

UTC)

---

**From:** gabriel.j.juliussen@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 8:53 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Kenai, Alaska 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,  
Gabriel Juliussen

UTC)

---

**From:** dawn regier <dawnsuzanne1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 9:11 AM  
**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.

dawn regier

97223

**From:** brian.s.graham@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 9:24 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Texas 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,  
Brian Graham

(UTC)

---

**From:** david.a.graser@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 9:52 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from California 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 safety, environmental compliance, 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 Environmental Impact Statement (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 EIS:

- 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,  
David Graser

**From:** TOM SMITH <mtnman1971@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 9:54 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Do Not Support Vancouver Oil Terminal

The Port of Vancouver has approved an oil terminal that now requires the Governor's approval for it to proceed. I do not support this use of our port. Tesoro and BNSF both assure us that this will be an extremely safe operation with no risk. Recent events do not support this:

- "The July 6 derailment and explosion of an oil train in the Quebec town of Lac-Mégantic near the Maine border killed at least 15 people and forced the evacuation of 2,000."
- "An explosion and fire at a Washington state (Tesoro) oil refinery shook homes and shot flames into the night sky early Friday, killing five people and critically injuring two others. The fire struck the **Tesoro Corp. refinery** in Anacortes, about 70 miles north of Seattle on Puget Sound, at about 12:30 a.m., the company said. The blaze occurred while maintenance work was being performed and was extinguished in about 90 minutes."
- "**Tesoro Corp.** on Friday restarted a North Dakota crude oil pipeline that ruptured and spilled more than 20,000 barrels of oil in a North Dakota wheat field."

The Port of Vancouver states that this would result in \$4.5 million per year in increased revenue. The risk of potential damage to the area, upstream in the Columbia River gorge, and downstream in the Columbia River estuary far outweigh this minor revenue source. A relative minor incident - the Davy Crockett cleanup - cost the taxpayers \$22 million. What would a derailed train going into the Columbia River or the collision or grounding of a tanker going downstream from Vancouver cost this state? It's not a question of "if", it is a question of "when" an accident will happen.

The shipping channel in the Columbia River is narrow and shallow (43' deep) much of its way down the Columbia River from Vancouver. What will the draft be for the ships carrying oil down the Columbia? What will their length and width be, and their impact on other cargo ships currently using the Columbia River up to Portland and Vancouver? What will their impact be on recreational users, commercial fishing, and sports fishing? What will their impact be on erosion of the Columbia River shoreline? I believe that the potential cost of increased rail and river traffic, an accident, and the impact on other revenue sources far outweigh the benefits.

The Columbia River is a jewel that we need to protect and preserve for our children and our grandchildren - and for generations to come. I respectfully request that you do not approve this proposed oil terminal.

Tom Smith  
1200 NW Sluman Road

Vancouver, WA 98665

(UTC)

---

**From:** judithwatson@savageservices.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 10:04 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of North Dakota and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The proposed project will receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries to offset or replace foreign imports and declining production in Alaska and California. This crude oil will be refined in US refineries to help meet the everyday needs of residents and businesses along the US West Coast – including those of the state of Washington. In short, it helps with America's energy security and will bring economic benefits and valuable jobs to our local communities.

As a resident, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. As such, I would request that the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis be 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:

- Risks caused by earthquakes
- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Protection of Columbia River water quality and fish and wildlife resources
- 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 and have a dampening effect on transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Vancouver, Clark County and the state of Washington.

This balanced approach is consistent with 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,  
Judith Watson

(UTC)

---

**From:** Diana Boom <diana@dboom.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 10:39 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** proposed Vancouver Oil Terminal

Please deny this permit. We should be moving away from oil, not putting ourselves and our land at risk by building an oil terminal.

The dangers outweigh any supposed benefit.

**UTC)**

---

**From:** James Morse <jamesmorse66@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 10:39 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Oil Terminal Project Comments

Dear Mr. Stephen Posner:

As a life-long risk analysis practitioner, chemist, and professional engineer, I can no longer remain silent on the issue of the Vancouver WA Oil Terminal Project. The arguments against oil transport and the Vancouver terminal are reminiscent of earlier fallacious arguments against most other forms of technology or commerce. Considering the risk vs. benefit, one must realize that no endeavor is completely without risk. The judgment is then: does the benefit outweigh the *actual* (not perceived) risk. Consider we have had a century of experience with transport and storage of petroleum products with a remarkably low incidence of mishaps. Using the recent Quebec oil train mishap to govern our risk considerations is like pointing to the small number of aircraft accidents each year as proof that flying is unsafe!

Again, I respectfully recommend that an *objective* risk-benefit analysis be accomplished to form the final decision. Please avoid allowing anti-commerce, anti-technology, emotional hysteria to influence your judgment!

James L. Morse, Professional Engineer (CA Safety Engineer Cert. No. 1999 )  
Vancouver WA



**From:** David Land <dcterra@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 11:39 AM  
**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.

David Land

20901

UTC)

---

**From:** Marguerite Hall <margueritehall@ymail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 12:03 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** I am opposed to the Tesoro Savage Terminal!

EFSEC Committee,

I live in Portland Oregon and will be directly impacted by this devastating plan.

You are in a powerful position to overturn the insane proposal of creating a fossil fuel corridor along the Columbia river! You are making history and the responsibility to deny a permit for the Tesoro Savage Terminal and halt the destructive process of a plan that harms people, flora and fauna and sea life communities at large is in your hands!

The world wants clean safe energy options! We all know what the consequences will be if we head down the road of fossil fuel expansion. The export of highly combustible fossil fuels through communities, environmentally protected areas and vulnerable communities (communities that suffer from lack or low emergency response) is not a viable plan, it is simply insane!

The cart was put before the horse on the fossil fuel expansion plans. Coal, Liquid Natural Gas and Oil are being extracted at alarming rates without a market or infrastructure. Fossil Fuel extraction does not follow a supply and demand scenario rather it is being developed and invested in by trans multi-national companies who also lobby to weaken federal environmental laws, suppress green energy programs, policies and innovations. Furthermore communities here and across the ocean are being forced to participate in this contrived and hedged market plan given no other options. All of the tools of oppression apply.

We could just as easily and for the same amount of investment, develop sustainable energies and their infrastructure.

We are living in times where we have witnessed the environmental devastation wrought by unsustainable energy. The Pacific Ocean is poisoned by nuclear power catastrophe at Fukushima and mass extinctions are taking place and increased health problems are being documented a record levels. The sea stars are disintegrating off the Canadian coastline. Babies along the Pacific coast in the US are exhibiting thyroid problems. Mass extinctions of marine life are also taking place in the Atlantic Ocean due to the BP spill and toxic corexit use; zooplankton is not flourishing and all sea life in the food chain are malnourished, dying or displaying birth defects. Oceans and water ways turn black with oil. The air in China is so toxic, there is a state of emergency. The populations in China that live in high smog environments caused from coal fear for their lives, so much so that the government has instituted environmental policy and set a goal to decrease the use of coal fire plants. The use of fossil fuels is linked to global warming and the increasing intensity of natural catastrophes such as we recently witnessed with Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines. Hydraulic fracturing for liquid natural gas and crude oil has depleted or permanently damaged water supplies all over the U.S.

Do not support the boom bust cycle of fossil fuel expansion, the damage to the environment is irreparable. The costs outweigh any profit to be made.

Sincerely,

Marguerite Hall  
2745 NW Pettygrove  
Portland OR 97210

**From:** Lowell Greenberg <ljg100@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 12:10 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

Dears Sirs:

I am strongly opposed to this project. I have also fought against the coal export terminals in the Pacific NW as well as strongly supporting national efforts to stem climate change.

If you have visited a Chinese major city recently- you would find days that the pollution smog is so thick it forms a toxic fog over the city- killing innocents, seniors, the weak and insidiously destroying our collective well being, health and humanity. The burning of coal, the fracking for natural gas and the extraction of oil- as well as the transport of these things poses innumerable risks to the community- fire, diesel pollution, environmental contamination, etc. In addition, to encourage the continued development of these forms of energy is a profoundly irresponsible act- jeopardizing the health and well being of the planet through the terrifying impacts of climate change. Climate instability that costs millions of lives per year- and if current trends continue- hundreds of millions- even billions of lives.

The Pacific NW has a unique responsibility to say No! to this. Not just divestment- but the courage to say no more. To do otherwise is an abrogation of our collective humanity.

Sincerely,

Lowell J Greenberg  
2670 NW Kennedy Court  
Portland, OR 97229  
503-809-9383

**From:** cclark@barnhartcrane.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 12:40 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of Washington and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The proposed project will receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries to offset or replace foreign imports and declining production in Alaska and California. This crude oil will be refined in US refineries to help meet the everyday needs of residents and businesses along the US West Coast – including those of the state of Washington. In short, it helps with America's energy security and will bring economic benefits and valuable jobs to our local communities.

As a resident, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. As such, I would request that the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis be 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:

- Risks caused by earthquakes
- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Protection of Columbia River water quality and fish and wildlife resources
- 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 and have a dampening effect on transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Vancouver, Clark County and the state of Washington.

This balanced approach is consistent with 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,  
Cristy Clark

**From:** dcb1952@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 12:43 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of Washington and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The proposed project will receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries to offset or replace foreign imports and declining production in Alaska and California. This crude oil will be refined in US refineries to help meet the everyday needs of residents and businesses along the US West Coast – including those of the state of Washington. In short, it helps with America's energy security and will bring economic benefits and valuable jobs to our local communities.

As a resident, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. As such, I would request that the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis be 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:

- Risks caused by earthquakes
- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Protection of Columbia River water quality and fish and wildlife resources
- 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 and have a dampening effect on transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Vancouver, Clark County and the state of Washington.

This balanced approach is consistent with 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,  
Doug Berry

JTC)

---

**From:** Sherry Bupp <sherry\_bupp@joimail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 12:50 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.

Sherry Bupp

98052

**From:** Suzy\_Clark@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 12:50 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Texas 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,  
Suzanne Saenz

UTC)

**From:** michaelray@savageservices.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:13 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Savage employee and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Savage employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience how important clean, efficient and safe operations are to Savage. A terminal run by Savage in Vancouver will bring the community jobs like mine. And I'm proud to say I work for this company, and I'm also proud of our impressive track record of integrity and social responsibility.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. I work in the Savage operation in Delaware city, Delaware and know 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 US refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing US crude to move through a US terminal to US refineries, Savage and Tesoro are supporting US energy independence and creating US jobs.

I urge the committee to keep site of the positive impact this terminal will have on the US economy. As a Savage employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas market in the US. 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,  
Michael Ray



UTC)

---

**From:** Bernice Pluchos <b.pluchos@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:17 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Proposed Oil Terminal

This unspoiled corner of our United States must not be put under the threat of a potential contaminating and even explosive oil spill.

I "vote" against the proposed oil terminal project in Vancouver, WA. We don't want this type of employment here.

JTC)

---

**From:** tesorosa@box911.bluehost.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:18 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Savage employee and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Savage employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience how important clean, efficient and safe operations are to Savage. A terminal run by Savage in Vancouver will bring the community jobs like mine. And I'm proud to say I work for this company, and I'm also proud of our impressive track record of integrity and social responsibility.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. I work in the Savage operation in Delaware and know 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 US refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing US crude to move through a US terminal to US refineries, Savage and Tesoro are supporting US energy independence and creating US jobs.

I urge the committee to keep site of the positive impact this terminal will have on the US economy. As a Savage employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas market in the US. 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,  
Kimberly Neely

**UTC)**

---

**From:** James Loacker <jdloacker@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:20 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Proposed Vancouver oil terminal

Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council,

It is past time to be expanding our oil infrastructure. It is time to shift our focus to renewable sources of energy. Eight years ago the president of General Motors said we need to get off oil. The major car manufacturers have responded by making electric cars. Twenty two models are available, with more on the way.

This is not about Energy Independence. It is about profits for the oil industry. And at what cost? A single train derailment in the Columbia Gorge is estimated to wipe out our salmon industry for decades. Not to mention the flammability of the Bakken oil. It is an explosive like gasoline.

The Northwest and all between here and the oil fields of North Dakota should not be put at such a high risk for the benefit of a few.

Please reject this proposed oil terminal in Vancouver, and all other proposals of this kind.

Respectfully,

James D. Loacker  
8990 Oceancrest Lane  
P.O. Box 1103  
Manzanita, OR 97130

**From:** Lynn Stiglich <lstiglich@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:37 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comments on proposed oil terminal project in Vancouver WA

Dear Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council,

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed oil terminal project, which would store and transfer 380,000 barrels of Bakken crude oil from rail cars to ships at the port in Vancouver, WA.

This is a dangerous project and should not be built. I am against its existence and completion for the following reasons:

It will bring pollution and the possibility of environmental degradation and disaster to the region, affecting people's health, the ecosystems, air quality, animals and waterways.

Even if there is no actual disaster, the presence of the oil and the dirtiness of the product is unhealthy. And there no 100% safeguards against disaster as evidenced by the accidents in Quebec and in Alabama just this past year. In the case of Quebec, the loss of life and devastation of the city was tragic and serves as a warning to other communities.

The oil is more volatile, and more prone to explosion, requiring greater care in handling.

The environment does not need this risk, nor the eventual burning and use of the fuel. The oil is better left in the ground. The companies extracting and selling stand to make money, or they would not be trying to do it. But the price is being paid by the health of people, animals, environment and communities nearby.

The Columbia River Gorge is a spectacular place, among the world's most special spots. Do not risk contaminating and polluting it.

Practice the principle of prudent avoidance. Do what is right for people and the Earth. Resist the lure of a few jobs and money to be made.

Do not undertake this project.

Respectfully,

Lynn Stiglich  
4214 NE 136th Circle  
Vancouver, WA 98686

submitted 13 December 2013

(UTC)

---

**From:** Debbie Brush <debrush@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:35 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.

Debbie Brush

80104

(UTC)

---

**From:** matthew.p.gill@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:39 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Support for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee whose area of responsibility covers both Alaska and the Pacific Northwest and I am writing to you 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 including our operations at our Anacortes rail offloading facility that performs a function similar to what we are proposing at the Port of Vancouver.

This terminal will greatly 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. Specifically, this terminal will create 120 full-time family-wage jobs along with 250 temporary construction jobs in Washington State.

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 and have a chilling effect on other projects seeking to invest in Washington State. 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,  
Matthew Gill

(UTC)

---

**From:** tomhunter26@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:44 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Savage employee and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Savage employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience how important clean, efficient and safe operations are to Savage. A terminal run by Savage in Vancouver will bring the community jobs like mine. And I'm proud to say I work for this company, and I'm also proud of our impressive track record of integrity and social responsibility.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. I work in the Savage operation in and know 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 US refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing US crude to move through a US terminal to US refineries, Savage and Tesoro are supporting US energy independence and creating US jobs.

I urge the committee to keep site of the positive impact this terminal will have on the US economy. As a Savage employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas market in the US. 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,  
Thomas Stine

(UTC)

---

**From:** Diane Ryerson <adryerson7@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 2:13 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.

Diane Ryerson

95521



**From:** KIRTI.s.SHAH@TSOCORP.COM  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 2:16 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from California 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,  
KIRTI SHAH

**From:** William Shirey <williamriek@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 2:47 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.

William Shirey

35601

**From:** kbalcom@barnhartcrane.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 2:56 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of Washington and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The proposed project will receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries to offset or replace foreign imports and declining production in Alaska and California. This crude oil will be refined in US refineries to help meet the everyday needs of residents and businesses along the US West Coast – including those of the state of Washington. In short, it helps with America's energy security and will bring economic benefits and valuable jobs to our local communities.

As a resident, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. As such, I would request that the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis be 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:

- Risks caused by earthquakes
- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Protection of Columbia River water quality and fish and wildlife resources
- 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 and have a dampening effect on transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Vancouver, Clark County and the state of Washington.

This balanced approach is consistent with 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,  
Kent Balcom

UTC)

---

**From:** Ann Littlewood <annlittlewood3@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 3:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Vancouver Oil Terminal

Dear Governor Inslee,

Please deny the permits for the Vancouver oil terminal. I live in Portland and am very concerned about expanding this dirty and outmoded industry in my neighborhood. The oil is likely to be exported, while we end up with predictable spills and pollution. The oil companies get the profits, any jobs promised are overstated, and we get the mess and expense of cleaning it up. We don't need this in the Northwest.

With best regards,  
Ann Littlewood  
Portland, OR

--

*Leave the coal in the hole, the oil in the soil, the gas under the grass.*

UTC)

---

**From:** bigmax454@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 3:13 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Savage employee and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Savage employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience how important clean, efficient and safe operations are to Savage. A terminal run by Savage in Vancouver will bring the community jobs like mine. And I'm proud to say I work for this company, and I'm also proud of our impressive track record of integrity and social responsibility.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. I work in the Savage operation in and know 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 US refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing US crude to move through a US terminal to US refineries, Savage and Tesoro are supporting US energy independence and creating US jobs.

I urge the committee to keep site of the positive impact this terminal will have on the US economy. As a Savage employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas market in the US. 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,  
Frank Milan

UTC)

---

**From:** Tanya Kocian <tkocian@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 3:15 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.

Tanya Kocian

94015

(UTC)

---

**From:** David Sincox <dsincox@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 3:17 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.

David Sincox

60657

**From:** turnerdavid821@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 3:27 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Savage employee and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Savage employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience how important clean, efficient and safe operations are to Savage. A terminal run by Savage in Vancouver will bring the community jobs like mine. And I'm proud to say I work for this company, and I'm also proud of our impressive track record of integrity and social responsibility.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. I work in the Savage operation in California and know 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 US refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing US crude to move through a US terminal to US refineries, Savage and Tesoro are supporting US energy independence and creating US jobs.

I urge the committee to keep site of the positive impact this terminal will have on the US economy. As a Savage employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas market in the US. 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,  
David Turner



UTC)

**From:** joe@pedersonbros.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 3:46 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of Washington and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The proposed project will receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries to offset or replace foreign imports and declining production in Alaska and California. This crude oil will be refined in US refineries to help meet the everyday needs of residents and businesses along the US West Coast – including those of the state of Washington. In short, it helps with America's energy security and will bring economic benefits and valuable jobs to our local communities.

As a resident, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. As such, I would request that the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis be 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:

- Risks caused by earthquakes
- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Protection of Columbia River water quality and fish and wildlife resources
- 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 and have a dampening effect on transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Vancouver, Clark County and the state of Washington.

This balanced approach is consistent with 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,  
Joe Wilson

UTC)

---

**From:** Todd.W.Keys@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 4:01 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from California 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,  
Todd Keys

**From:** Tripsguy@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 4:47 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Vancouver oil terminal

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver, WA.

My name is Lehman Holder and I'm a resident of Vancouver. I spoke to EFSEC panel members at Clark College on Oct 29, but wasn't able to give the full scope of my thoughts due to very limited speaking time.

My opposition is based on the following points:

1) The likelihood of an earthquake: On Sept. 30, at a town-hall style meeting in Vancouver sponsored by Tesoro and Savage companies, I spoke to three of their representatives regarding my concern about the effect of a large earthquake on such a terminal. I hope that EFSEC appreciates that it isn't a question of *if* a large quake will occur -- it's a question of *when*. Seismologists and geologists believe that the Northwest is overdue for a major earthquake, of the magnitude that devastated Japan in 2011. Tesoro has assured everyone that their storage tanks will be safe in such an event because a berm will be built around them to contain the oil. I don't believe that they understand or appreciate just how severe an 8- or 9.0 magnitude quake is. Almost certainly, the ground on which these tanks would be built will liquify, and the berm will fracture. The result will be a nightmarish oil spill, with most of the oil going directly into the nearby Columbia River. Electric transmission lines would be severed, likely igniting the oil and setting the river ablaze. Of course, such a huge seismic event might not happen for 100 years or more, but it could happen much, much sooner. According to a report in the *Portland Oregonian*, if this large quake doesn't happen by 2060, our region will exceed 85% of all known intervals of earthquake recurrence over the past 10,000 years. If EFSEC is realistic about this danger, it should be extremely sobering. And yet, even when this large earthquake occurs, this scenario can be prevented. EFSEC should simply recommend that Gov. Jay Inslee say "NO" to this ill-conceived project. The safety, health and well-being of our community and our environment demand it.

2) Vancouver economic development: The City of Vancouver already has plans underway to redevelop it's waterfront area between I-5 and the Port of Vancouver. Trains carrying oil to this proposed oil terminal would pass extremely close to this waterfront development. Waterfront development work will provide many more jobs than Tesoro and Savage companies claim would be created by their proposed terminal.

3) Volatility of "fracked" oil: The fact is that oil obtained by hydraulic fracturing, or "fracking," is much more volatile than other oil. This was proven by the fiery explosion and tragic loss of life in Lac-Megantic, Quebec, in July. Since that happened, two more train derailments have occurred, in Saskatchewan and Alabama. The fact is that no matter what Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Co. says, derailments occur, which can result in loss of life and extreme property and/or environmental damage. Additionally, this oil would be carried down the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, right next to the river. When a derailment occurs, the oil would be spilled directly into the river, creating an environmental nightmare.

I urge you to recommend to Gov. Inslee that this project be turned down. Hundreds of Washington residents have asked EFSEC to do this in public comments, and thousands more have expressed their opposition by e-mail. I hope EFSEC will strongly consider this, the danger to public safety and the unacceptable environmental consequences of an accident. This project should *NOT* move forward.

Thank you.

Lehman Holder  
8916 NE 11th St  
Vancouver, WA 98664

---

**From:** Rosemarie Knox <rknox\_87110@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 5:17 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.

Rosemarie Knox

87110

ITC)

---

**From:** Colleen Hutchins <Colleen371@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 5:34 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.

Colleen Hutchins

01469

---

**From:** Virgil Pauls <VirgilPauls@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 7:13 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.

Virgil Pauls

R2V1P4

**From:** Carol <carolellispokane@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 8:57 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC); Kernutt, Matt (ATG)  
**Subject:** Rail Accidents Sept 2001-2008

Wikipedia by decade lists all rail accidents around the world. I started conservatively, listing accidents only in the Central and Western US that seemed pertinent when I first began my research. So my first years' lists are not comprehensive. Then I started to include some Eastern US accidents where there was oil, coal, or environmental involvement. I mostly did not include accidents with vehicles at grade level crossings. I was looking for what was happening with the rail system with trains on rails. Soon I will deliver by email my 2008-2013 summary. Today's list covers 2000 - 2008. Remember that in Oct. 2008 Congress passed the Positive Train Control Act to try to reduce rail accidents, which I detailed to you on 12/11/13 by email.

9/13/01 - Windover Ut - Passenger train hit coal train. Injuries.  
1/18/02 - Minot ND - derailment, ammonia spill.  
6/20/03 - Commerce, CA- derailment ruptures natural gas lines  
10/12/03 -Chicago - Speed. Cars roll, 45 injured, many not on train.  
6/28/04 - TX - Train fails to stop at signal. 4 die, 51 injured  
11/3/04 - DC - Train rolls backward into another train. Operator failure.  
11/11/04 -San Antonio - Derailment in industrial area. 1 killed.  
11/29/04 - Richland, FL - In fog 2 trains collide.  
1/6/05 -Graniteville, SC - Moving train hit parked local. Crew failed to reline switch. 9 die.  
4/14/05 - 19 cars derail due to forest fire.  
5/5/05 - Gall, Ill. Train derails, destroys 140' bridge.  
8/5/05 - BC - 9 cars derail near Whistler into River. 500,000 fish die.  
9/17/05 - Chicago - Commuter train derails, kills 2.  
10/15/05 - Texarkana- 1 train rearends, derails, explodes. Evacuation . 1 killed.  
1/6/06 - Possum Pt, VA -broken rail, 3 cars off track. NTSB: tracks not repaired, speed.  
6/14/06 - Madera, CA - 2 trains collide. Driver, high on cocaine, ran red signal.  
7/1/06 - Abington, PA - 2 trains collide on 1 track. 36 injured.  
10/20/06 - New Brighton, PA - Train derails over bridge. Fire. Evacuation.  
11/9/06 - Baxter, CA - 6 runaway cars derail, kill 2 crew on maintenance rig.  
11/30/06 - Baltimore, OH - 15 cars derail, hit another train, more derail.  
1/10/07 - Woburn, MA - Commuter hits work crew, 2 die.  
10/22/07 - Middlebury, VT - train leaks into Otter Creek. Evacuation.  
10/29/07 - 2 BNSF derail, spill. 350 evacuated.  
11/9/07 - DC - rail cars roll, dump load, hit bridge.  
11/3/07 - Chicago - 1 train hits another. Engineer going 40 in 15 mph zone.  
1/7/08 - Harvard, Ill - train derailed by tornado.  
2/5/08 - Boswell, IND - Fog. 2 die at crossing with prior accidents and deaths.  
3/17/08 - Marysville, WA- BNSF train crashes into big rig at crossing. Derailment.  
3/25/08 - Canton, MA - Train hits runaway box car. 150 injured.  
5/28/08 - Boston - 1 train rearends another. 1 dies.  
9/12/08 - Chatsworth, CA - Commuter train hits freight train. 25 die.

---

**From:** Matthew McGrew <mcgrew.matthew@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 9:04 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.

Matthew McGrew

75025



**From:** Gordon Fulks <gordonfulks@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 1:56 PM  
**To:** Robert Benze; kensforsoil@comcast.net; global-warming-realists@googlegroups.com  
**Cc:** Kramer, Becky; EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** RE: Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing - The Spokane Spokesman-Review

Dear Bob,

I completely agree. When I did consulting for various public and private clients on one or the other 'scientific scares,' I would point out that every human activity carries some degree of risk. It is not possible to eliminate all risk. Hence the rational approach is to reduce the risk as much as possible with low cost approaches such as wearing a seat belt. I would then proceed to estimate the risk of whatever worried them and compare it to the risks they were already willing to take, from driving a car to having a baby to being struck by a meteor. If the risk were less than risks they were already taking, I argued that their time and money would be better spent addressing the greater risk.

Its all part of the need to understand the concept of "Acceptable Risk." There is a wonderful but obscure little book 'Of Acceptable Risk' that spells this out beautifully. The author points out the absurdity of believing that we are today taking far more risks than we did a century ago.

In the early 1900s the primary pesticides were 'Paris Green' and related lead arsenic compounds. Paris Green was used to kill rats in the sewers of Paris and to kill pests on strawberries. Lead-arsenic compounds were also used on apples grown in Hood River, Oregon, leaving such a soil residue that realtors must still disclose "leaded soils." After WW2, the US military dumped large quantities of arsenic compounds on Sicily to try to control malaria. But the discovery by Swiss Chemist Paul Hermann Muller that DDT was far more effective and far less dangerous than arsenic compounds revolutionized vector control programs. Although he won the Nobel Prize in Medicine in 1948 for his discovery, he lived long enough to see zealots like Rachael Carson begin the great reversal of scientific progress against malaria with her largely unwarranted demonizing of DDT.

Ever since, uneducated political zealots have tried to and in some cases succeeded in reversing progress on a number of fronts with scare tactics.

The real battle we fight is against ignorance and all who encourage it.

Gordon

Gordon J. Fulks, PhD (Physics)  
Corbett, Oregon USA

---

Date: Thu, 12 Dec 2013 12:19:22 -0800

Subject: Re: [GWR] Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing - The Spokane Spokesman-Review

From: robert@benze.com

To: kensforsoil@comcast.net; global-warming-realists@googlegroups.com

CC: beckyk@spokesman.com; efsec@utc.wa.gov

Almost everything carries some degree of risk — including the long- established impacts of railroad traffic. However, we are now so far into the weeds worrying about virtually insignificant effects that the rest of the world must question our sanity. Years ago I had a recording by a comedian named Brother Dave, who suggested the only safe course of action was to stay in bed, assume the fetal position, and turn the electric blanket up to 9. Perhaps that is where we are headed.

The problem with this nonsense, as most GWR members recognize, is that it has major adverse consequences on the world's standard of living. And the misguided advocacy to eliminate carbon is just one issue of many.

I just commented to Newsmax on the wrongness of their latest email news alert titled: *GMO food is worse than we thought* — pointing out that such efforts to eliminate GMO food impact the the the ability of of poor people around the world to dramatically improve their lives. An example is the movement to prevent the use of Golden Rice, which has been modified to include Beta Carotene to counter the awful effects of Vitamin A deficiency in the diets of millions of poor people worldwide.

Apparently facts are no longer important, causing us to abandon the concepts of relative risk, statistically valid epidemiological studies, and the other proven scientific approaches to providing reliable information upon which to base policy? Who would have guessed 50-years ago that advocacy-influence public opinion would be how the U.S.A., with its history of technology and innovation, would handle scientific issues in the 21st century.

Simply amazing.

Bob Benze

Environmental Engineer

---

**From:** ken Schlichte <kensforsoil@comcast.net>

**Date:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 at 9:49 AM

**To:** <global-warming-realists@googlegroups.com>

**Cc:** <beckyk@spokesman.com>, <efsec@utc.wa.gov>

**Subject:** [GWR] Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing - The Spokane Spokesman-Review

**Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing**

*Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Hearing*, by Becky Kramer and in the December 12 Spokane Spokesman-Review link at <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2013/dec/12/fears-about-oil-train-safety-impacts-voiced-at/>, begins as copied below.

## **Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Hearing**

**Becky Kramer** The Spokesman-Review

A proposal to ship North Dakota crude oil through Spokane by train drew mostly opponents at a hearing Wednesday night.

About 75 people showed up for the state hearing on a proposed oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver that could result in up to four oil trains daily passing through Spokane.

"I see the trains go over the Latah Creek Bridge from my patio," said Pauline Druffel, a retired psychotherapist, who lives less than a mile away.

Besides concerns about public safety and the potential for oil spills in the Spokane River, "my primary resistance is global warming," she told members of Washington's Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. "It's insane that we keep taking this stuff out of the ground and putting it into the atmosphere."

Other speakers echoed Druffel's comments on climate change.

Pauline Druffel and the other speakers and participants at Wednesday night's hearing in Spokane would be much less concerned about global warming in Washington state if they were made aware of the official climate data from the NOAA National Climatic Data Center Climate at a Glance site at [www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/) indicating that Washington state's annual temperatures have actually trended downward at a rate of 2.2 degrees F per decade over the last 10 years.

Ken Schlichte

---

(UTC)

**From:** christina.mcdowell@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:00 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,  
Christina McDowell

(UTC)

**From:** Judy Walton <judywalton@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 4:52 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590

To: December 12, 2013  
Stephen Posner  
Interim Manager, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
P.O. Box 43172  
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3172

Dear Mr. Posner,

I'm writing to express my concern about the Tesoro-Savage Joint Venture to develop and operate a new 360,000 barrel-per-day, crude-by-rail uploading and marine loading facility at the Port of Vancouver, Washington. I heard about the development through a local chapter of the national organization 350.org.

I'm the former executive director of a national sustainability non-profit (Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education) with roots in Portland. I also recently helped establish the "Greater Portland Regional Center of Expertise (RCE) on Education for Sustainability Development," officially designated as a United Nations RCE (there are 120 worldwide). Its geographical scope includes Clark County, Washington as well as three counties comprising Metro in Oregon. The RCE aims to leverage education efforts to advance regional sustainable development.

From a sustainable development perspective, this oil facility plan leaves me quite concerned. I'd like to respectfully request that you address the following issues in your review, beyond the usual environmental impacts:

- Impacts on human health
- Economic impacts to the region, including home values. An image as a "dirty, oil city" may dampen Vancouver's and Portland's efforts to become models of sustainable urbanization.
- Rail traffic/accident risk/pollution
- Public costs for rail infrastructure now and into the future
- Global climate contribution

I'm especially concerned about the cumulative impacts from this project - i.e., past, present, and likely future activities that may exacerbate the environmental impacts and others listed above. How will you account for such cumulative impacts?

Can you explore options such as requiring safer rail cars, establishing a spill or incident clean-up fund, and ensuring parent company guarantees of all liabilities? Also, how will you account for adverse impacts due to changes in the amount of oil passing through the terminal, such as market-based increases and decreases? Do such scenarios factor into your analysis of possible adverse impacts?

I look forward to following the progress of this project, and hope that your agency can consider *all* likely adverse impacts of the project, not just a limited scope. Many citizens are trying to create a green economy in this region and plan for the impacts of climate change that are already occurring. This oil terminal project sounds like one that will negatively impact our region's well-being for many generations to come.

Thank you for listening to my concerns. Please feel free to respond by email.

Sincerely,

Judy Walton

--

Judy Walton  
[judywalton@gmail.com](mailto:judywalton@gmail.com)  
(503) 233-3560

UTC)

**From:** john.m.averill@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 5:42 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Kenai, Alaska 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. As a member of the EHS department at Tesoro's Kenai Refinery, I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

It is my opinion that this terminal is a good project on many levels, such as:

- It will contribute to energy independence in the United States.
- It will provide much needed construction/support jobs for a sagging economy
- It will provide another long term economic engine for the Port of Vancouver.
- And chiefly, it will provide a safe and environmentally sound way to supply the U.S. West Coast and Alaska with "green" Bakken Crude Oil. I use the term "green" because "sweet" Bakken Crude contains less waste and less residue than other "sour" crudes and that translates to reduced disposal/environmental impact and less energy required to process a barrel of Bakken crude. I believe energy savings and less waste/residue are good for every consumer of crude oil products.

This terminal will also 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,  
John Averill



JTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Bev Hedin <bevhedin@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:21 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 12, 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 in Vancouver 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 oil 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 the Columbia River Gorge 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. Bev Hedin  
1720 SW 4th Ave Apt 416  
Portland, OR 97201-5533  
(909) 241-9930

**JTC)**

---

**From:** camryn lee <chezcamryn@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 13, 2013 1:28 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comments to request that Governor Inslee stand up to special interests and deny oil permit; re: EFSEC  
**Attachments:** Letter to Gov. Inslee.doc  
**Categories:** Red Category

Dear Governor Inslee,

I am writing you in solidarity with Columbia Riverkeepers, Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Vancouver Rising Tide, Portland Rising Tide, Planet Earth Pledge, 350PDX, Greenpeace, and other organizations. Please support these groups and prevent the proposed oil permit from polluting our precious natural resources, including the beautiful Columbia River Gorge Scenic Area, our salmon, forests, streams, water, air and our opportunity to ensure, as citizens, that our state does not become the site of another Exxon Valdez or Gulf oil spill. I understand the deadline for comments is Dec. 18, 2013. I hope that you receive sufficient support to encourage you to take more progressive, far-seeing action and deny this permit.

Sincerely,

Camryn Lee  
Wildlife Biologist (retired from USDI FWS)  
Member: Society for Conservation Biologists

11412 NE 154th St.  
Brush Prairie, WA 98606  
360-600-3701

Dec. 12, 2013

Dear Governor Inslee,

I am writing to you regarding fossil fuel issues and the denial of permits for the Vancouver oil terminal. As you're aware, you have strong support from the general public in the denial of this permit. My primary concern is global climate change and environmental conservation. At a time when sea levels and temperatures are rising, the sea ice is melting and polar bears, once a common species, are now Endangered, why would we even consider such an outrageous permit?

Last May, atmospheric levels of Carbon Dioxide spiked at 400 parts per million (PPM). The last time that happened, the planet was much warmer and the oceans were 200 feet higher. Do you have children and/or grandchildren? Do you care what kind of planet you leave to them? As temperatures rise, we are all more vulnerable to tropical diseases that were once limited to the jungles of South America. As a biologist, I know that all kinds of diseases we have never encountered before will flourish as temperatures rise. We are ALL at risk of destroying our lives, our planet, and every species on earth. When will this madness stop? It will take a brave man, such as yourself, to say NO to exports of American oil at the cost of our well-being, our health, our planet - it's the only one we have!

As you know, this is NOT about 'Energy Independence'! The Wall Street Journal reported that EXXON is lobbying Congress to allow exports of American oil. How does that translate to energy independence? It doesn't. We have many opportunities, in the Pacific Northwest, to use our wind, wave energy, electricity for cars, and solar power. If every home and business in WA used solar cells for energy, we could reduce our need for power by more than 30%, just with solar alone!

Exxon obstructs research into other sources of power because they want to continue sucking up oil to make money for themselves and their greedy stockholders who don't care about the environment. Americans are sick of that greed. The people of Vancouver know that plans for an oil terminal are not about a need for oil. In 2005, the president of General Motors said "we need to get off oil". All major car companies know that Americans do not want to continue down this path; we all know there is a finite supply of oil, so we do not want to play this game anymore. All the car makers make hybrid and electric cars. There are more than twenty two models in showrooms already. THAT is where the future is and Exxon doesn't want to face the truth, they want to 'milk it' as long as they possibly can. I want them to go the way of the blacksmith. Times change and we all need to change for our own survival! Every year and in every country, people are developing new and better ways to survive without reliance on fossil fuels. The list gets longer every day. Why are we even considering this archaic proposal?

I have not purchased gas from Exxon ever since the hideous Exxon Valdez accident because they never did and never will adequately compensate for that shameful event. Fish, wildlife and native people all suffered due to that accident. It is inexcusable to permit anything that would ever let that kind of accident ever occur along the Oregon and Washington Coasts or in the Columbia River. Imagine what would happen to the Columbia river fisheries, our natural heritage, if there were just one train derailment in the Columbia River. An accident like that could wipe out our salmon industry for decades. Is it worth it to wipe out our precious natural resources just so we can send OUR resources overseas? What have we become if we do that?

The oil industry has a long history of deception, environmental abuse and obfuscation. Oil companies allowed spill-responders to believe that all the oil from a pipeline leak into the Kalamazoo River was cleaned up. The truth, however, is that there were more than one million gallons of heavy tar sands crude oil that was submerged out of sight and drifting downstream during flood stage. Are

these the kinds of people you want to collude with? Do you want your good name to be merged with these greed mongers who rape and exploit our rivers and streams for their own personal gain?

What will it take to change our ways? We had the enormous recent oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico and the area has not recovered, we had Exxon Valdez in Alaska and the area has not recovered. Why is it that oil barges are not regulated as carefully as tanker ships? If this can happen with tanker ships, just imagine what can happen with oil barges and the potential for oil spills.

Oil trains are not as well regulated as oil pipelines and Emergency Response Plans are poorly written, inadequate, and not even funded! I know you do not want a disaster like this to occur here because you would have authorized it, knowing full-well that the potential consequences were deadly.

Bakken Oil is explosive, like gasoline, so why is it being regulated the same way as regular oil? This is dangerous and must be changed. In the event an oil train exploded in the beautiful, scenic, and relatively pristine Columbia River Gorge, is there adequate insurance coverage? NO. What if this happened during the forest fire season, which, by the way, is getting longer and longer due to climate change? If there were a fire in the Gorge, it would race up the hills and spread throughout the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, destroying towns and homes along the way. It would ruin our famously scenic by-way. You are well-aware that climate change is causing forest fires to spread much faster and with greater intensity than ever before and the warmer air will desiccate our previously moist, fern filled forests.

Already, three thousand jobs in Washington State have been jeopardized by acidification of the waters in Willapa Bay from high atmospheric CO2 levels. There have been negative impacts on fish, wildlife, and water quality and livelihoods. Do we want to poison every last bit of our water with the addition of acid to all our inland waterways?

I am pleading with you, as a devoted citizen and conservationist, to protect our land, our water, our air, our forests, our fish and wildlife, our jobs, and our reputation for showing leadership as we march into this century with a new type of thinking about natural resource management. Please make us proud to be from Washington, proud that we will not cave to the pressure of companies like Exxon and other oil companies, proud that we do not sell out and let our land suffer due to greed. You know that the right thing to do is to deny this permit and you know you will have the strong support of Washington residents behind you. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Camryn Lee  
Wildlife Biologist  
Member: Society for Conservation Biologists

11412 NE 154th St.  
Brush Prairie, WA 98606  
Phone: 360-600-3701  
Email: [ChezCamryn@yahoo.com](mailto:ChezCamryn@yahoo.com)

(UTC)

---

**From:** M. Fox <mimsfox@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:55 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** letter against Vancouver oil terminal  
**Attachments:** oil terminal letter EFSEC.docx  
  
**Categories:** Red Category

RE: DENY THE VANCOUVER OIL TERMINAL DEC. 12, 2013

Dear members of EFSEC:

I am a property owner in Vancouver, Washington, and my family has lived along the Columbia River since 1889. I urge you to DENY the proposed Vancouver Oil Terminal. I am a mother of three young boys and am terribly worried about their climate future. I do not want my children to be climate victims of the ill-informed and misguided decisions made by state officials.

It is simply insane policy to allow a project such as this that will send even more carbon emissions to our atmosphere. We in the Pacific Northwest are already experiencing record-breaking floods, severe storms, fires, droughts, snow loss, and now sea level rise, from climate change. If we don't slash emissions now, we will lose our opportunity, because climate tipping points will kick in and add irrevocable momentum. Scientists warn of runaway planetary heating if we exceed the remaining "budget" of carbon dioxide that we can emit into the atmosphere.

Oil and coal must be left in the ground, period. We must mount an all-out effort to switch to 100% renewable energy by 2030, as other nations are doing. This must be done to protect our children's future, but it will also boost our economy with millions of jobs and save billions of energy costs and health costs over the long run. But it will not happen if our local decision-makers have their heads in the sand and wrongly use their public office to allow dirty projects. Please recognize that we no longer live in the 1980s. Our world has changed. It's time to wake up from your dream and say "NO" to proposals that would cause us a living nightmare.

That our local and state decision-makers are even considering this proposal shows how ill-informed they must be as to climate issues. Framing this decision as a "jobs" issue, as the proponents do, is short-sighted, myopic, and downright stupid if one knows the basic facts about global heating. These terminal decisions carry grave consequences for our local communities, our state, and our planet. Frankly, I am not willing to sacrifice my children's future just so a few people can have work. To them I would say, find work that doesn't destroy the climate that supports our very survival. Get re-skilling in windmill construction and maintenance. I am becoming increasingly convinced that the jobs issue is a front for decision-makers that are more loyal to the project proponents than the public at large.

These serial proposals from fossil fuel developers are sapping the time of the community that should otherwise be spent building new infrastructure and policies to reduce our energy and fuel consumption so that we can achieve de-carbonization, as scientists say we must to maintain a habitable nation.

The environmental risk of spill in connection with this terminal is unacceptable as well. Our river and fisheries resources are invaluable and should not be put at risk.

Please deny the proposal in short order so that we can all return to productive endeavors that will help us meet the climate reality upon us.

Mary Christina Wood, Owner of 13120 S.E. Evergreen Hwy., Vancouver, WA



UTC)

---

**From:** Michael.r.booth@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:53 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska 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,  
Mike Booth

---

**From:** Donna Lozano <Donna.Lozano@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:37 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.

Donna Lozano

78552

**From:** mydiane@q.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 12, 2013 3:31 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Vancouver Oil Terminal

Dear Governor Inslee, I would appreciate your listening to people concerned about the environment and the economics of big oil companies around the globe. Vote NO on Vancouver oil terminals. Diane Conrad