

From: Jan Verrinder <janowa85@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 9:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Oil Concerns

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Here are my concerns regarding the oil terminal proposed for Vancouver.

380,000 barrels of crude oil traveling along the Columbia River Gorge in four, mile-and-half long trains (100-110 cars) daily. Derailments happen. Spilled oil would sink and travel the fast current spreading extensively.

Prevailing wind patterns would carry daily chemical emissions from the facility to nearby neighborhoods.

Bakken oil is more combustible. It is acquired in North Dakota by the environmentally questionable practice, fracking. The field there was recently the site of a significant spill.

A strong earthquake would threaten the river. The soil would likely liquefy, breaking berms around storage tanks. Damaged berms would not be able to contain leaking oil.

The president of our ILWU said the 120 jobs created are not worth the threat to the environment, health, and livability of our community and they don't want them. It's not "if" an accident happens, it's "when".

I don't want Vancouver known for its dirty fossil fuels. It's a great town and this would threaten the "northwest" feeling.

Jan Verrinder
5410 Idaho St
Vancouver, WA 98661

You are what you eat, so don't be fast, cheap, easy or fake.

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Susan Peik <belight1020@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 10:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 9, 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 and the quality of life of all residents in the 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 especially 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 the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal are, 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, recreational, and tourism 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 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. Susan Peik
16869 65th Ave
Lake Oswego, OR 97035-7865

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of John Ame <ledges@peak.org>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 11:29 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 9, 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. John Ame
835 SW 11th St
Corvallis, OR 97333-4243

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Gregg Kleiner <kleinerg@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 11:29 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 9, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

We just saw what happened in Alabama when an oil train derailed. This could happen on the scenic Columbia if the proposed Tesoro Savage project moves forward. 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. Gregg Kleiner
940 SE Alexander Ave
Corvallis, OR 97333-2052

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of William McMurray <wpm1953@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 12:29 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 9, 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. William McMurray
12000 2nd Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98177-4508

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Joe Wilkins <joe.robert.wilkins@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 12:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 9, 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. Joe Wilkins
1015 NE Galloway St
Mcminnville, OR 97128-3832

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Jack West <jpwest@teleport.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 1:29 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 9, 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. Jack West
3914 SE Licynta Ln
Milwaukie, OR 97222-8835
(503) 659-7922

From: Donna Brune <donnabrun@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 1:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesero/Savage Port of Vancouver project

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Committee:

My family has lived on the Columbia River for 3 generations. My great grandmother was a Native American. This river has provided for the people of the State of Washington and Oregon for hundreds of years. Today I am a resident of Camas WA and live on the Columbia River. The railroad that you propose to use to transport 386 thousand barrels of oil per day on is 50 feet from my front door.

My husband and I built our home knowing the railroad is there and accept they run trains, however in addition to the environmental impact this project has for the port and those downriver from the port, it will have significant impact to everyone along the river. My neighborhood in particular. The railroad is planning on adding another 2 mile long track in front of our houses on which to store for and unspecified period of time railcars full of oil. The neighborhood was not contacted by the railroad about this project, in fact we inadvertently learned of the project when they attempted to vacate the community right of way to only one of two roads that access the entire community. (the railroad told us they would do whatever they want, the neighborhood has no say in the matter) Any trains sitting on this spur will block the only emergency access we have. We currently have one crossing which is often blocked. In the 7 years I've lived here the crossing has been blocked countless times but on at least 5 occasions, it was blocked by a train for more than 1.5 hours. Adding this spur, planned to begin within 10 feet of our only crossing, will block access to and from our homes for the time it takes to get a 2 mile long train to speed. This will be the difference between life and death for someone.

I am very opposed to the Port project and would like to point out the impacts just in my neighborhood.

- 1) Significant safety impact. Where ever a spur and a train come together the probability for derailment and crashes increase dramatically. With oil and gas on these trains, our homes and our live are at significant risk because of this project.
- 2) Water, while many have spoken of the disaster that occurs with a spill in the river, any contamination along this train contaminates the water table between the rail and the river. We all have wells on our property for our drinking water. Our homes, the largest investment most American families make in their lifetimes become worthless without water. And those of us who have lived her for generations lose a way life that will not be recovered.
- 3) Security. Along the river there are many places on railroad property that the homeless choose to camp and other criminal activity occurs. The train sitting on a spur that is not visible from and major highway or in an industrial area is an easy target for both petty criminals and terrorists wanting to make a statement. We frequently deal with this element. There are many places along the Columbia where the trains are easily accessed. We live in an isolated neighborhood with no security.

4) Access, which is also a safety concern. Last year, I lost my husband to a heart attack . While I waited for the ambulance to arrive, I gave him CPR, The ambulance took over 25 minutes to arrive---if there had been a train blocking the crossing at that moment I would have waited another 30 minutes. They revived him and he died in the ambulance on the way to the hospital. Please don't let one of my neighbors wait an hour while they watch their loved one die so that the port of Vancouver can ship oil overseas. The spur and increased train traffic will quadruple the length and number of times our access is blocked.

5) The future prosperity of Clark County, and the State of WA is at risk because of this project. Oil is a temporary commodity that will one day be replaced with better alternatives. Water, however, is a precious commodity that now and especially into the future will be far more valuable to our community and our State.

I urge you to look to the true future of what the city of Vancouver and the State of Washington can be. We can start by being visionary, making decisions for the future, not for next year. It's a brave thing to do, please have the courage to fight for the people of the State of Washington to continue to live in the best place in the world. Say no to Tesero.

--

Donna

From: Charles Young <charlesandrewyoung@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 2:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Please protect our town from the TSVEDT
Attachments: TSVEDT Opposition.pdf

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Charles and Kassondra Young
315 W 25th Street
Vancouver, WA 98660

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

For the Attention of Stephen Posner, Interim EFSEC Manager

Dear Sir:

I wish to express our community's strong objection to the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal (Application No. 2013-01, Docket No. EF-131590.) After careful examination of the proposal we have determined that the risk of this project would far outweigh the minor rewards to our community and the broader area. This project would enrich a few out of state parties while placing a completely unreasonable burden of risk on the city of Vancouver. These risks are to safety, real estate value and our local environment.

My primary concern is the questionably safety of this project. This proposal involves a MINIMUM of four, mile-plus long unit trains of crude oil per day going through dense residential and commercial zones at main line speed. Contrary to popular belief, crude oil DOES explode. Sadly this has

already been witnessed this summer in Lac Megantic Quebec, where almost 50 residents were incinerated by a relatively small unit-train of Bakken crude. Just yesterday there was another derailment and explosion of an oil train in Alabama. A simple internet search illustrates past oil-industry catastrophes and aftermath. While hazardous material does already travel by rail through our community, this proposal would exponentially increase the number of carloads, and thus exponentially increase the risk to us all. Is this fair to our community?

The people hurt most by the mistakes of the petrochemical industry are those who live nearby. Large companies such as Tesoro and Savage have no stake in our state or our community. If an accident were to occur, they pay some fines and go to court with a team of lawyers. This is a minor speeding ticket for them. Meanwhile our community would be left to pick up the pieces on our own. In the aftermath of the Lac Megantic tragedy, no party is admitting fault and the province is on the hook for much of the recovery. Why would we expect a different outcome from a mishap involving this project? Tesoro already has a highly questionable safety and environmental record. This is not disputed fact.

The city of Vancouver is in the process of renewing our downtown and clawing back from the economic ravages of the great recession. Our property values are on the rise and life is looking brighter for our town. Unit oil trains do not fit into this broader picture of investment and real estate development. The rail line would run right through our waterfront project. Who would want to invest in real estate adjacent to this? This proposal would negatively impact our recovery and the value of our real estate.

With regard to our local environment, this project is a potential environmental disaster. Large-scale transport and transshipment of oil has a long history of disastrous spills. In addition, the industry has an atrocious record of cleanup and compensation. The Columbia River is a resource that belongs to us all. By allowing these out of state corporations to use our riverbank we accept the risk of spills and damage to our renewable resources with no benefit to us. In addition, it is the height of hypocrisy that Washington State be a part of the Pacific Coast Action Plan while approving the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. This would turn our community into a hub of carbon export.

In summary Tesoro and Savage would be exploiting OUR resources for THEIR profits. This project will produce negligible job creation and minimal revenue generation, with maximum risk to safety, real estate and our environment. This is entirely unacceptable and we implore you to not approve this project.

Sincerely,

Charles and Kassondra Young

Charles and Kassondra Young
315 W 25th Street
Vancouver, WA 98660

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

For the Attention of Stephen Posner, Interim EFSEC Manager

Dear Sir:

I wish to express our community's strong objection to the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal (Application No. 2013-01, Docket No. EF-131590.) After careful examination of the proposal we have determined that the risk of this project would far outweigh the minor rewards to our community and the broader area. This project would enrich a few out of state parties while placing a completely unreasonable burden of risk on the city of Vancouver. These risks are to safety, real estate value and our local environment.

My primary concern is the questionably safety of this project. This proposal involves a MINIMUM of four, mile-plus long unit trains of crude oil per day going through dense residential and commercial zones at main line speed. Contrary to popular belief, crude oil DOES explode. Sadly this has already been witnessed this summer in Lac Megantic Quebec, where almost 50 residents were incinerated by a relatively small unit-train of Bakken crude. Just yesterday there was

another derailment and explosion of an oil train in Alabama. A simple internet search illustrates past oil-industry catastrophes and aftermath. While hazardous material does already travel by rail through our community, this proposal would exponentially increase the number of carloads, and thus exponentially increase the risk to us all. Is this fair to our community?

The people hurt most by the mistakes of the petrochemical industry are those who live nearby. Large companies such as Tesoro and Savage have no stake in our state or our community. If an accident were to occur, they pay some fines and go to court with a team of lawyers. This is a minor speeding ticket for them. Meanwhile our community would be left to pick up the pieces on our own. In the aftermath of the Lac Megantic tragedy, no party is admitting fault and the province is on the hook for much of the recovery. Why would we expect a different outcome from a mishap involving this project? Tesoro already has a highly questionable safety and environmental record. This is not disputed fact.

The city of Vancouver is in the process of renewing our downtown and clawing back from the economic ravages of the great recession. Our property values are on the rise and life is looking brighter for our town. Unit oil trains do not fit into this broader picture of investment and real estate development. The rail line would run right through our waterfront project. Who would want to invest in real estate adjacent to this? This proposal would negatively impact our recovery and the value of our real estate.

With regard to our local environment, this project is a potential environmental disaster. Large-scale transport and

transshipment of oil has a long history of disastrous spills. In addition, the industry has an atrocious record of cleanup and compensation. The Columbia River is a resource that belongs to us all. By allowing these out of state corporations to use our riverbank we accept the risk of spills and damage to our renewable resources with no benefit to us. In addition, it is the height of hypocrisy that Washington State be a part of the Pacific Coast Action Plan while approving the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. This would turn our community into a hub of carbon export.

In summary Tesoro and Savage would be exploiting OUR resources for THEIR profits. This project will produce negligible job creation and minimal revenue generation, with maximum risk to safety, real estate and our environment. This is entirely unacceptable and we implore you to not approve this project.

Sincerely,

Charles and Kassondra Young

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Margarita Donnelly <dannelly.margarita@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 09, 2013 3:00 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Comment, Blue Category

Nov 9, 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. Margarita Donnelly
5643 nw oak cr dr
CORVALLIS, OR 97330-3003
(541) 753-3110