
From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tex Cusic
<texcusic@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:28 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Tex Cusic
254 Ho Hum Ln
Aberdeen, WA 98520-8533
(360) 533-9835

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sue Ellen Carpenter <geraldsueellen@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:29 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sue Ellen Carpenter
248 Bon Jon View Way
Sequim, WA 98382-8093
(360) 681-2766

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kathleen Tei <kateirn@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:54 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Kathleen Tei
1408 A Street Kp N
Lakebay, WA 98349-9642

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sandra Earle <dsearle@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:55 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sandra Earle
5642 40th Ave W
Seattle, WA 98199-1035
(206) 281-7274

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lauren Taylor <outloudart@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 2:56 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Dr. Lauren Taylor
PO Box 1112
Ashland, OR 97520-0038
(541) 488-2146

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of c giles <gilesci@eou.edu>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 3:11 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. c giles
1702 Oak St
La Grande, OR 97850-1556
(541) 663-0858

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Thomas Romano
<thomasromano3829@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 3:29 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Thomas Romano
12995 SW Allen Blvd Apt 6
Beaverton, OR 97005-4576
(503) 430-0569

From: Lee Rafferty <director@vdausa.org>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 3:58 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Weighing in on the Tesoro lease with the Port of Vancouver
Attachments: oil terminal letterhead.docx

Categories: Green

Hello, Mr. Posner. Please consider the attached letter when evaluating the proposed oil terminal near downtown Vancouver, Washington. While our board of directors is not taking a pro or con stance, we do have concerns.

Thanks for your consideration.
Lee Rafferty

[Like us on Facebook](#)



Lee Rafferty
Executive Director
811 Main Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
360.258.1129
www.vdausa.org



Board of Directors

- Casey Wyckoff
President

- Josh Oliva
Vice President

- Charlene Dahlen
Secretary

- Linda McLain
Treasurer

- Linda Glover
Immediate Past President

- Nancy Baker

- David Copenhaver

- Lee Coulthard

- Brian Davis

- KC Fuller

- Michael Lary

- Linda Reid

- Celinda Rupert

- Christie Rust

- Michelle Thor

- Alishia Topper

- Adam Tyler

- Sherry Stewart

- Lee Rafferty, *Executive Director*

811 Main Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
360.258.1129
www.vdausa.org

November 12, 2013

Mr. Stephen Posner, interim EFSEC manager,
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council,
P.O. Box 43172,
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.
Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

Dear Mr Posner:

We are the board of Vancouver's Downtown Association. Our work is laser focused on the vitality of our city's downtown core. We have advocated for the things that would make our downtown stronger. We have opposed the things that would make it harder to live, work, and invest in our downtown. Our core mission is to do those things that will help our city center become an even stronger economic driver in our region.

We understand that the EFSEC comment period regarding the matter of oil being shipped to and from the Port of Vancouver has been extended to December 18, 2013. Our board has taken no formal position on this issue.

Here's what we DO want to ask: Please look at our downtown as a place that you might be considering an investment, a vacation, or as a potential hometown. That's what VDA does every day. We ask that you carefully consider the impacts your decision will make on our community and neighborhoods. We ask that you be careful about the odors, the potential chemical environmental impacts, and the safety of the operation. One of our major programs for positive change is the 'Clean and Safe: A Tool For Revitalization' project. It is a litmus test for a number of our decisions.

Very passionate and well-informed people are on opposite sides of this issue. Vancouver's Downtown Association lands on the side of 'please do no harm' to our downtown that will alter its prospects for a vibrant, healthy future. If you would like to learn more about our work and our passion for this special place, go to www.vdausa.org

This difficult decision falls ultimately to you. We appreciate the gravity and the stakes of this for this topic on you as a decision maker. And, we urge you to look at it through the lens of Downtown Vancouver's stakeholders.

Respectfully,
Lee Rafferty

Lee Rafferty
Executive Director
Vancouver's Downtown Association

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lloyd & Elizabeth Taylor <emtseattle@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 6:06 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Lloyd & Elizabeth Taylor
721 N 138th St
Seattle, WA 98133-7424
(206) 349-1856

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Maureen Johnston <maureenjohnston988@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 6:07 PM.
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Maureen Johnston
13421 26th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125-4307
(206) 367-4841

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of M Freeman
<me_freeman@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 6:30 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. M Freeman
4516 NE 106th St
Seattle, WA 98125-6907

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lloyd Johnston <lajceigthi@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 7:00 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Lloyd Johnston
13421 26th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125-4307
(206) 367-4841

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Padraic Freeman
<paddy.freeman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 7:31 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Padraic Freeman
405 McGraw St
Seattle, WA 98109-2144
(206) 963-1673

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Diane Moan
<dianemoan@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 7:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Dr. Diane Moan
12517 26th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125-4301
(704) 651-4126

From: Grace Teigen <teigeng@q.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 8:09 PM
To: info@portvanusa.com; EFSEC (UTC); vancmo@cityofvancouver.us; Elect Topper; Patty Murray; Maria Cantwell; Jaime Herrera; stonier.monica@leg.wa.gov; boardcom@clarck.wa.gov; letters@columbian.com
Cc: Sandy and Erskine Wood; Joyce and Jim Tobias and Chiappetta; Robin Engle
Subject: Proposed Oil Terminal Port Development, Albina Asphalt Plant Expansion, Columbian articles Nov 14, 2013

Categories: Green

Burlington Northern loves the easy grade and low cost of bringing all sorts of cargo through the Columbia River Gorge and into Vancouver and beyond. The Port Commissioners are doing their job when they explore every opportunity to expand business at the Port. That said, we believe that they should look through a wider lens to get the full picture. The proposed Tesoro Oil Transfer site poses serious risks to many thousands of neighbors all along the route.

1. Consider that 47 residents (including a 4 year old child) in Lac Megantec, Canada were incinerated in their beds by the exact same type of oil in July 2013. All for lack of a set safety brake.
2. Consider that two Washington oil terminals have just had their permits reversed for "failure to address public safety and environmental issues".
3. Consider that when combined with proposed Albina Asphalt tanks and plant, the remaining hazardous chemical combination, after all possible filters have worked perfectly, is supposed to "scatter in the wind" according to Tesoro's "environmental consultant". The wind? Really? Two different proposals, two different decision makers but their properties are located in the same place and their "air combines".
4. Consider that Tesoro has a record of poor compliance with safety requirements and that their financial health is questionable. Can we rely on their promises? Did BP's protestations of safety protect the Gulf Coast?
5. Consider that a Tesoro Logistics pipeline recently ruptured in North Dakota spilling 865,000 gallons. Ask the farmer whose land is destroyed how he feels about Tesoro's safety record?
6. Consider that the promise of 100% use of new technology rail cars to mitigate the acknowledged risk, if true, is easily broken by Tesoro and Burlington.
7. Consider that Albina has received 49 odor complaints since 2010. Can the addition of tanks to hold 1,000,000+ gallons of asphalt and an additional "heating building", recently approved by the city, improve the situation?
8. Consider the when the oil is loaded on ships and taken out past the (dangerous) Columbia River bar, the risk we would be taking with the river, with Warrenton, with Astoria, with the LongBeach peninsula? And with everyone who lives and works along it?
9. Consider whether, when we voted for unopposed Port Commissioners, we ever imagined that we were authorizing them to impose these potentially life threatening risks on this many of their fellow Washington citizens.

That litany should be enough to discourage anyone, but we believe the Port Commissioners, the Vancouver City Council and the Governor should also consider that both the Tesoro or Albina developments do serious damage to Vancouver's attractiveness as a place to settle and raise a family or indeed make many other types of investment. We had been hoping and planning to buy one of the new Columbia West Renaissance condos that will soon be built just a short distance along the river. We are changing our mind because, even if the proposed sites pass every sort of emissions standard, the proximity of these sites to and the resultant damage to our city's

image, does harm to every investment in the area. We believe many other potential investors will share our concern. None of the regulators or decision makes have jurisdiction over our investment but...

Vancouver has already spent millions of tax payer dollars into the new infrastructure to pave the way for the Columbia West Renaissance Development. This is in keeping with the Vision Plan (2010)of Vancouver as a livable, attractive, family friendly place. The City has worked hard to transform the downtown core, build a Convention Center, beautify Esther Short park, create a Farmers Market . If we expand the asphalt plant by 1,000,000 plus gallons **and** we roll 380,000 barrels of crude oil a day past Wintler Park, Tidewater Cove, hundreds of homes along Evergreen Boulevard, along our Heritage Trail, past the back door of the new City Hall and end within smelling distance of the residents Fruit Valley, Jantzen Beach and the 1.3 billion dollar proposed river front development, how have we impacted all these positive efforts? Is 120 possible jobs enough? What could conceivably be "in it" for Vancouver that will offset the damage to our health, safety, our community, our image for "livability", our attractiveness for tourism and our many individual and collective investments?

Neither Tesoro nor Albina can in any sense, be considered "harmless". Though we don't live in Fruit Valley, we stand with their concerned residents and ask both the City Council and the Port Commissioners to take another very serious look at where we are going. We ask Governor Inslee to step in. Who will take a look at the "whole picture" and make more considered decisions.

Respectfully,

Grace Teigen
Gene Wigglesworth

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bertha Bertha <concernedperson7@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2013 8:12 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Nov 15, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

If approved, the plan would result in 380,000 barrels of oil each day being shipped through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and other Northwest communities. Oil-by-rail is a bad deal for Washington State. The project comes at a steep price for rail communities and the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to recommend the rejection of Tesoro-Savage's proposal.

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route.

This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Bertha Bertha
private
Manzanita, OR 97130