an important part of establishing both energy independence and economic development.

What if the Terminal at the Port of Vancouver is unnecessarily delayed by an expanded study that effectively precludes its development? It will not stop the rail transport of crude, which already occurs and will require unit trains to go a greater distance to existing and proposed bulk facilities in Anacortes, Ferndale, Tacoma, or Hoquiam.

While it is argued that the development of the Terminal in Vancouver creates an adverse impact, is this impact greater than transport of oil from Alaska or from overseas? And, while there are risks which absolutely must be minimized, the risks posed by off-shore domestic production are arguably greater, as the BP spill in the Gulf so tragically demonstrated.

Accordingly, we believe that limiting the scope of the SEPA EIS to the proposed facility, which is rigorous and comprehensive, is appropriate and affords the proper balance that is consistent with SEPA statutes and regulations. It will provide important environmental protection and will also help ensure Washington State's economic growth and regional economic development while contributing to our Nation's energy independence.

Sincerely,

Elson and Janet Strahan  
604 Umatilla Way  
Vancouver, Washington 98661

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sandra Petrarca <smpetrac@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sandra Petrarca  
323 N 83rd St  
Seattle, WA 98103-4217  
(206) 784-7219

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lynnette Anderson <lianderso@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Ms. Lynnette Anderson  
504 W Smith St  
Seattle, WA 98119-2537  
(206) 669-4716

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Terrence Forbyn <tforb@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2013 9:15 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing regarding Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01 to urge the Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) to assess the full environmental and public safety impact of the joint Tesoro-Savage proposal to turn the Port of Vancouver into a major crude oil export terminal.

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped 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 recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of this proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities.

Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.

2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.

3) 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.

4) 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.

5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the proposed oil terminal, I respectfully ask you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's application.

Sincerely,

Mr. Terrence Forbyn  
4200 N Albina Ave  
Portland, OR 97217-3078  
(503) 752-4195