

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

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27952

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

(UTC)

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 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

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27960

Docket EF-131590

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 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

UTC)

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

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

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27967

Bucket EF-131590

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

UTC)

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