

UTC)

From: Sandra Jarrard <sjarrard@greaterspokane.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 2:40 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Comment
Attachments: tesorosavage.pdf

Categories: Orange

Please see the attached comment letter for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution.

Thank you,

Sandra Jarrard
Director of Public Policy
Greater Spokane Incorporated
Create Something Greater
509.321.3622
www.greaterspokane.org



Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/greaterspokane
Like us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/greaterspokane

UTC)

From: Phyllis Thayer <phyl2mail@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:32 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil Trains

To: The Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

Dear Council members,

I am deeply saddened by the potential of bringing oil-hauling trains through Spokane. When the awful accident occurred in Canada, I thought "well at least they are only talking about bringing coal through Spokane". The possibility of derailments, explosions, significant contamination and death are not the only reasons to NOT transport this oil.

By taking a stand to NOT allow oil (and coal) to travel through Spokane, we may help move this country toward more sustainable energy consumption. Please do not let potential dollars rule your decisions. Otherwise we could find out too late that this is a more expensive proposition than we were led to believe.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Thayer
2512 W. Courtland Avenue
Spokane, WA 99205

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27903

UTC)

From: tecaine@comcast.net
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:44 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver

Governor Inslee -- Please deny permits for the proposed oil terminal in Vancouver, WA, USA. This appears to be another situation where a large individual company stands to make large profits while the general public takes all the risk. I don't believe we can afford to take the chance of having a disaster anywhere along the Columbia River of the magnitude that could happen with the transporting and handling of oil that would result from an oil terminal. There are many more reasons for denying the permits which I'm sure you have already heard, so I won't enumerate them here. But I do stress the importance of denying the permits and ask that you would do so, knowing that I will support you in that decision.

Thank you
Tom Caine
3504 NW 191st Circle
Ridgefield, WA 98642

UTC)

From: Georgia Schell <georgiaschell@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:45 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

I want to register my opposition to the establishment of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver, WA Oil Terminal. As we in the northwest and across the U.S. progress toward lower carbon emissions and particulate pollutions, and strive for increased alternative energy sources, it is counterproductive to export oil. The atmosphere knows no boundaries and what is burned across the Pacific Ocean does end up increasing our pollution here in the NW.

Additionally, we have concerns with the rail and barge shipment of oil in addition to coal and LNG. The following are my reasons for opposing the oil terminal and it's rail shipment through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area:

Pollution within the Gorge and Globally;

- Hazard of shipments through gorge communities;
- Increased rail traffic making it difficult and more costly for shipment of other commodities such as farm produce;
- Increased rail traffic splitting communities and making it difficult for tourists to access the river – a business that has been hard won in the gorge and supplies much needed jobs in those communities;
- Increased rail traffic means increased noise levels;
- Increased rail traffic means longer wait at rail crossings;
- Pollution in gorge and river;
- Need for less carbon based energy use worldwide;
- Very few long term jobs by project – we need the right jobs that supply working wages and long term employment;
- It is morally the wrong thing to do if we are to leave this earth and this place to future generations.

Thank you,

Georgia Schell
7335 SW Canyon Lane
Portland, Oregon 97225

UTC)

From: mark.c.marmes@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Mark Marmes

(UTC)

From: Susan Cullom <doitfast@mail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:56 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

Susan Cullom

33436

From: Susan Cullom <doitfast@mail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:57 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

Susan Cullom

33436

From: Guy Kanon <guykanon@mail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:00 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

Guy Kanon

98020

(UTC)

From: weltepe@gmail.com on behalf of Peter W <the.peter.w@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:07 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: please say no to Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

Hello,

I am writing this brief letter ask that you please oppose the oil terminal that has been proposed.

The following should be considered:

1. Dangers to schools and parks.
2. Dangers posed to wildlife and waterways.
3. Potential cost implications from clean ups. Has any study been done to assess what the greatest possible human and environmental costs would be from leakage, derailment, and/or explosion? Is there a definite means to collect the full cost should such an incident occur?
4. Impact on traffic. Has an assessment been done to consider the economic costs associated with the increased traffic delays from the rail traffic?
5. Total GHG emissions that this project would facilitate. How much carbon would travel through this terminal and what are the local, regional, and global environmental implications?

Thanks!

✉ p. — [@techieshark](#)

(UTC)

From: Melinda Scott <scotttwins@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:15 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

Melinda Scott

27858

(UTC)

From: Eve Heidtmann <eveandden@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:15 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tersoro Savage Terminal

Dear Mr. Posner,

I am writing to ask you to reject the siting of the proposed Tesoro Savage oil terminal in Vancouver. I am concerned about the probability of oil spills anywhere along the route and the threat to Vancouver in particular. I am also aware that to slow the pace of global warming we must shift rapidly away from fossil fuels. Building more oil routes and terminals is hardly the way to go.

Please protect our region and help our planet by saying no to this proposal.

Thank you,
Eve Heidtmann

UTC)

From: borsope@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:17 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Oil Terminal

To the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council,

I am writing to ask you to deny the permit to export oil from a Vancouver facility. This is a very dangerous plan. The Columbia River is a vast resource for fisheries and habitat. An oil spill in this area would be devastating to the natural resources. The oil that is proposed to be transported and exported is volatile and should be regulated as such. Oil barges and trains are not regulated the same way as pipelines.

The insurance to cover a catastrophic spill may not be there. This should be in place at the very least. Emergency response plans are vague, inadequate and unfunded. What would happen if there were a spill during wildfire season?

It is irresponsible to continue to push fossil fuel exports. The fallout from CO2 emissions already has caused ocean acidification which affects thousands of jobs in fishery and shellfish industries.

Please deny the permit for this facility. We can do better. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Pam Borso

UTC)

From: Wes Kempfer <wkempferjr@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:26 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Tesoro-Savage Oil Terminal

Dear Council Members:

In my opinion, the Tesoro-Savage oil terminal in Vancouver should not be allowed to move forward. In addition to putting what remains of the health of the Columbia River at higher risk due to the danger of accidents and spills, and subjecting communities to the ill-effects of increased rail traffic--such as citizens blocked for long periods from emergency services and more diesel pollution, a very important probability is that continued production and consumption of fossil fuels under the current business-as-usual scenario is inevitably going result in an unprecedented level of human death and suffering over the next few decades, and this project will contribute significantly to it.

Some of you I hope are aware that there is debate in the scientific community as to whether or not humans could become extinct over the next several decades if we continue to burn fossil fuels and allow the global average temperature to rise 4 to 6 degrees C. I recommend that you read some of the work of paleontologist Peter Ward. Ward has studied past extinction events and believes that by burning fossil fuels, humankind is mimicking the greenhouse-gas-producing volcanic processes now understood by scientists to be the primary cause of most mass extinction events in Earth's past, including the worst one known as the Permian-Triassic event, which occurred about 255 million years ago. Climate forcing resulting from volcanic activity completely shifted the nature of the oceans and atmosphere. Because the warming eventually reduced the slope of the temperate gradient between polar regions and the equator, the conveyer currents that help to oxygenate the ocean's waters shutdown. With lowered oxygen levels, anaerobic organisms--which rather and producing CO2 as a metabolic byproduct, produce hydrogen sulfide--became predominant. Hydrogen sulfide is fatally toxic to land animals. Around 90 percent of species on the land and in the sea became extinct in a short (geologically speaking) period of time.

I have heard Ward state in an interview that he thinks humans might be able to survive this outcome. Whether or not one believes that, it is certainly evident that we are heading toward a situation in which climate change effects could cause food production to fall very rapidly, even if we don't succeed in recreating the P-T extinction event. The human population will, of course, fall in tandem. This is more than just a curve on a graph. Anyone living through this circumstance will know hell--think Easter Island on a global scale: war, starvation, riots, cannibalism. Is this the future you would wish for your children and grandchildren?

I think for people who have not studied and followed climate change over the last thirty years, the scenario described above seems outlandish. But, science is indicating that it could all actually come to pass, and sad to say, appears as though it will. I urge that you look into this further. I believe that if you do, you will agree that any project that promotes the continued burning of fossil fuels must be stopped. I think you will also agree that as public officials and community leaders, you would be derelict in your duty if you allow the Tesoro-Savage project, or any fossil fuel project for that matter, to move forward.

On behalf your descendants and mine, and all of the other living things that will suffer and die horribly, and become extinct because of our continued irresponsibility, I request and demand that you do everything in your power to block the realization of this project.

Sincerely,

Wes Kempfer, Jr.
4101 NE Sumner St.
Portland, OR 9711
503-926-3867

UTC)

From: M. A. Kaufman <DV10@COMCAST.NET>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comments Re. Oil Terminal Proposal - Rail Shipment

To: Energy Facility Evaluation Council
From: M. A. Kaufman
10805 East 23rd Ave.
Spokane Valley, WA 99206

Dec. 12, 2013

Re: Oil trains delivering crude to western Washington refineries

There appear to be two primary objections to delivering large amounts of crude oil by railroad. The first is based upon people's belief that the primary cause of climate change is greenhouse gases emitted by human activity, and the second is safety concerns.

As a geologist, I, like many of my colleagues dissent from the currently politically correct cause of climate change. When looking at geological history, there have been frequent drastic climate changes related to natural forces, and these forces have not suddenly disappeared. Moreover, many "scientists" who have promoted the human-caused theory have been caught fudging data. Two facts have severely damaged their cause. First, Earth's climate has remained stable now for over fifteen years, during a time of increasing human-caused CO2 emissions. And second, recent studies of volcanic-caused greenhouse gas emissions indicate how they override human-caused emissions. For example; the 1991 eruption of Mount Pinatubo spewed out into the atmosphere more greenhouse gases than the entire human race has emitted in its entire history. And there are over two hundred known active volcanoes at present, and many more unknown. The human-caused theory provides a basis for people who call themselves environmentalists to attempt blockage of all fossil fuels development, with no currently viable alternative.

The second objection(safety concerns) is a very legitimate one. Ever since early humans heated their caves and cooked with fire, there have been accidents, and they will always happen because of human error. It is much cheaper and safer to move oil by pipeline than by rail, but the same people who oppose rail shipment also block pipelines. Rail shipment does offer more flexibility than pipelines, but, obviously, there must be rigid safety standards. The use of double lined tank cars would be a big safety step.

The bottom line is that the rail shipment of crude to the Washington ports is critical to America. If it is blocked it will play a key roll in sabotaging the U.S. economy,

Sincerely,

M. A. kaufman Geologist, P. Eng.

(UTC)

From: Lisa Adatto <ladatto3@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:45 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: oil transport through the west coast.

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to express my concerns about allowing increased rail traffic to transport oil to West Coast ports. Here are my objections:

1. The West Coast States have chosen to limit greenhouse gasses. We should not allow our transportation system to be used to increase ghg emissions. These emissions are dangerous to our future
2. Increased rail traffic will decrease quality of life for West Coast residents. The systme is already overused and stressed.
3. Oil trains can spill causing great damage to communities and the environment

Thanks for allowing me to share my concerns,

Sincerely,

Lisa Adatto
c: (503) 914-9678
ladatto3@gmail.com

From: Charles Flavin <chuckflavin@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:50 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: People

Listen to the voices of the People . This is something that won't serve their needs. It is the people whose needs that need to be addressed and not the needs of the large corporations. Please do the right thing for the needs of the people.
No oil terminal PLEASE

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27917

JTC)

From: Gerri Sue Lent <gerrisuelent@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:03 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Coal and Oil Terminals for rail and water fossil fuels

Dear Sir, PLEASE DON'T LET ANYONE SHIP COAL AND OIL THROUGH THE COLUMBIA GORGE. This treasure, placed in part in your hands, could be destroyed in one explosive accident. Shipping coal degrades the environment adjacent to the tracks and spreads pernicious pollution far and wide. Oil can not be shipped without devastating effects. The Gulf Coast (the whole coast) and Prince William Sound only had one accident. Why should the USA ship a diminishing resource to the world when we will need it ourselves? PLEASE DON'T LET ANYONE SHIP FOSSIL FUELS THROUGH THE COLUMBIA GORGE. This would be a reasonable decision; I believe you are a reasonable person. Help protect my wonderful, beautiful Gorge and forever be known as a brave and farseeing leader. Thank you! Gerri Sue Lent, 1834 SE Spokane St. Portland, OR 97202

From: karuna gatton <karunagatton@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:09 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

karuna gatton

97403

(UTC)

From: Linda McLain <lindamclain@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:11 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: info@jayinslee.com
Subject: Times have changed

To the EFSEC Council and Governor Inslee,

There seems to be a huge last minute rush to make all the money that can be made from transporting fossil fuels. Times have changed in our country and times have changed for Vancouver, Washington. Vancouver used to be an industrial town. We had Alcoa and Lucky Lager brewing. Because of that our town didn't really have a downtown core and was a bedroom community to Portland. Like many towns that once wore that industrial cloak, Vancouver has begun to see a regrowth and take on a new identity. We have all worked so hard to see that happen. New restaurants and businesses are coming back to downtown. Our former Mayor started this comeback, and lead the effort to change our downtown with a new park that hosts a farmer's market. Nice condos and apartments have sprung up around the park. Now you can go downtown any evening and even find it hard to park – so many people enjoying our revitalized downtown. And to add to all of this, we all look forward to our new Waterfront project. How wonderful when a city can claim it's waterfront for shops, restaurants, businesses and homes. A place to walk and enjoy our beautiful Columbia River.

I think we all know what will happen if an oil terminal comes to Vancouver. It is so close to the downtown. Things deteriorate slowly. People and businesses who can afford it start moving away from the smell and ugliness of a big oil terminal. The nice apartments become low income housing. The people who can't afford to move are stuck with the smell and pollution that come with a project like this. Vancouver will survive and will go back to being that bedroom community of Portland – no central downtown core left.

And this all pales with the thought of a new glut of fossil fuel and the disastrous effects it will have on all of us. We all know this is temporary – everyone is out to make a profit while they can. Are these short term profits worth ruining a town, subjecting people to the pollution and danger of Brakken oil? I think not.

I think not only of our town, but of the other towns along the train routes leading here. I think of their downtown associations realizing their hard work of revitalization was for naught.

Linda McLain
Vancouver, Washington

(UTC)

From: Darrel Rast <rast77@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:16 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Proposed Oil Terminal at Vancouver, WA

When I first heard rumors of an oil terminal in Vancouver, I said, "There's no way that will ever be approved. Look at the risks, the potential impacts to OUR river (the Columbia)." And yet, as time has passed, it seems that there are those that think "progress" (if you can call it that) is more important than protecting our precious resources. The revenues generated by water recreation activities alone in the Columbia are immense. If ONE oil train were to derail, the devastation to our economy would be far greater than any promise of "we'll clean it up." I cannot imagine anything of such importance that would warrant putting our region at risk in this way. I realize that the money generated by Bakken oil will continue to push for a way to bring their product to market, but the path through Vancouver is enormously risky to our environment.

Please protect our land from the potential of unimaginable disaster by denying oil trains access to Vancouver.

Sincerely,

Darrel R. Rast
11312 NE Mead Rd
Vancouver, WA 98682
rast77@gmail.com

(UTC)

From: Katerina Kokolis <karenkokolis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:19 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

Katerina Kokolis

29212

From: dick harmon <dickwisingup@hevanet.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:40 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: opposition to Vancouver-Tessoro oil project

Mr. Stephen Posner
Interim Director
Washington State
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

Mr. Posner:

I am 76, with children, grandchildren and great grandchildren in both Washington and Oregon.

Please ask Governor Inslee and your colleagues on the Site Evaluation Council to consider their own offspring as they ponder the Tesoro Vancouver permit.

Consider what oil spills (yes, there will be spills) into the Columbia will do to the imagination and spirit of ALL our children.

Consider the impact of oil train explosions on forest fires up the sides of the Columbia, and, in turn, the impact of those fires on our children's hope for a viable, beautiful home setting.

Consider the loss of historical job sectors—fisheries, farms, tourism—on the economic future of our children.

Consider Bill McKibben's emissions math (backed by Potsdam Institute research) on our children and their children: We have about 14 years, according to that math, before the climate system's feedback loops go nuts and present our children (how old will each child be in 14 years?) with an unrecognizable world.

Consider your—and our—legacy, as a natural stage in human development for mature adults; what are we giving our children? Are we betraying them for the sake of convenience and obedience to the fossil regime? Do we want them to respect us, or to piss on our graves?

Consider our children's birthright, as a gift of nature and the divine working in the depth of nature. Business-as-usual by policy makers at all levels of this nation have, for more than thirty years, ignored our children's birthright and repressed our own legacy in the denial and convenience of fossil-uber-alles.

Please consider this, above all, as a MORAL decision, which defines us all as choosing life or death— for all living organisms and the climate's stability here in our own region, as well as globally.

Thank you.

Dick Harmon
1023 SE Bidwell
Portland, OR 97202
503-233-0548

From: robert norton <rdjnorton@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:56 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

robert norton

91943

UTC)

From: Jane Reading <jane@watersongs.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:20 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

Jane Reading

85050

UTC)

From: Mary Ellen Petrich <mepetrichsss@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:35 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. Oil-by-rail and export by ship is a bad deal for Washington State and the entire Northwest region. The project comes at a steep price for rail and river communities throughout the state and along the Columbia River, yet offers few jobs in return. Based on the far reaching impacts of this project, I urge you to deny Tesoro Savage's unprecedented proposal.

The public safety and environmental impacts of the state's largest pipeline-on-wheels proposal deserve close scrutiny. For example, EFSEC must assess:

- The potential impacts of a large train-related oil spill along the rail route in Washington and beyond.
- The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.

After carefully considering the safety, environmental, and climate risks associated with the project, I respectfully ask you to deny Tesoro Savage's application.

Thank you.

Mary Ellen Petrich

91436

Docket EF-131590

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27926

UTC)

From: Jeff and Dianne Dyer <bluebird@rockisland.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:31 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC in Vancouver

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

My name is Jeff Dyer and I am a San Juan County taxpayer. I am concerned about the potential impacts from the proposed Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC in Vancouver to the infrastructure of San Juan County. Please thoroughly study the following:

Based on the barrels of crude oil proposed to be transported and subsequently burned, what would be the impacts of the acceleration of Climate Change to San Juan County? What would be the costs from associated increased storm winds, ocean surges, and precipitation? What would be the impacts due to sea level rise? What would be the costs associated with sea level rise? What would be the costs associated with more intense storms coinciding with the highest "King Tides?" What would be the adverse impacts to San Juan County's public roads, docks, etc. located on or near the shoreline with sea level rise? With sea level rise, what would be the adverse impacts to San Juan County's private development located on or near the shoreline?

Sincerely,

Jeff Dyer
turtleenergy@rockisland.com
360-468-2843

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27927

JTC)

From: TURTLE Energy <turtleenergy@rockisland.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:19 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

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

My name is Jeff Dyer and I am a San Juan County resident and property owner. Our County relies on our tourism-based economy where our resident orca whales are an economic driver. I am concerned about the potential impacts from the proposed Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC in Vancouver to the health of the Southern Resident Orca Whale. Please thoroughly study the following: What would be the adverse impacts from the proposed crude oil transport terminal to the Southern Resident Orca Whales that spend time at the mouth of the Columbia River where it is presumed that they are feeding on upper Columbia and Snake River Chinook salmon? What would be the adverse impacts to Chinook salmon from the construction and the on-going operation of the proposed Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC and associated rail lines, docks, ship loaders, storage facilities, conveyors, and equipment? What would be the cumulative adverse impacts to Chinook salmon from all the proposed fossil fuel terminal proposals within the Columbia River? What would be the cumulative adverse impacts to Chinook salmon from the increased vessel traffic associated with the Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC and all other proposed fossil fuel terminal projects in the Columbia River? What would be the cumulative adverse impacts to Chinook salmon from the increased risks of an oil spill especially given the treacherous conditions that can exist at the Columbia River Bar which is also known as the "Graveyard of the Pacific?"

Sincerely,
Jeff Dyer
turtleenergy@rockisland.com
360-468-2843

From: TURTLE Energy <turtleenergy@rockisland.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:23 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC

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

My name is Jeff Dyer and I am a San Juan County resident and property owner. The economy of San Juan County relies upon the environmental beauty of the islands. I am concerned about the potential impacts from the proposed Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal LLC in Vancouver to the economy of San Juan County. Please thoroughly study the following:

What would be the adverse impacts including the increased risk of a major oil spill from the increased barge or ship traffic to/from Tesoro refinery at Anacortes that would have to travel adjacent to the waters of San Juan County? What would be the loss of property values and what would be the loss of tourism, real estate sales, and housing construction related tax revenue from a single major oil spill in San Juan County; from multiple moderately-sized fuel spills over time; and from multiple small-sized fuel spills over time?

Sincerely,

Jeff Dyer
turtleenergy@rockisland.com
360-468-2843