

Talburt, Tammy (UTC)

From: Ann Donnelly <adonnelly7@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 7:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil Terminal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

I am writing in support of the oil terminal. The energy industry has changed dramatically in the past five years, during which the U.S. has become the world's largest producer of oil plus gas (surpassing Russia this year). Within the next five years, facilities will be built throughout North America to carry this new valuable production to markets all over the world. The Port of Vancouver can either be part of the new dynamic economy or it can watch the opportunities move to other ports, such as the Port of St. James in Louisiana, already a major hub for pipelines, storage facilities, railroads, and processing and refining plants. The Port of Vancouver is competing with sites all over the country for this long-term source of revenue. The more that we appear to waver, the more developers will incline toward their other alternatives, whether in British Columbia, Louisiana, Texas, or any number of other locations.

The question is, do we want a long-term source of income for our Port, or will we be satisfied to sit by and watch other locations win out? Time is of the essence.

Ann T. Donnelly, Ph.D.
4305 Oregon Drive
Vancouver WA 98661
adonnelly7@comcast.net
360.921.1281(mobile)

Talburt, Tammy (UTC)

From: Kirk VanGelder <vandad12@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 05, 2013 10:00 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver oil terminal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

To whom it may concern,

We are in favor of building a safe and well designed oil terminal in our community. As long as reasonable best practices are taken, we are in full support of this. It stands to bring in a fair amount of economic activity that will benefit our community.

Please allow it to go forward!

Very sincerely,

Kirk & Jodi VanGelder
Vancouver, Wa 98682

Talbert, Tammy (UTC)

From: Andrea Nelms <anelms9@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 06, 2013 8:50 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver oil terminal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

Hello,

I oppose locating an oil terminal at Vancouver and routing the oil through Vancouver. The potential for environmental destruction is too great. The substance being shipped is extremely dirty and subject to explosion. The harm a spill or explosion would cause greatly outweighs the financial advantages that will go to a few.

Thank you.

Andrea Nelms



RECEIVED

OCT 08 2013

**ENERGY FACILITY SITE
EVALUATION COUNCIL**

Docket EF-131590

October 4, 2013

Ms. Bumpus:

We are representatives of Spokane as elected City Council members, but we are writing today as concerned citizens of the City of Spokane. We are requesting that EFSEC host a public informational hearing in Spokane, Washington to inform citizens about the Tesoro/Savage Crude-by-Rail terminal, proposed for the Port of Vancouver.

Over the last twelve months, we have each individually gone on record during two separate public scoping hearings for proposed coal export terminals in western Washington, raising concerns about the potential negative impacts of increasing coal by rail shipments through Spokane.

Before we got to those public hearings, we used our positions as leaders in the Spokane community to call on state and federal regulatory agencies to host the aforementioned public hearings in Spokane. We felt then, and continue to believe it important for information to be shared to citizens of Spokane, and for there to be a venue for citizens to raise concerns. While we understand this is a separate project, not connected to the coal export projects, we cannot ignore the similarities in the concerns.

The terminal itself would be sited in Vancouver, Washington, however, citizens of the Spokane stand to bear significant adverse impacts resulting from increased rail traffic carrying crude oil to the proposed terminal.

The Tesoro/Savage proposal contemplates transferring up to 360,000 barrels per day of crude oil from rail lines to marine vessels at the proposed site in Vancouver. The company's application to EFSEC states that on average four trains per day will arrive at the terminal, meaning an additional 8 trains per day (traveling to and from) will cut through Spokane on the rail lines.

As alluded to earlier, Spokane is already likely to face negative impacts from increased rail traffic due to the coal export terminals proposed in Cherry Point and Longview, Washington, as well as the Port of Morrow terminal proposed for Boardman, Oregon.

The public hearing concerning the Cherry Point coal export terminal, held last December at the Spokane County Fairgrounds drew over 800 people, and the public hearing concerning the Longview coal export terminal, held on September 25, 2013 at the Spokane Convention Center, drew over 400 people. The majority of those in attendance at each hearing spoke in opposition to the projects and raised concerns about impacts to public health, the environment, traffic congestion, emergency response being delayed, an increase in the likelihood of accidents, rail infrastructure impacts and the costs associated with the projects.



SPOKANE CITY COUNCIL
808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane, WA 99201-3335
(509) 625-6255

For this proposed project in Vancouver, our concerns mirror those addressed in the coal export discussion, and can be summed up by simply stating that the City of Spokane would be negatively impacted by an increase in crude oil shipments via trains through Spokane, and the best people to bring up those concerns are those living in Spokane, not those attending public meetings in or near Vancouver, Washington.

EFSEC's own rules only require a public informational hearing "in the general proximity of the proposed project," WAC 463-26-025, yet it is our understanding that EFSEC intends to include a discussion of scoping for the project pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) during the public informational hearing near the end of October. The purposes of SEPA are to encourage harmony between humankind and the environment, prevent or eliminate damage to the environment, stimulate the health and welfare of human beings, and enrich understanding of the natural resources important to the state and nation. See RCW 43.21C.010. Consistent with these purposes, EFSEC should provide the citizens of Spokane an opportunity to weigh in on the Tesoro/Savage Crude-by-Rail proposal.

Sincerely,

Ben Stuckart
Council President

Jon Snyder
Councilmember

Amber Waldref
Councilmember

Talbur, Tammy (UTC)

From: wjhsgh355@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 3:53 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Attention: Stephen Posner

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

EFSEC@UTC.WA.GOV Attention: Stephen Posner

From: W.J. Hudson (360)573-7121

As we discussed on the telephone on October 9, 2013:

I called Annette Cleveland, via Hot-Line, regarding Teroso-Savage oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver. She, in turn, asked Alex Swanson, on the Board of Commissioners, to contact me and he referred me to you at EFSEC.

At a Teroso-Savage meeting on September 30, 2013; I asked that, because of the volatility of the fracking crude, I questioned the use of the 111 and 111A tank cars that are known to fail in accidents. The 112 and 114 tank cars, with head shields, have a good safety record. The response from Table 2, was that the 111 and 111A are approved by DOT. I asked another man at Table 2 what Comprehensive Security plan is in place to protect this 43 acre facility. He answered that the Port will handle security, they have fences and cameras. I commented about the Teroso-Savage emphasis on security and especially with the volatility of fracking crude contained in the 6 storage tanks containing 2.5 million barrels and 380,000 barrels delivered daily, shouldn't they have a heightened concern for security. It would seem that in the construction plans to match the state-of-the-art facility there would be a state-of-the-art security system to protect against terrorism and other acts and the safety of the residents of Vancouver. Hopefully, the EFSEC will consider these issues in the investigations and deliberations in approving, or disapproving, the Teroso-Savage plans for the oil terminal in Vancouver.

y (UTC)

From: Gail and Mike Cannady <gailandmike34@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 1:55 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Written comments of Tesoro Savage Energy Distribution Terminal, Application No. 2013-01

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

As residents of Vancouver, WA living very close to the Port of Vancouver, my husband and I strongly oppose the Tesoro Savage Energy Distribution Terminal.

We do not believe having such a facility so near residential neighborhoods is safe, nor is it necessary. Explosions, oil spills and runaway trains are the **ultimate** adverse impact, as has happened in Canada recently. There is no possible way to give 100% assurance of safety to the people living close by, and without 100% assurance, why would any prudent governing body take on so many risks? **The probable significant adverse impacts** to the safety of Vancouver neighborhoods, the local environment, and our chance at having clean jobs such as the Vancouver Waterfront Development Project **far outweigh and benefits** from Tesoro's project.

Please keep Vancouver neighborhood livability in mind, and deny this application.

Gail and Mike Cannady
300 W 8th St. #426
Vancouver, WA 98660

Talburt, Tammy (UTC)

From: Sarah Collmer <sicollmer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 9:34 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Review of the Tesoro/Savage Project at the Port of Vancouver

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

I, a citizen of Vancouver and mother of two young children, urge you to quickly and completely reject the proposed project at the Port of Vancouver. Given the scope and nature of the project alone, I am deeply concerned about its threat to the Columbia River, as well as the environment along the tracks, by which the oil will be transported. The Columbia is a rich, significant natural resource, as are the lands surrounding it, which include forested, natural habitat and residential housing. Even a "minor" spill, along rail lines or into the river or riparian zone, would prove catastrophic, destroying life and quality of life not only in the immediate vicinity, but downstream as well. Such destruction would necessarily result in economic devastation as well: fishermen's yields decimated, tourist activities impeded, waterfront development in Vancouver halted entirely, tax funds required for mitigation, etc. As you can see, the mere threat alone of such devastation makes this project both irresponsible and impractical.

What makes the project even more irresponsible and impractical - - a tragedy should it come to fruition - - is Tesoro's abysmal, reproachable track record for health and safety. Already this company's negligence has cost 7 lives in Anacortes, deaths that could and should have been prevented if the company had responded to warnings and citations. If they don't care about the lives of their employees, those who make them money, why should we think that they'd care about citizens, who they consider peripheral to their profit margins? Why should we imagine that our town will be spared the dangerous situation faced by citizens in Quebec when a train carrying the same Bakken oil derailed and exploded? Should we really think that Tesoro can and will prevent such disasters? Is it plausible, given their history and the history of all corporately-caused environmental disasters, that they will fully cover the cost of mitigation in such an event (and how, one may ask, do you mitigate lives lost)?

Most recently, we've seen Tesoro's negligence in North Dakota, as acres of land have been destroyed indefinitely by a spill that went undetected for 2 days and unreported for much, much longer. Could the Columbia River recover from such a spill? Could the Pacific? Could the Columbia Gorge? Could downtown Vancouver? NO! The effects of such disaster would be comprehensively horrible and long-term.

What have we to gain from this proposed trespass? 135 jobs is not enough to sacrifice the health of our environment, our citizenry, and our future. Reject this project.

Sincerely,
Sarah Collmer

Talburt, Tammy (UTC)

From: Heidie McCall <heidie@factoryweststudio.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 7:22 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Distribution Terminal Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

Dear Stephen Posner,

This terminal is a terrible idea for the Northwest and Vancouver. We live in what may possibly be one of the last pristine populated areas in the United States why on earth would any human want to be a part of possibly harming the environment in any way at this point in history?

As a citizen of the planet I implore you to use common sense and think about what you are about to do.

It's not too late for you personally to simply be a part of clean and prosperous future just turn away from oil, coal and nuclear. Love the planet before money.

Heidie

--

Heidie McCall
<http://FactoryWestStudio.com>

Talburt, Tammy (UTC)

From: David Rowe <dlrowe3162@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2013 10:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver energy Distribution Terminal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

Dear Council:

I am concerned with the development of the Vancouver Washington Crude oil terminal. If it is built the attractiveness of Vancouver Harbor and Columbia River will be forever changed to the worst. Also I am a passenger of Amtrak and Cascades Trains. The oil trains will hamper the on time performance of the current and future passenger trains.

I urge your council to deny this facility due to the negative impact on our community and river environment.

David L. Rowe
8817 NE 275th St
Battle Ground, WA 98604
phone 360-687-9178
e-mail dlrowe3162@icloud.com

Talbert, Tammy (UTC)

From: S F <ciaran1964@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 10:11 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Comment

My name is Skipper Fuller and I will not be able to attend the upcoming meeting opposing bringing in huge amounts of oil through this areas ports. This email is voicing my vote to oppose this,

I have lived here for over 30 years and seen Vancouver grow and expand, sometimes for the better and sometimes not. I don't believe bringing oil through this area is a good idea. If anything should happen, and pretty much history has proven it inevitable, it could destroy so much that is held dear to so many.

Why is greed always put ahead of the possible, or sometimes definite, damage that can occur? Please rethink your choices and do not allow this happen. Please listen to the people instead of the greed of those who are just after more profits.

Thank you for your time,
Skipper Fuller

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Sarah Hafer <sarah.hafer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 12:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 25, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

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

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

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

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

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Sarah Hafer
1401 Wyant Way
Sacramento, CA 95864-2639
(916) 384-9551

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Ann Hollyfield <hollyhast@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 12:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Blue Category

Oct 25, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

We are fouling our own nest. Continuing to destroy the natural world will also destroy us. We cannot live without it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Ann Hollyfield
PO Box 70
Seal Rock, OR 97376-0070
(541) 563-3376

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Wayne Kelly <waynekins@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 12:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 25, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

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

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

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

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

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Wayne Kelly
1257 Siskiyou Blvd # 1133
Ashland, OR 97520-2241

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Michael Wilson <mvalentinewilson@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 12:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 25, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

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

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

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

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

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Michael Wilson
1405 SE Taylor St
Portland, OR 97214-2651
(503) 956-6634

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of . Steel <iamsteel@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 12:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 25, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

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

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

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

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

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. . Steel
General Delivery
Sandy, OR 97055-9999

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Scott Wisenbaker <scott.wisenbaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 12:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 25, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including

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

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

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

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

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Scott Wisenbaker
202 Overlook Road
Underwood, WA 98651

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Matthew Kaminker <jzmnk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 12:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Oct 25, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oils by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including