

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30601

UTC)

From: David Sovey <hdhsystems@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:49 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

OIL IS TOXIC. IF GOD WANTED US TO PLAY WITH THIS STUFF HE WOULDN'T HAVE BURIED IT SO VERY DEEP IN THE GROUND

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.

David Sovey
1225 E Sunset Dr
Ste #369
Bellingham, WA 98226

JTC)

From: Nate Allen <nateallen5@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:55 AM
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.

Nate Allen

85042

From: George.V.Kefalas@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 5:52 AM
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,
George Kefalas

(UTC)

From: Marc Lansden <mlansden@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:00 AM
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. My family has lived in the Columbia Gorge area for over 40 years, and 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.

Marc Lansden
2820 Ellis St
Bellingham, WA 98225

UTC)

From: Rebekah Fox <bluesky4butterfly@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:24 AM
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.

Rebekah Fox
7616 88th PL NE
Marysville, WA 98270

UTC)

From: michael.t.gunter@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:27 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Texas 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,
Michael Gunter

(UTC)

From: miles.t.heller@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:36 AM
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,
Miles Heller

From: geraldine.d.burt@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:41 AM
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,
Gerri Burt

(UTC)

From: Rick Blanchett <rick-nancy@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 6:49 AM
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.

Rick Blanchett

33025

(UTC)

From: Eric Burr <burrski@methownet.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 7:14 AM
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.

Eric Burr
585 Lost river Rd.
Mazama, WA 98833

UTC)

From: Lewismarjoriej@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 7:18 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Protect the Northwest from dirty oil exports

FROM:
MRS MARJORIE J LEWIS
4 SCOTS CLOSE
HEREFORD
HR1 2RT
UNITED KINGDOM

Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee,

Although I am not a citizen of the United States of America or of Washington State, I am writing to you on the subject of the Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project because I am very concerned about the environmental impact of the proposal which I think has implications for the world as a whole, as well as the people of the Columbia river area.

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 for taking the time to read this e-mail.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

MARJORIE J LEWIS (MRS)

Governor Jay Inslee
Washington State

UTC)

From: GLENDA GAYLE <g2gayle@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:06 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Concern re: oil terminal for Vancouver

Dec 18, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed oil terminal in Vancouver, Washington. As a grandmother and resident for over forty years, I would rather see waterfront development which would provide permanent jobs for Vancouver. In the past year both Quebec and Alabama have had serious explosions and I am concerned about the potential for such a devastating event in Vancouver. I do not believe that this project is in the best interest of public safety.

Sincerely,

Glenda Gayle
4013 NE 44th St
Vancouver, WA 98661

(UTC)

From: Gregory Sotir <gsotir@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:44 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

To Whom It May Concern,

I am contacting you to ask that you not issue permits to Tesoro Corporation for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal. Tesoro Corporation has a history of faulty record keeping and skirting the laws protecting community and citizen health in numerous locations. Tesoro Corporation seems unable, or unwilling, to comply adequately with the established laws of the existing regulations regarding transportation, refinement, and maintenance of their toxic and carcinogenic products and compounds.

Tesoro Corporation's most recent violations of the Clean Air Act in numerous locations in four states including Anacortes, WA. (May 2013) is only the latest in a long stretch of shoddy practices and violations, including on-site explosions which killed workers in Anacortes in 2010. A cursory review shows many violations at many of their facilities around the nation, not just in Washington state. To the larger picture of imminent and economically dangerous climate change as it affects local bioregion resources, Tesoro Corporation has no answer but to continue pushing CO2 levels up above 500ppm, a level that would have devastating consequences for our planetary biosphere.

Given the history of this corporation, the importance of maintaining health and safety for the community of Vancouver, and the inherent natural beauty and sustainability of the local bioregion, it seems to me a severe breach in the social contract to allow this corporation to launch and maintain any oil terminal facility at this location for oil export.

Please deny the permits and protect the health and safety of the people and workers of this region.

Gregory Sotir
Home-owner and Schoolteacher
4726 NE 66th Ave.
Portland, OR 97281
503-234-2648

(UTC)

From: Posner, Stephen (UTC)
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:54 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: FW: Vancouver Crude Oil Export Terminal Scoping/Site Selection Process

From: Hal Stockbridge [mailto:h_stockbridge@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 7:35 PM
To: Posner, Stephen (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Crude Oil Export Terminal Scoping/Site Selection Process

Dear Mr. Posner:

I am writing in opposition to the proposed crude oil export terminal in Vancouver, WA.

I am a physician in Olympia, trained in internal medicine, public health, and environmental medicine, and affiliated with the University of Washington.

I have been following the issue of train transportation of coal and crude oil in our state and across the country. I have read numerous reports of tragic incidents such as the disaster in Lac Megantic, Quebec.

I have serious concerns about the many negative impacts of a crude oil export terminal on the health of our citizens.

I would hope that you and your colleagues will recommend to Governor Inslee that he NOT approve the terminal.

I would be happy to discuss the health aspects with you at your convenience. Please feel free to contact me any time.

Yours truly,

Hal Stockbridge, MD, MPH
Olympia, WA

UTC)

From: Loretta Railing <lorettarailing@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:55 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Proposed oil terminal in Vancouver Wa

Please deny permits to the proposed oil terminal in Vancouver Wa ... We don't need the black gunk we need to move forward not backwards in our energy thinking

Here are some important points that haven't been emphasized very much.

1. This is not about Energy Independence! The Wall Street Journal reported today that EXXON is lobbying Congress to allow exports of American oil.
2. This is not about need! In 2005, the president of General Motors said, we need to get *off* oil. Now all the major car companies are making electric cars. Twenty two models are already in the showroom. The list gets longer every quarter.
3. Imagine the Exxon Valdez type of accident along the Oregon and Washington Coasts or in the Columbia River. My Coast Guard friends say that one train derailment in the Columbia could wipe out our salmon industry for decades.
4. The oil industry has a history of obfuscation. It allowed the spill-responders to think that all the oil from a pipeline leak into the Kalamazoo River had been cleaned up, when in truth, there were more than one million gallons of heavy tar sands crude which were submerged out of sight and drifting downstream during flood stage.
5. Oil barges are not regulated as carefully as tanker ships.
6. Oil trains are less regulated than oil pipelines. Emergency response plans are vague, inadequate, and unfunded.
7. Bakken Oil is regulated the same way as regular oil. Instead it should be regulated as explosive, like gasoline.
8. How adequate is the insurance coverage in the event of an oil train explosion in the Gorge during forest fire season? A fire would race up the hills and spread throughout the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. Already, because of Climate Change, forest fires spread much faster and with greater intensity. Warmer air desiccates our forests.
9. Three thousand jobs in Washington State have already been jeopardized by the acidification of the waters in Willapa Bay from high atmospheric CO2 levels. There was talk last fall of adding antacids to our inland waters.
10. Last May, atmospheric levels of CO2 spiked at 400 parts per million. The last time that happened, the planet was much warmer and the oceans were 200 feet higher.

Thank you

--

Loretta Railing,

360-521-5153 cell

UTC)

From: Bruce Gundersen <pandb7@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:55 AM
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.

Bruce Gundersen
27655 Beham St NW
Poulsbo, WA 98370

UTC)

From: Patricia Chandler <patchand@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:04 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro-Savage OilTerminal

Stephen Posner
Site Manager-EFSED
P.O. Box 43172
1300 S. Evergreen Drive SW
Washington, 9804-1172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed Tesoro-Savage Oil Terminal in Vancouver Port.

I am extremely concerned about the dangers inherent in the transportation of up to 360,000 barrels of crude oil per day by rail, with storage on site, in Vancouver, before shipping.

Even federal officials state that the large steel tank cars that carry the oil through towns and cities, past homes, factories, farms and fragile ecosystems of our beautiful Northwest are potentially dangerous and ruptures could cause a major disaster. We do not need more threats to the Columbia River ecosystem.

The fiery inferno that followed the explosion of these cars in Quebec, Canada this past summer showed the danger. Forty-seven people were killed. It was extremely troubling to hear a man who works near the tracks in Quebec say that he'd warned his family, "the question is not if, but when" (another such accident will occur).

This would be a tragedy that does not need to happen and I encourage you to make the decision that this is a terminal that will not be built.

Most sincerely,
Patricia L. Chandler
A concerned mother and grandmother who loves this land and her people

UTC)

From: Albert Carter <alcarter55@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:05 AM
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.

Albert Carter
315 Lawrence
City
Hoquiam, WA 98550

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30619

Docket EF-131590.

UTC)

From: Kathleen Snyder <ksnyder75@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:14 AM
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 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.

November 2013 has been labeled the warmest November on record, across Earth, since record-keeping began in 1880. That we should be purposefully adding to this huge problem by encouraging fossil fuel production is unconscionable.

The scoping document should include the implications of this project on environmental and community health.

Thank you.

Kathleen Snyder
2406 81st PI SE
Everett, WA 98203

UTC)

From: Stephanie Chamberlin <steph@marcchamberlin.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:52 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Oil Terminal Comments

Sirs:

I am truly baffled by even the thought of an oil terminal in Vancouver. All evidence points to no increase in jobs due to the ones that will go away if it is built. The environmental impact is huge! It will not change your paycheck to do the right thing and NOT build an oil export terminal. If you do build one it will really look like you were paid off by big companies. As elected officials you really need to say NO! The majority of citizens do not want this built and you must honor the citizens who elected you. Also, it will destroy all the tax payer funds used to build up the downtown area this is a no win deal for all citizens. Please do the right thing and say no to this horrible proposition.

Thanks for your ear,
Stephanie Chamberlin
35519 NE 30th st
Washougal,
WA 98671

UTC)

From: Susan Horne <Susan@Horne.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:00 AM
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.

Susan Horne

02067

From: Ron Pyeatt <patronpye@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:11 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver WA Energy Dist Terminal

I am strongly opposed to using rail tank cars for transportation of crude oil to the Vancouver terminal. However I am not opposed to the terminal itself. There are some existing pipelines, and if not, build new ones to do the job. They are not noisy, disruptive or unsightly and basically a safer means of transport.

Tank cars should not be the "permanent" mode of crude transportation because of their tremendous disruption to all the communities the rail traffic affects along its travel from source to terminal. Tubular steel is made for this purpose and should be the only means of permanent transport of crude oil. Rail has more inherent danger but it does have some safeguards regulated presently. If no appropriate pipelines do not currently exist allow a reasonable period for construction and then mandate no rail traffic after that.

Hundreds of towns and cities in the country have their traffic, businesses and residential areas constantly disrupted by trains and in spite of their supposed efficiencies have a great effect on the well-being and commerce of the country. How much energy is consumed in permanently hauling crude by train? Trains have their place in transportation but not in transport of huge quantities of liquid commodities.

If I wanted more trains to go by my home I would move to Flagstaff AZ or perhaps Scottsbluff NE with their 50-60 plus trains per day polluting their communities with noise and exhaust pollution and disruption.

Ronald L Pyeatt
125 Wells Gap Road
Prosser WA 99350
patronpye@yahoo.com

(UTC)

From: craig.l.vanarsdale@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:12 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Martinez, 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,
Craig Van Arsdale

From: lowridertruck@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:38 AM
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,
Ruben Padilla

UTC)

From: Brian Jokela <bmjokela@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:32 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro-Savage Project

35417 N. Dalton Road
Deer Park, WA 99006
December 18, 2013

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

Re: Tesoro-Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal
Application No. 2013-01
Docket No. EF 131590

Dear Mr. Posner:

Please note the following comments for inclusion in this application:

EFSEC should review a scope of impacts similar to Whatcom County's requirements:

Increases in rail traffic across the region, particularly within Spokane and adjacent to the Columbia River;
Increases in vessel traffic in and out of the Columbia River;
Increased crude oil spill risk from rail transport over aged tracks in aged containers, and from terminal storage and river/marine transport;
Additional crude oil extraction in North Dakota and Alberta tar sands;
Additional particulate pollution from increased diesel rail transport through residential and urban areas;
Greenhouse gas emissions and life cycle impacts resulting from transport of crude oil.

We urge the Council to reject this Application.

Very truly yours,

Mary S. Jokela
Brian A. Jokela

UTC)

From: penderosa@tds.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:41 AM
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,
Tom Pender

(UTC)

From: Dr.Hendrick Serrie <serriehal@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:50 AM
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.

Dr.Hendrick Serrie

34234

From: Trish Weber <trish.weber@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:52 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Greetings,

I am opposed to the development of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal and hereby request that you deny the permit.

This terminal will serve to exacerbate climate change and introduce unacceptable direct risks to the health and safety of the people of the Pacific Northwest. Oil trains have been involved in many explosions over the past several months and it is not appropriate to construct a large export terminal anywhere, but especially not in a densely populated area such as Vancouver WA.

Furthermore, investing in dirty energy infrastructure precludes an equivalent investment in a clean renewable energy economy, which has been demonstrated to create more jobs and have a greater positive impact on the economy.

Please exercise your authority in safeguarding our communities, our economy, and our planet by denying this permit application.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Cordially,

Patricia J Weber
1730 NW 17th Street
Corvallis OR 97330
541-829-0887

(UTC)

From: Marilyn Gould <marilgould@charter.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:01 AM
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.

Marilyn Gould
702 SE Heron Dr
College Place, WA 99324

UTC)

From: g_dicus@frontier.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:04 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Tesoro Savage Project

Hello - I am writing to express my objections to the Tesoro Savage Project. I believe this project is driven primarily by corporate profit desires, and not by real energy needs. At a time when we should be reducing consumption of fossil fuel energy wherever possible and making real investments in alternative energy sources, this project reflects poor energy planning. In addition, the rail transport of such large quantities of oil and other petroleum products poses a very real threat to numerous communities and high-quality water resources, not to mention its inherent support of environmental degradation at the Alberta oil sands sites. Please embrace the current critical need for careful energy planning and reductions in fossil fuel consumption. Please do not approve the Tesoro Savage Project.

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of James Nielson <james@changemachine.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:11 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 18, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

As a deckhand I attend maritime fuel transfers. As a hazmat tech I clean up industrial accidents. These jobs exist for the simple fact that massive industrial accidents have always happened. And continue to happen. Predictably. It's a multi-billion-dollar industry.

You'd think that all the money spent on cleanup could fix the damage done, but it doesn't. Ever. We mop around until companies have enough PR material, and decide that paying fines makes more sense than paying for cleanup. Then we stop. You'd think it was science, but it's not.
It's accounting.

Feeding-frenzies like Deepwater Horizon or the Davie Crockett may mean million-dollar bonuses for our CEO's, but for the rest of us, these environmental disasters just mean steady work for a while. The rest of the time we're expected to perform heroics like firefighters, for the price of on-call, part-time janitors.

Does Tesoro Savage promise it'll make the whole community rich? Will it be so squeaky clean that we could just grow our sweet-peas right along the pipe? I'm sure they haven't mentioned my industry. We're just their dirty little bastard offspring that they don't admit to.

Sincerely,

Mr. James Nielson
8125 NE Wygant St
Portland, OR 97218-4153

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30632

(UTC) Docket EF-131590

From: john ennis <ennis7@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:15 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)

PLEASE do not consider approving the "pipeline on wheels" project. when moving things by rail it is not a matter of if but when. sooner or later there will be a mistake. I just hope it is not when it is crossing the hundred year old 3/4 mile long bridge over our lake.

thanks for your consideration.

john ennis
sagle, id

UTC)

From: Broadie Copeland <Bnciv@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:41 AM
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.

Broadie Copeland

70816

UTC)

From: Sam Bickel <sambic3637@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:06 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil Terminal at Port of Vancouver Washington

To: Mr. Posner

I oppose the oil term in Vancouver Washington. Vancouver is a small city. Any "spillage" would effect an already fragile environment. The risks far out weight the too few jobs that would be created.

Sincerely
Sam Bickel

(JTC)

From: tripsguy@q.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:58 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: source of oil for proposed Port of Vancouver terminal

It's my understanding that EFSEC will be considering the environmental implications of the proposed oil storage terminal at the Port of Vancouver.

I urge EFSEC to strongly consider how the oil that would be transported to Port of Vancouver is obtained. I'm sure that EFSEC knows that the method hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," is obtained. EFSEC may not be aware of a recent study in the scientific journal *Endocrinology*, which found beyond any doubt that oil secured by fracking contains elevated levels that have been linked to infertility, birth defects and cancer. If this tainted oil is transported to the Port of Vancouver, it would obviously pose a huge health risk to Vancouver and every community it passes through en route.

In view of the above and many other negative factors, EFSEC should not approve the proposed terminal.

Lehman Holder
Vancouver WA

UTC)

From: lkpurchase@q.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:09 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: Kernutt, Matt (ATG); Steinke, Don
Subject: Tesoro Savage

Dear EFSEC,

My family and neighbors wish to bring to your attention this security risk.

If a 120 tanker rail car train, hauling the very explosive Bakken Crude oil were to be derailed under the I-205 Bridge, the span from pier #13 to #14 could be compromised, and may take years to replace. The oil train explosions to date in Canada & Alabama have been reported to have generated flames 300 feet in the air. The I-205 Bridge over the BNSF rail road tracks is roughly 120 feet.

Those of us living on the south side of the tracks would be pinned in with no access to emergency vehicles. Our only escape route would be the Columbia River. Hundreds of beautiful homes, restaurants, hotels, on the south side of the tracks line the Columbia River, for a fifteen mile stretch from Vancouver east to Camas, WA.

River emergency boats now take up to a half hour or more to reach our area. We rely on emergency boats from the Portland, OR area, that have to travel down the Willamette River to Kelly Point Park that feeds into the Columbia River below the city of Vancouver, than up the Columbia River seven miles to our area. Precious time would be lost to help those in need. Where would those in need be taken? Our hospitals happen to be on the north side of the tracks.

Protect the land we were blessed to have, and give us the peace of mind to live without the fear of danger and destruction. We have to trust that those of you in power will think beyond today but for the many generations to come. Will you be the ones that will protect us or destroy us.

Vancouver cities history dates back to the first settlements in the Northwest. Destroying our beautiful waterways, scenic highways, and dozens of lush streams feeding into the Columbia River that makes our area so beautiful is a crime beyond belief. We must think past our own ambitions of money greed and think of where this will lead the future for this prestige northwest city and area along the Columbia River. One spillage into one of our streams that go under the tracks would be irreversible.

Wenonah and Larry Purchase
11929 SE Evergreen Hwy
Vancouver, WA 98683
360-254-5635

From: Steve Schildwachter <spschildwachter@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:10 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.

Steve Schildwachter

34787

UTC)

From: griffin.d.patrick@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:14 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee in Martinez, CA and I have worked in Washington state and I 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. 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,
Griffin Patrick

From: fishesfunhouse@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:37 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,
Mark Fishman

UTC)

From: Pat Hughes <spathughes@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver oil terminal

Sir: I & my wife live in the Salmon Creek area & back up to the green belt of that creek. We bought our home here 19 years ago because of the clean air & water, & the great natural area, with all its wild life. We are directly UP WIND of the proposed oil terminal at the port of Vancouver. I have worked in the oilfields of So. Calif. as a young man, & as a Hazmat Tanker truck driver as an old man. I have observed numerous spills, the results on several explosions, & fires in chemical/oil refineries. I know the dangers of living near hazardous materials.

I urge you to Oppose the Tesoro/Savage Oil transfer facility at this location. There should be no more oil, coal, or chemical pollution to this clean environment!

Sincerely, Stephen P Hughes, 1807 NW 140th circle Vancouver Wa. 98685

(UTC)

From: Michael Snow <michael.p.snow63@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:52 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.

Michael Snow
1111 13th St
Bellingham, WA 98225

From: Norman Albers <nvalbers@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:53 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Re: Thank you for your comments regarding EF-131590, Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal, LLC

The NRDC, last (?) winter or so, wrote on piping tar sands oil, and on shipping coal to East Asia. They were equivocal about coal, given the market's need. The oil gets totally thumbs down.

On 12/18/13, EFSEC (UTC) <EFSEC@utc.wa.gov> wrote:

> Thank you for your comment on the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy
> Distribution Terminal. It is being processed, included in the project
> record, and forwarded to the Council for review. Your contact
> information has been added to the EFSEC mailing list for this project.
> If you choose to unsubscribe from this list please reply to this email
> and we will remove your information.
> Thank you for your interest in the EFSEC process.
> Sincerely
> EFSEC Staff
> www.efsec.wa.gov<<http://www.efsec.wa.gov/>>
>
>

(UTC)

From: kamp999 kamp999 <kamp999@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:57 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Proposed oil terminal at Port of Vancouver

Dear Madam or Sir,

I am opposed to the proposed oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver for the following reasons:

- the danger of derailment during transport, with oil ending up polluting the Columbia River
- the danger of explosion and loss of life (as happened in Quebec in July)
- potential seismic (earthquake) impact on the terminal, if built (this is a very real danger)
- the negative impacts on public water supplies because of the method used in obtaining the oil (hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking") - the chemicals used in fracking have been linked to infertility, birth defects and cancer

These issues, and others that have been stated by citizens opposed to the oil terminal, should be seriously considered, and upon such consideration, permitting for the oil terminal should be DENIED.

Regards,
Kathleen Procter
22402 NE 85 ST
Vancouver, WA. 98682

UTC)

From: Dennise Waldron <2dennw@live.ie>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:59 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.

Dennise Waldron

N/A

UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Desiree Hellegers <desiree.hellegers@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:11 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 18, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

At the outset let me state that I live in Portland and work in Vancouver at Washington State University Vancouver, and I could not be more strenuously opposed to siting the Tesoro oil terminal in Vancouver. One need look no further than the 2013 Lac-Mégantic rail crash, which left the Quebec town looking like a war zone, for evidence of the potentially catastrophic implications of this project for the region. Transforming an area whose magnetic appeal rests on its reputation for "livability" into an export hub for dirty fossil fuels is nothing short of folly. The project is clearly incompatible with long term investments that have been made into developing Vancouver's downtown core and scenic riverfront. Far from enhancing the economic viability of the region, the terminal is far more likely to damage property values, undermine prospective investors who would be lured by the city's "livability," and result in capital flight from the region.

These arguments, however, don't even begin to touch on the environmental threats this project poses to Northwest fisheries all along the Columbia Gorge.

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.

Again, I am strenuously opposed to this project.

Sincerely,
Desiree Hellegers, Ph.D.

Sincerely,

Dr. Desiree Hellegers
4632 NE 16th Ave
Portland, OR 97211-5036
(503) 927-1709

JTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Meredith Martin <mmeskin@gorge.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:11 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 18, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

Whoa! Just when we've been so focused on not having coal trains running through the Gorge, here comes some oil train proposals!

I am absolutely opposed to oil trains coming through the Columbia River Gorge. It is insane to think it is safe to transport this much oil by train. If one train derails, it would be catastrophic to the river and the wildlife in it. Also, as an avid windsurfer, I spend a lot of time in the Columbia River. I can tell you that oil doesn't make a good medium to windsurf on.

Even if all trains safely make it through the area, the extra train traffic would be extremely disruptive to hikers, campers, and general visitors to the area.

In my opinion there is no economic need for this project, and too big of a chance for environmental disaster.

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. Meredith Martin
1401 Cross Creek Ln
Hood River, OR 97031-1370
(541) 386-9517

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30647

Docket EF-131590

(UTC)

From: Julia Hughes <juliakhughes@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:13 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Proposed oil terminal at Port of Vancouver

I am very much opposed to the transport of oil through Vancouver for many reasons the most important being the environmental impact, the health and safety of our residents.

I hope you and the council will recommend to Gov. Inslee that the project will not proceed and the terminal be vetoed.

Sincerely
Julie Hughes

UTC)

From: pcsdpc@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:20 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Proposed oil terminal at Port of Vancouver

Dear Madam or Sir,

I oppose the proposed oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver because:

- the risk of marine pollution from sea transport of oil
- the risk of train derailment during transport, with oil ending up polluting the Columbia River
- the risk of explosion and loss of life
- the risks to public water supplies because of the hydraulic fracking) - the chemicals used in fracking have been linked to infertility, birth defects and cancer

These risks far outweigh the few jobs provided by an oil terminal. Permitting for the oil terminal should be DENIED.

Regards,
David Cannarella
22402 NE 85 ST
Vancouver, WA. 98682

UTC)

From: Mark Leed <markleed02@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:36 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Please consider the following impacts when evaluating the proposed oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver in Vancouver, WA:

- 1) Danger of derailment during transport, with the possibility of oil entering the Columbia River or any other waterway adjacent to the rail route from the point where oil is loaded to the proposed terminal.
- 2) Seismic impacts at the proposed site.
- 3) impacts on public water supplies in the areas where the oil would be obtained by means of hydraulic fracturing.
- 4) potential emissions of volatile organic chemicals from oil storage tanks at the proposed facility, and their impacts on Clark County neighborhoods
- 5) impact on quality of life for residents of the nearby Fruit Valley neighborhood, and of the proposed Vancouver waterfront development
- 6) impact on property values in these same neighborhoods.
- 7) the impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on Washington's oyster industry.
- 8) the project's impact on climate change, This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as from tar sands oil, from cradle to grave.
- 9) 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 and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

Thank you,

Mark Leed
3419 E. 21st St., Unit #4
Vancouver, WA 98661
markleed02@gmail.com

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30650

UTC)

From: Jurgen Hess <hess@gorge.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:25 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Oil shipment proposal

To: Stephen Posner
Interim EFSEC Manager
EFSEC

Dear Mr. Posner,

These are comments regarding the Tesoro Savage proposed oil shipments via trains through the Columbia Gorge, storage at Vancouver, WA and via ships through the lower Columbia River.

The amount of oil proposed to be transported through the Columbia Gorge and lower Columbia River is astronomical—360,000 barrels per day. Here are my concerns:

- There will be train derailments with oil spills. The Gorge has a history of derailments, just look up the number of derailments in the Gorge. At least 1 every 5 years on average in the last 26 years.
- Train derailments will spill oil into fragile aquatic habitats impacting fisheries, invertebrate species, riparian plants and dependent wildlife.
- Tesoro has a lousy record of safety with \$2.4 million in fines for safety violations.
- Train engines and ships spew out emissions and carbon particulates creating climate change impacts. Air quality in the Columbia Gorge is a major concern, how will emissions be controlled?
- Trains will travel through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I was the Secretary of Agriculture's appointee to the Gorge Commission charged with protecting and preserving the Gorge's natural, scenic, cultural, recreation and economic resources. As a former member of that Commission I am very concerned with impacts to the Scenic Area, particularly cumulative impacts on air quality and climate change and impacts to aquatic resources from oil spills.
- Impact assessment must be done by including the cumulative impacts of proposed coal train travelling through the Gorge.
- Assess impacts from ocean going ships through the lower Columbia River waterway. Potential impacts in this area include diesel emissions, ships running aground and collisions with resultant oil spills, the need to increase the frequency of channel dredging by adding more ocean going ships with deep drafts, noise and air pollution from ships on adjacent wildlife sanctuaries.

I am very concerned with this proposal. SEPA studies must include all of the assessments that I have described above.

Thank you for considering my comments.

PS....even though I am not a resident of Washington, I live on the Columbia River. Impacts on the Columbia River will know no boundaries.

Jurgen

Jurgen A. Hess
412 24th Street
Hood River, OR 97031
541.645.0720 hess@gorge.net

(UTC)

From: frank.t.marino@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:27 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,
Frank Marino

(UTC)

From: Michael Hall <micahall1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:39 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Please stop this madness!

Below is this morning's "Tainted water at fracking sites" article from The Oregonian. Who could want such poisonous stuff coming down the Gorge? Please stop this madness!

Thank you, Michael Hall

The Oregonian, 12/18/13, pg. A4

Tainted water at fracking sites

WASHINGTON — Water samples collected at Colorado sites where hydraulic fracturing was used to extract natural gas show the presence of chemicals that have been linked to infertility, birth defects and cancer, scientists reported Monday.

The study, published in the journal *Endocrinology*, also found elevated levels of the hormone-disrupting chemicals in the Colorado River, where wastewater released during accidental spills at nearby wells could wind up.

Tests of water from sites with no fracking activity also revealed the presence of so-called endocrine-disrupting chemicals, or EDCs. But the levels from these control sites were lower than in places with direct links to fracking, the study found.

"With fracking on the rise, populations may face greater health risks from increased endocrine-disrupting chemical exposure," said senior author Susan Nagel, who investigates the health effects of estrogen at the University of Missouri School of Medicine.

Fracking involves injecting millions of gallons of chemical-laced water and sand deep underground to crack shale formations and unlock oil and gas. The process is exempt from some regulations that are part of the Safe Drinking Water Act, and energy companies do not have to disclose the chemicals they use if they consider that information a trade secret.

The study was published as the Energy Information Administration issued a forecast that natural gas production would continue to rise, and gas would overtake coal as the United States' main source of fuel for power plants. The fact that the domestic boom in oil and gas is driven by fracking has made discussions of its impact extremely fraught.

Nagel and her colleagues tested samples of surface water and groundwater from Garfield County, Colo., which, with its approximately 10,000 wells, is a center of oil and gas development driven by fracking. The research team gathered water samples at five natural gas sites where spills of fracking wastewater had occurred.

From: Patrick Inwegen <pvaninwegen@whitworth.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:51 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 also urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities.

That said, I also strongly implore you to not be so narrowly focused that you miss the big picture. We can't keep burning fossil fuels at the rate we are currently. Making it easier and cheaper to do so by building this new terminal only makes it that much more difficult to wean the world off of fossil fuels. We can't knowingly do the things that we know will come back to haunt us very soon. Ultimately, the function of government is to be aware of these things and protect us from ourselves. If you fail in this capacity, you have failed in your reason for existing.
Thank you.

Patrick Inwegen
607 W. Cleveland Ave
Spokane, WA 99205

(UTC)

From: Leigh McKeirnan <lmckeirnan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:53 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Coal in the Northwest

Even China is looking for alternatives for coal. Some chinese friends in Portland who work for Intel said none of their friends are returning to china because of the pollution. And even worse it would be transported along the Columbia River...think of the damage with one derailment...and there is always one..Not to mention that thin layer that's left protecting the earth....tell me you are educated people who won't be bought off please....Leigh McKeirnan...

Wildlife Watchers of America said Washington's biggest asset even over the timber industry is tourism....you can kiss that goodbye if coal comes in.

(UTC)

From: James Day <jamesday99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

Reader: as an employee of the state of Washington last year I spent many hours observing train operations along the Columbia gorge from Plymouth to Bonneville. I am very concerned about the use of this public right of way for coal and oil freight. I have observed trains traveling both directions on the single track, while opposing trains wait on sidings. This rail line is at or beyond safe capacity leaving little time for maintenance crews to work on those same tracks.

The Amtrak trains along this corridor are also very difficult to use since they receive the lowest priority and are often many hours late due to freight traffic. It is hard to imagine that Amtrak passenger service will be possible at all if the number of trains in daily use in this area is increased. As a public resource has Amtrak taken a position on the impact of coal and oil trains on its service? This would undoubtedly impact Amtrak service on the main north south corridor as well. I would suggest that someone should confirm what Amtrak's position is on coal and oil trains!!

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.

James Day
865 high prairie rd
202
Lyle, WA 98635

UTC)

From: Carol <carolellisspokane@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:02 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC); Kernutt, Matt (ATG); Carol
Subject: rail bridge accidents

By no means is the Wikipedia list I've compiled exhaustive. Today when I quickly googled rail bridge accidents I came across 3 on the first page not even on the Wikipedia list; the 5/25/13 MO bridge collapse was the only one on the first page already on my prior list. Extrapolating one may assume many other bridge accidents are not on my first lists.

7/4/12 - Glenview, IL - railroad bridge collapses due to "extreme heat" of rails. 2 die.

5/19/13 - Colorado River bridge, TX - fire first day, collapse second day. Fire fighters unable to squelch fire.

6/2/13 - Sudbury, Ontario - trestle broke, maybe due to a wheel bearing failure. 3 or more cars in river.

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30657

Docket EF-131590

UTC)

From: Kris Bishop <bsslap75@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:21 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil plant

Im opposed to an oil plant in vancouver i think its unsafe for the people who live and work in the are. Also it could have some impacts on the enviorment please do not build this plant for our health and the safty to our enviorment

Thank you

Kris Bishop

(UTC)

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:19 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because I am convinced that another degree C of warming will be catastrophic. We cannot enable the continued consumption of petroleum fuels.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30659

Docket EF-131590
(UTC)

From: Claudette Longoria <calongoria@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:40 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil trains

To Whom It May Concern;

I am adamantly opposed to the transportation of oil by rail. A prime example is what happened in Quebec. My concern is the pollution of a spill to any aquifer along the train route.

And I do vote!

Claudette A Longoria

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30660

UTC)

From: Sandy Polishuk <polishuk@easystreet.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: comment on the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner,

I write to ask the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to deny the permit for the Tesoro Sabage Vancouver Oil Terminal for a number of reasons.

Perhaps the most important is that we must stop enabling the increase in carbon fuels at a time when not doing so is committing mass suicide of our species via climate disruptions. I do not rely upon that reason exclusively as I know that reason will not be seen as specific enough to this project.

Then let me say that transporting crude oil by rail is risky business as we know from what happened in Lac Megantic. Everyone always assures us that their project will be safe but accidents happening is a rule of life. The terminal can rightly be denied on safety grounds especially given Tesoro Savage's safety record. They lack credibility and we the public just say "NO" to them.

In addition to the risk of moving this oil by rail, once it is shipped from the terminal the potential tragedy of a marine spill is too much to risk as well. Even one spill would spoil our beautiful Pacific NW. I am not only concerned about the beauty, of course, but of our natural resources, the ocean as habitat. Many species that would be endangered are listed under the Endangered Species Act. That fact alone should be enough to say NO to this project.

Then there is the adverse effect on the air and water quality of the region.

Common sense and science both tell us this is not a project for the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to ratify.

Sincerely,
Sandy Polishuk
1610 NE Tillamook St., Apt. 3
Portland, Oregon 97212
USA

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Oil Vancouver

To EFSEC
Regarding the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal
Attention Tami

Tami, I assume that you and your associates have created a chart and are entering tally marks for each concern mentioned.

For the life of me, I can't think of a concise column heading to use for the concern I'd like addressed.

Here is that concern:

The major auto makers already have 22 plug-in hybrids and all-electric vehicles that exceed 80 MPGe. If the oil terminal is built, how will that impact people's incentive to buy those alternatives?

Don Steinke
POB 822393
Vancouver, WA 98682
360 892 1589

(UTC)

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

- To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because of the threat of oil spills to Columbia River salmon. This toxic petroleum should not be allowed near the Columbia. Of the recent known oil spills: Valdez, Deep Water Horizon, Kalamazoo, Mayflower Arkansas, none have been effectively cleaned up. Especially with respect to fish and other water life. A spill of crude oil into the Columbia or adjacent watershed is a risk to salmon that cannot be balanced or compensated.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

UTC)

From: Kris Bishop <bsslap75@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:21 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil plant

Im opposed to an oil plant in vancouver i think its unsafe for the people who live and work in the are. Also it could have some impacts on the enviornment please do not build this plant for our health and the safty to our enviornment

Thank you

Kris Bishop

(UTC)

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:19 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because I am convinced that another degree C of warming will be catastrophic. We cannot enable the continued consumption of petroleum fuels.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

JTC)

From: Claudette Longoria <calongoria@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:40 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil trains

To Whom It May Concern;

I am adamantly opposed to the transportation of oil by rail. A prime example is what happened in Quebec. My concern is the pollution of a spill to any aquifer along the train route.

And I do vote!

Claudette A Longoria

From: Sandy Polishuk <polishuk@easystreet.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: comment on the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner,

I write to ask the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to deny the permit for the Tesoro Sabage Vancouver Oil Terminal for a number of reasons.

Perhaps the most important is that we must stop enabling the increase in carbon fuels at a time when not doing so is committing mass suicide of our species via climate disruptions. I do not rely upon that reason exclusively as I know that reason will not be seen as specific enough to this project.

Then let me say that transporting crude oil by rail is risky business as we know from what happened in Lac Megantic. Everyone always assures us that their project will be safe but accidents happening is a rule of life. The terminal can rightly be denied on safety grounds especially given Tesoro Savage's safety record. They lack credibility and we the public just say "NO" to them.

In addition to the risk of moving this oil by rail, once it is shipped from the terminal the potential tragedy of a marine spill is too much to risk as well. Even one spill would spoil our beautiful Pacific NW. I am not only concerned about the beauty, of course, but of our natural resources, the ocean as habitat. Many species that would be endangered are listed under the Endangered Species Act. That fact alone should be enough to say NO to this project.

Then there is the adverse effect on the air and water quality of the region.

Common sense and science both tell us this is not a project for the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to ratify.

Sincerely,
Sandy Polishuk
1610 NE Tillamook St., Apt. 3
Portland, Oregon 97212
USA

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30667

Docket EF-131590

UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Oil Vancouver

To EFSEC
Regarding the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal
Attention Tami

Tami, I assume that you and your associates have created a chart and are entering tally marks for each concern mentioned.

For the life of me, I can't think of a concise column heading to use for the concern I'd like addressed.

Here is that concern:

The major auto makers already have 22 plug-in hybrids and all-electric vehicles that exceed 80 MPGe. If the oil terminal is built, how will that impact people's incentive to buy those alternatives?

Don Steinke
POB 822393
Vancouver, WA 98682
360 892 1589

JTC)

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

- To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because of the threat of oil spills to Columbia River salmon. This toxic petroleum should not be allowed near the Columbia. Of the recent known oil spills: Valdez, Deep Water Horizon, Kalamazoo, Mayflower Arkansas, none have been effectively cleaned up. Especially with respect to fish and other water life. A spill of crude oil into the Columbia or adjacent watershed is a risk to salmon that cannot be balanced or compensated.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

UTC)

From: Joan Enslin <jjcamano@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:34 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.

Joan Enslin
1320 Beach Drive
Camano Island, WA 98282

(UTC)

From: Benton Elliott <benton.elliott@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:41 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Public Comment: Tesoro Savage Proposal

I am writing in opposition to the Tesoro Savage project for the reasons outlined below, and urge EFSEC and Governor Inslee to refuse it as bad for citizens and the environment.

- Tesoro Savage proposes transporting 360,000 barrels of crude oil along the Columbia River by rail and then ships. This would involve at least four, mile-and-a-half long trains every day. We're talking about roughly half the amount of oil proposed in the controversial Keystone XL project.
- The terminal would receive oil, or any other petroleum product, via trains passing through downtown Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, the City of Vancouver, and other cities on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail line.
- This project is so big that Governor Inslee will make the final decision to deny or approve the terminal. The Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) will make a recommendation to the Governor.

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30671

(UTC)

From: patricia o'shea <patricia.oshea@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Please stop the Tesoro Salvage Energy Distribution Project

I oppose this gigantic oil transfer project for several reasons. Trains carrying crude run on diesel and spew pollution into the environment all along their run. As a person with lung issues called reactive airway disease, I am hypersensitive to hydrocarbon pollutants, and particulate matter.

We know this project would increase air pollution, hurt people with asthma, emphysema and lung diseases of all kinds. Recent research at the Harvard School of Public Health has shown linkage between diesel pollution and the development of autism and children. This major report was published first in June 2013. Do we really want to poison the brains of the next generation?

The Columbia Gorge is a national treasure. It is one of the most beautiful places in the world. I say this after having lived in a number of countries.

Economics. There is a thriving tourist industry on both banks of the Columbia in Washington and in Oregon. Very close to the tracks. These bed-and-breakfasts, hotels, restaurants, hiking sailing and so on facilities would be adversely affected by oil trains. Noise pollution, dirt. Not appetizing for tourists. Long trains also would slow down the response time for medical emergencies because crossing the tracks would be a problematic issue in a number of communities. Then how about the possibility of train derailments? Big environmental messes are still being resolved in Canada and Alabama after major oil train derailments this very year. Let alone loss of innocent life.

We must be good stewards of our land and rivers and the animals that inhabit it. I ask you what would an oil spill do to the Columbia River and the precious salmon runs?

I know you know already about global warming. Every community needs to do their part to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. If Washington wants to be a leader in environmental awareness and responsibility, how could you possibly allow this kind of dangerous project to develop?

Thank you for the consideration of my thoughts.

Sincerely yours,

Patricia O'Shea

JTC)

From: tndgardens@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Citizen Comments - Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver, WA

Thousands of people are in our unique national scenic area, the Columbia River Gorge, every day for a variety of reasons. The Gorge and its resources are a major economic driver of the region. People use the Gorge for, for example:

- * water sports - wind surfing, kite boarding, waterskiing, boating
- * outstanding scenery, views, endemic species, wildflowers, and thus hiking, photography, biking, sightseeing
- * fishing - salmon runs are an important source of revenue as are sturgeon.
- * the Gorge is a major east-west corridor and there are several small communities stretched along the river, i.e., along the railroad tracks
- * native Americans have unique fishing rights in the Columbia River.

All this will be put in jeopardy if there should be an oil spill or explosive fire from crude oil trains passing through the area en route to the terminal in Vancouver. The Gorge has many hazards, among them:

- * landslides, for example, Wind Mountain is known for its slides and slumps that sometimes overwhelm the tracks
- * earthquakes - the Northwest is in an earthquake prone zone
- * a build-up of coal dust on the tracks from existing coal rail traffic; plus, two more coal terminals are proposed for Bellingham (18 trains/day) and Longview (16 trains/day)
- * accident - for example, car/truck collisions at one of the many at grade crossings in the Gorge or with large animals such as deer or elk
- * general soil failure, where a portion of the fill material under the tracks, the alluvial soil, or steep slope adjacent to the tracks fails and slips. This is evidenced by numerous slumps visible on the pavement of Highway 14
- * the added risk of using outdated rail cars (the T-111 and T-111A cars that the Association of American Railroads has called for replacing) instead of newer, safer ones.

In the EIS please consider the necessary safety and security steps this project will have to take to address each of these hazards adequately and protect our amazing environment and the lives of so many people.

Thank you.

Diana L. Gordon
642 I Street
Washougal, WA 98671
360-835-7748
tndgardens@comcast.net

December 18, 2013

(UTC)

From: patricia o'shea <patricia.oshea@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:58 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: NO to the Tesoro Project

Hi Mr. Posner,

I just wrote you a rather long note on my deep opposition to this this energy distribution project .

If you want to know I am legitimate, please note my name is Patricia O'Shea. I live at 4122 N. East Hazelfern Pl., Portland, OR 97232. I have a brother Carbery O'Shea and Janet O'Shea his wife who live Redmond WA. Along with another household of Mary Kay and Michael O'Shea also living in Redmond. We also have Brian O'Shea living in Seattle. We are all opposed! Very opposed.

Sincerely,

Patricia O'Shea

Sent from my iPad

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern: Dwindling reserves and National Security

Oil is a precious resource and is not renewable. When the cheap supplies are gone, we'll wish we had made more of an effort to switch to alternatives and choose more efficient cars.

How will our National Security be affected long term, by dwindling reserves?

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

UTC)

From: jrgauer@nalco.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:11 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,
Jason Gauer

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30676

UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:14 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern: Energy Independence not

Last week, the Wall Street Journal reported that EXXON is seeking to export American Oil.

The proposed Tesoro Savage oil terminal is not about energy independence, it is about making money as fast as possible. Tesoro will sell the oil wherever the price is highest.

Please prepare a study regarding how we will obtain energy independence if we use up our oil as fast as possible.

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

JTC)

From: tndgardens@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:16 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Citizen Comments - Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver, WA

While I do NOT see a terrorist or arsonist under every rock, the passage of trains full of crude oil bound for the proposed oil terminal in Vancouver, Washington, poses a threat of oil spill or explosive fire. Here are a few places close to home that I prefer a terrorist not place an IED:

- * under the I-5 Bridge in Vancouver, the Bridge of the Gods and other bridges over the Columbia and its tributaries like the Washougal River
(I assume the 205 Bridge in Vancouver could withstand an explosion.)
- * near any of the numerous downtown areas in small communities along the Gorge and therefor along the tracks
- * in the Camas Paper Mill (the track actually goes through the mill yard - lots of combustible material around)
- * anywhere near Bonneville Dam or the Hanford Nuclear Reservation or power plant
- * in the Steigerwald National Wildlife Refuge in Washougal, Franz Lake Refuge, Beacon Rock State Park, Catherine Creek Nature Reserve, forested areas along the Gorge, etc. (In 2012, we lost 47 acres of Steigerwald to a wildfire - it was an exceptionally dry year and we have had several fires in the Gorge in the last few years)
- * in Vancouver itself, especially near the terminal.

In the EIS please study the need for security in areas other than just the Port of Vancouver. If someone wanted to make mischief, a train composed of outdated rail cars (T-111 and T-111A that the Association of American Railroads has recommended replacing) carrying a highly volatile cargo could be a tempting target.

Thank you.

Diana L. Gordon

December 18, 2013

642 I Street
Washougal, WA 98671
360-835-7748
tndgardens@comccast.net

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30678

UTC)

From: Christine Hart <christine.el.hart@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:21 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Oil Terminal

Concerning the Tesoro-Savage Oil Terminal proposed in Vancouver, WA,

An environmental assessment would demonstrate high risk for chronic and sustained bio-accumulation of petrochemicals in the Columbia River Gorge, via water contamination, and air pollution. In 1996, the results of the National Human Adipose Tissue Survey showed nearly the whole population exhibited measurable amounts of carcinogenic petro-based chemicals like benzene, styrene, and toluene.

To grant the permit for this oil terminal in Vancouver is to pollute the Columbia River Gorge and to Pollute Our Body and Our Health.

There is a Roman adage, "If touch all, all must agree."

This is a risk the communities - the people who live in the gorge - do not consent to.

NO to the Vancouver Oil Terminal.

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30679

UTC)

From: michael.j.madden@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:25 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,
Michael Madden

UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:36 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern 1: Shipwrecks in the Columbia, and along the Northwest coast

Imagine the Exxon Valdez type of accident along the Oregon and Washington Coasts or in the Columbia River. Accidents happen.

Concern 2: Landslides, derailments, and the salmon industry

My Coast Guard friends say that one train derailment in the Columbia Watershed could wipe out our salmon industry for decades. What are the chances of a landslide over the tracks and derailment of an oil train?

Concern 3: Forest Fires in the Skamania County

Bakken Oil is more explosive than regular crude. Sensors fail, and wheel bearings on rail cars over heat. What is the risk of a forest fire in Skamania County?

Concern 4: Water and land impacts of the fracking industry in the Bakken Formation.

I asked my friends working for a non-profit called *Food and Water Watch*: Why are you opposed to fracking? She told me "It jeopardizes the water supply of America."

Concern 5: Do the benefits of the oil terminal outweigh the risks?

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

UTC)

From: tndgardens@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Citizen Comments - Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver, WA

The proposed oil terminal at Vancouver, Washington, would bring at least four 1 and 1/2 mile long trains a day down the Columbia Gorge, along with many problems and more potential problems.

To start with, local communities, according to recently revealed rulings, would be financially liable for overpasses and up-graded crossings for the increased rail traffic. Towns that could not afford these upgrades, would have limited access to areas these trains would cut off for vehicles such as fire and ambulance. Some businesses would be cut off from potential customers every time a train would come through. Also, diesel exhaust from these trains would add more pollution.

All along the route these trains would travel, including the Columbia River Gorge, the possibility of a derailment and explosive fire such as in Lac Megantic, Quebec, Canada, or in Alabama in November, 2013 exists. Vancouver, Bonneville Dam, and the I-5 Bridge are just a few examples of towns, dams, and bridges these trains would pass through and by, putting them in peril, as well as the oil terminal itself.

Please include these concerns in your EIS.

Thank you.

Thomas N. Gordon
642 I Street
Washougal, Washington 98671
360 - 835 - 7748
tndgardens@comcast.net

December 18, 2013

(UTC)

From: Bunny & Ray Witter <bwit555@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:47 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil terminal in the Port of Vancouver

Dear EFSEC,

I am writing to express a comment regarding the proposed oil terminal in the Port of Vancouver, Washington.

I oppose this project for many reasons. Primarily because the economic benefit does not in any way justify the hazard created by handling dangerous crude oil in our community or along the rail travel route to get here. A derailment during transit would be very serious, possibly polluting major rivers and streams such as the Columbia and leading to loss of life. The location of this terminal is subject to major damage in case we have a major earthquake which could result in the release of the oil stored in the Port of Vancouver. Even though the railroad claims they are a very safe way to transport, just one accident could be catastrophic. The consequences are so serious that it doesn't justify the risk.

Please do not allow this terminal to be built in the Port of Vancouver or anywhere for that matter.

Raymond L. Witter

1407 SE 196th Ave

Camas, Washington 98607

(UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:50 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro savage vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern a: Lack of transparency

The oil industry has a history of obfuscation. When a pipeline leaked 1.1 million gallons of diluted bitumen aka dilbit into the Kalamazoo River in 2010 it allowed the clean-up team to think that all the oil had been cleaned up, when in truth, there were more than one million gallons of heavy tar sands crude which were submerged out of sight and drifting downstream during flood stage. Bakken crude floats, but dilbit sinks after the solvents evaporate.

Concern b: Oil barges are not regulated as carefully as tanker ships.

Concern c: Oil trains are less regulated than oil pipelines.

Concern d: Emergency response plans are vague, inadequate, and unfunded.

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

(UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:58 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro savage vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern: Insurance coverage and financial responsibility
How adequate is the insurance coverage in the event of each of the potential disasters.

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

(UTC)

From: Susan Monson <semonson@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 5:00 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal

As a life long resident of Portland, Oregon I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding the potentially disastrous effects that could occur if a thorough study is not undertaken on the proposed Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal.

At a minimum the following impacts should be scoped:

What will be the impacts on human health along this corridor and in North Dakota where fracking is known to poison water supplies.

How will this affect animal species along the corridor What will be the costs to taxpayers to develop the terminal or pay for environmental "accidents".

How will this in its entirety affect climate change.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Susan Monson

UTC)

From: Carol <carolellispokane@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 5:02 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC); Kernutt, Matt (ATG); Carol
Subject: aquifer, stream, lake, river maps

I ask you to map comprehensively all the proposed rail routes for trains carrying oil and coal in Washington, starting with the south end of Lake Pend Oreille where the Spokane sole source aquifer begins. Please map how many trestles and bridges are on the routes, their length and elevation, their material structure, their age, and the maintenance that has been performed, when, how much, and what the future maintenance schedules are. You will need cooperation from all rail companies involved.

Then when you see the immense numbers of water sources that are affected on these proposed routes, ask how often you will be able to control these natural causes of derailments and bridge failure: heat, fire, freezing, flood, downpour, tornado.

Then ask how many times you can prevent or predict electronic mishaps, ball bearing failure, kinks, inadequate maintenance, human error (speed, missing a signal, poor judgment).

Now add the collisions, runaways, and rail crossing problems. We haven't counted where and how evacuations would be difficult to do in a timely way.

Keep Washington green! Do get all risks mapped! Involve a statistician! Use scientific data and methods. You will see that the risks are horrendous.

Thabk-you, Carol Ellis

(UTC)

From: Eric Strid <ericwstrid@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 5:29 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.

Eric Strid
545 Waubish
White Salmon, WA 98672

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30688

JTC)

From: Melissa Ropke <mropke@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 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.

Melissa Ropke
4118 Greenwood N
Seattle, WA 98103

UTC)

From: Lauren Patrick <krishnagalatea@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 7:41 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.

Lauren Patrick

54403

UTC)

From: mkk <mkkrygier@spiritone.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:35 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage oil-by-train poposal

12-18-13

To the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council,

As a citizen of Vancouver, WA, a teacher, a mother, and a grandmother, I have been appalled by the proposed Tesoro Savage oil- by-train and oil transfer terminal, which would include oil holding tanks, at the Vancouver Port.

The increased toxic diesel pollution would add to cancers, asthma, and respiratory and cardiac conditions, when people breathe diesel particulate matter, especially children. Traffic congestion and emergency access would be daily perils. The spills, derailments, and fiery explosions that have more and more frequently taken place have alerted everyone of the danger of shipping this oil.

The Tesoro Savage reporting and cleanup record has shown a lack of integrity.

The consequences of burning fossil fuels are already manifesting as ocean acidification, causing loss of fisheries and shellfish. Rapid increase of glaciers melting means loss of drinking water and irrigation for agriculture. Warmer oceans result in severe storms, causing losses of life, homes and property, as well as habitat.

Hydraulic fracturing is despoiling agricultural land and precious aquifers. The oil should be left in the ground! The move to clean renewable energy is advancing quickly. Washington municipalities are leasing and promoting electric cars. This is the way we need to go, along with conservation, to protect our planet, our health, and the health of plants, animals, and habitats.

The Teamsters union doesn't want to deal with this oil, and citizens don't want this dangerous Bakken oil. Citizens have shown their opposition to the entire proposal.

I urge you to study all aspects of this proposed project, from the environmental and health impacts to humans, plants, and animals, to the extraction by hydraulic fracturing, to shipping the dirty and dangerously explosive oil along the Columbia River, through towns and cities, and through Vancouver, to the proposed holding tanks and transfer to ships that would carry it on the Columbia. Please remember the port land is prone to liquifaction in the event of the Cascadia subduction zone earthquake. Please do a thorough study of all aspects of the impacts of this proposal, as so many citizens, and the City of Vancouver have requested.

Thank you,

Mary Kathryn Krygier

UTC)

From: Scott Rankin <scott_d_rankin@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:41 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.

Put simply - with the impacts of climate change already being felt, with even more severe consequences almost certain in years ahead, it is insane to even consider proposals that burn or transport more coal. I urge you to reject the Tesoro Savage project.

Thank you.

Scott Rankin
4724 SW Dawson St.
Seattle, WA 98136

UTC)

From: lisbudd@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:56 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,
Lisa Coates

(TC)

From: Betsy Phinney <betsyphin@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:14 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: oil terminal

To whom it may concern:

I would like to clearly state my opposition to the oil terminal project in Vancouver, Washington. I believe it is a danger to the environment and to human health in the entire Northwest Region. Thank you for hearing my comment.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Phinney
4900 NW Cherry St.
Vancouver, WA 98663
509-599-5128

UTC)

From: Peter Williams <williamspg@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:05 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil terminal proposal

To Whom It May Concern:

I am very opposed to the placement of an oil terminal in Vancouver, Washington. It will threaten the environment and the quality of life of the region. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Peter G. Williams, Ph.D.
4900 NW Cherry St.
Vancouver, WA 98663
(509) 879-6170

(UTC)

From: Jane Fritz <janefritz@frontier.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:23 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Crude oil transit terminal

Dear Gentle People,

I'm writing in opposition to the proposed Tesoro/Savage crude oil transit terminal at the Port of Vancouver. Although I don't live in Washington, I do live and work along the rail line in Idaho that would provide transport for the oil from North Dakota to Washington's coast. I also work as an oral historian and writer with the Kalispel Tribe of Indians, and although I cannot speak for them, I'm sure they have concerns about this project as well.

As the author of the popular recreation guide, *Legendary Lake Pend Oreille: Idaho's Wilderness of Water*, I understand the importance and vulnerability of our premier water resource. Although it is the economic engine for the Sandpoint area and its natural resource industries and recreational tourism, it is life itself for a myriad number of non-human species. Our watershed is too precious to risk to an oil spill from four, 1 1/2 mile long trains traveling through on tracks that were not meant to haul such dangerous cargo. I used to live above the rail line in Hope, Idaho, and I can tell you that in far too many places, a derailment would be devastating to our lake. This project must be nipped in the bud. During the 19th century when these rail lines were built, it was not with the idea of transporting life-threatening substances that could destroy whole ecosystems and communities. But that's what we have here with this dangerous proposal.

Please inform Governor Inslee that there is too great a risk — even with the promise of jobs and tax support — from such a project. Please ask him not to approve it.

Thank you for consideration.

Sincerely,
Jane Fritz

Writer/producer
AudioPress
PO Box 2418
Sandpoint, ID 83864
208-448-4069
janefritz@frontier.com

JTC)

From: Susan Stout <spstout@telus.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:44 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.

Susan Stout

v7g1v2

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Barbara O'Steen <barbarajosteen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 8:52 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. Barbara O'Steen
4364 SW Cloverdale St
Seattle, WA 98136-2406

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jan Ellis <janellis16@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:52 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. Jan Ellis
1218 115th Street Ct NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98332-9638
(253) 858-8414

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Barbara Snapp <araby1957@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 9:52 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,

Mrs. Barbara Snapp
3040 71st Ave SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040-2615
(206) 232-7388

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Felicia Dale
<felicia@pintndale.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 19, 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. Felicia Dale
321 Avenue G
Snohomish, WA 98290-2625
(206) 295-9388