

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Ron Martin <rwmartin@mtu.edu>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:01 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

**Categories:** Comment, Blue Category

Oct 30, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

I am writing as a resident of and a business owner in the Columbia River Gorge.

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,

Dr. Ron Martin  
1401 Cross Creek Ln  
Hood River, OR 97031-1370

**From:** Bob Gush <bob.gush@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 8:58 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Against oil terminal in Vancouver

**Categories:** Comment, Blue Category

--  
Bob Gush  
[bob.gush@gmail.com](mailto:bob.gush@gmail.com)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of sally newell <scoop@embarqmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 9:02 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

**Categories:** Comment, Blue Category

Oct 30, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

Just yesterday I heard that Gov. Inslee was standing with the other west coast governors to "take action," on climate change.

Looking carefully at alternatives to the proposed Tesoro Savage oil terminal in Vancouver would be an action that would make sense for governor Inslee and EFSEC.

This proposed project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day past my home in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on my home, as well as the wisdom of exporting oil.

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. sally newell  
PO Box 186  
Underwood, WA 98651-0186

**From:** Emmi McLarty <e.mclarty@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 9:40 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Health Concern

**Categories:** Comment, Blue Category

The Tesoro Savage Petroleum project in Vancouver, WA is contrary to our plans to restore the riverfront. We DO NOT want 14,000 train cars and 50,000 barrels of crude oil going through Vancouver terminal daily! From what I hear there are no safety plans if one car toppled over. When the fossil fuels are burned off they emit harmful chemicals into the environment. We are trying to revitalize our area but not at the suffering of people in NW. Please vote NO. Thank you, Emmi McLarty, registered voter

---

**From:** Wagner, Jon <Jon.Wagner@cityofvancouver.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 10:34 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Cc:** Holmes, Eric; Mercier, Dave; Potter, Bronson  
**Subject:** comments relating to the Tesoro/Savage project docket EF-131590

**Categories:** Comment, Blue Category

Please consider the following comments as a response from the City of Vancouver regarding the Scoping process.

The scale of this proposal is unprecedented for the city of Vancouver. The project, if approved, will have impacts on our local community.

The City has not previously been the host jurisdiction for an EFSEC project and we do not have a defined process for participating in the EFSEC siting procedures. We need time to develop a process for making decisions, including providing scoping comments.

The city did not receive the DS and Scoping Notice in a timely manner. EFSEC issued a Determination of Significance on Oct. 1, 2013. EFSEC staff sent the notice to an incorrect email address. As a result, notice was not received by the city. I discovered the notice on the EFSEC website in mid-October. I contacted EFSEC and an official notice was received on October 16; a full two weeks after the official notice was issued.

To provide EFSEC with the information needed to determine the EIS scope, the city needs additional time to review the project and discuss it with our decision-makers. And for the decision-makers to have an opportunity to hear from their constituents. An additional 60 days is needed to fully review the potential categories of environmental impacts and provide meaning full input into the scoping process.

Should you have questions, please contact me.

**Jon Wagner, AICP | Senior Planner**



CITY OF VANCOUVER  
Community & Economic Development Department  
415 W. 6<sup>th</sup> St. | 98660  
P.O. Box 1995 | Vancouver, WA 98668-1995  
P: 360.487.7885 | F: 360.487.7807 | WA Relay: 711

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Merle Clifton <merlepx@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 11:32 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

**Categories:** Comment, Blue Category

Oct 30, 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. Merle Clifton  
4457 NE Campaign St  
Portland, OR 97218-1724  
(503) 477-7755

---

**From:** Eric LaBrant <labrant@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 11:36 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC); Bumpus, Sonia (UTC)  
**Cc:** Linda Garcia; Kathy Peirce; Karen McCallister; Katy Brooks; Curtis Shuck; povcommissioners@portvanusa.com  
**Subject:** Crude-By-Rail EFSEC Scoping Comments  
**Attachments:** Tesoro - Google Maps.pdf  
  
**Categories:** Comment, Blue Category

Good morning,

Attached, please find a map of the area surrounding the proposed transloading terminal. Based upon wind data from much closer to the project site, the plume of TAP passes directly over a densely-populated area. My home is less than a mile and a half downwind, and I am terrified of the imminent health danger to my family, which includes two children. I mention this because at their age, their lungs are still developing, and are even more sensitive to these TAP emissions.

We cannot simply move. Aside from the economic constraints involved in that, the home will be unsaleable if it is contaminated in this way, with my only alternative being to unethically sell it to someone who is unaware.

Nor should we have to relocate to maintain our health and safety. If a new project is to be started, it is incumbent upon the applicant to thoroughly demonstrate that it will not interfere with our ability to live where we are already living.

TSJV has repeatedly described their vapor recovery process as "closed loop," with vapors being "destroyed by thermal oxidation." There is no loop. It is not closed. Vapors are piped directly to a vapor combustion unit and burned. The vapors that are not combusted completely would be released untreated into the air. According to the applicant's own optimistic projections, toxic emissions will average 97 tons per year.

Requests to EFSEC regarding review scoping:

- Please consider the extreme environmental, health, and safety sensitivity of the surroundings to the transloading terminal, and how an ongoing, cumulative release of TAP will impact their livability. The immediate neighborhood surrounding the project (Fruit Valley) includes 3,000 residents, an elementary school, several thousand employees, 4 parks, 2 rivers, several lakes, a national wildlife refuge, and a wetland mitigation bank literally across the street from the tank farm. This does not include adjacent neighborhoods, who each have residents, schools, parks, and employees of their own.
- Please require TAP release modeling based upon the project site's prevailing winds, not a location 4 miles away.
- Please require ongoing air quality monitoring with results released to the public monthly for human health and safety reasons.
- Please require strict emissions controls to protect nearby residents from being harmed by TAP.
- Please consider the effect of precipitation, temperature inversion, air stagnation events, and cloud mixing, and

how they will impact TAP concentrations in the surrounding neighborhoods.

- Please consider the cumulative impact of TAP release, inhalation, and precipitation over the course of the ten year project lease.
- Please investigate the potential contamination of soil, groundwater, and watersheds by TAP that exceed SQER and are rained back down across the area.
- As rail is an integral part of this process, please require full review and public hearing requirements, including health, safety, environmental, and accident response, for each county adjacent to any rail lines where crude oil or coal will be transported.
- As marine transport is an integral part of this process, please require full review and public hearing requirements, including health, safety, environmental, and accident response, for each county adjacent to waterway where crude oil or coal will be transported.
- Please require full disclosure of all spills, violations, incidents, near-misses, and fines involving Tesoro or Savage for the last ten years. Please use the frequency of these incidents to project the likelihood of an incident for a project of this capacity over the life of the ten-year project lease.
- Please require a projection of the economic impact to tourism along the path of oil transport, both during normal operation as well as in the event of an accident.
- Please require all discussions of health, safety, and environmental accidents to include all facets of impact, including tourism losses, air quality and TAP release, groundwater contamination, watershed contamination, soil contamination, wildlife impact, infrastructure damage or unavailability, fire, explosion, and transportation capacity loss.
- Please require seismic review of land adjacent to the rail path and project the likelihood of unanticipated rock slide or fall, both under normal conditions and under increased rail traffic commensurate with proposed rail projects.
- Please consider potential damage and/or shutdown cost to Columbia Basin dams and power generation capacity in the event of a rail incident.

Many of my concerns are spill and accident related, but I'm even more concerned about the contamination and health damage that will result immediately if the project functions exactly as planned with no surprises at all.

Please consider the real-world impacts of this project.

Many thanks,

**ERIC LABRANT**  
Receivables Consultant

LaBrant Receivables, LLC  
Training and problem-solving to help you get paid. | 503-875-1312 | [labrant@gmail.com](mailto:labrant@gmail.com)



Secure your cash flow.

Not sure how to handle past-due customers? Hate confrontation? Let's turn your unpaid invoices into cash, and your least favorite business chore into a sales-building powerhouse. Call me, and I'll show you how to use modern, simple, and customer-friendly tools right away to bring payments in.
















A copy of this map is publicly available at: <http://goo.gl/nlzCkB>



### Tesoro

Public · 4 Collaborators · 63 views  
Created on Oct 16 · By Eric · Updated 24 minutes ago

-  Nearest Home  
2427 W 31st St
-  Port of Vancouver Admin
-  Homes
-  Fruit Valley Homes
-  Vancouver Lake Feeder Marsh
-  Fruit Valley Elementary

-  Fruit Valley Park
-  Liberty Park
- Columbia River Wetland Mitigation Bank  
154 acre protected natural area
-  Vapor Burning and Release
-  Tank Farm
- Transloading area
- Storage Tanks  
Up to 380,000 barrels (1.6 million gallons)
- Vapor Combustion Units
-  Where crude oil will be flowing
-  Where crude oil will be flowing
- Prevailing Winds, 1.5mi  
This is the area up to 1.5 miles downwind from where vapors are burned.
- Prevailing Winds, 2.0mi  
This is the broader fan up to 2.0 miles downwind of toxic release (97 tons per year)
- More Homes
-  Wind Data

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Camille Roberts-Krick <chameleonr@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:02 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 30, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. Camille Roberts-Krick  
400 W 8th St Unit 416  
Vancouver, WA 98660-3445  
(503) 396-8971



**From:** Mike Pick <pickmc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 30, 2013 12:50 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Proposed terminal for crude oil to vancouver, wa

**Categories:** Comment

I would like to voice my strong DISapproval of this proposed terminal site. Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC has contracted the use of Vancouver's public lands for their terminal and are trying to sell it on the fact that it will bring jobs. It will, indeed, bring very few jobs at too high of a cost to our people and our city. A trade-off can't even come close to the risk this brings to our city.

There could be 14,000 train cars will carrying 50,000 barrels of crude oil to the Vancouver terminal EVERYDAY. These fossil fuels will be processed which means burning off and emitting benzene, chromium, mercury, xylene and other harmful chemical into the environment.

Tesoro does not have a good safety record and does not deserve our public trust in case of derailment or any other oil spill.

The many trains will disrupt homeowners along the Columbia river and in fruit valley to name but a few areas that will be greatly negatively impacted. This project will effect the entire NorthWest, for a spill, which is a given in time, will be extremely harmful to the environment, to boat owners, and to our efforts to beautify our wonderful Columbia river George.

Please do all you can to stop this for the good of the majority.

Thanks  
Carol pick  
Vancouver, WA