

(UTC)

From: frank.t.marino@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:27 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,
Frank Marino

(UTC)

From: Michael Hall <micahall1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:39 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Please stop this madness!

Below is this morning's "Tainted water at fracking sites" article from The Oregonian. Who could want such poisonous stuff coming down the Gorge? Please stop this madness!

Thank you, Michael Hall

The Oregonian, 12/18/13, pg. A4

Tainted water at fracking sites

WASHINGTON — Water samples collected at Colorado sites where hydraulic fracturing was used to extract natural gas show the presence of chemicals that have been linked to infertility, birth defects and cancer, scientists reported Monday.

The study, published in the journal *Endocrinology*, also found elevated levels of the hormone-disrupting chemicals in the Colorado River, where wastewater released during accidental spills at nearby wells could wind up.

Tests of water from sites with no fracking activity also revealed the presence of so-called endocrine-disrupting chemicals, or EDCs. But the levels from these control sites were lower than in places with direct links to fracking, the study found.

"With fracking on the rise, populations may face greater health risks from increased endocrine-disrupting chemical exposure," said senior author Susan Nagel, who investigates the health effects of estrogen at the University of Missouri School of Medicine.

Fracking involves injecting millions of gallons of chemical-laced water and sand deep underground to crack shale formations and unlock oil and gas. The process is exempt from some regulations that are part of the Safe Drinking Water Act, and energy companies do not have to disclose the chemicals they use if they consider that information a trade secret.

The study was published as the Energy Information Administration issued a forecast that natural gas production would continue to rise, and gas would overtake coal as the United States' main source of fuel for power plants. The fact that the domestic boom in oil and gas is driven by fracking has made discussions of its impact extremely fraught.

Nagel and her colleagues tested samples of surface water and groundwater from Garfield County, Colo., which, with its approximately 10,000 wells, is a center of oil and gas development driven by fracking. The research team gathered water samples at five natural gas sites where spills of fracking wastewater had occurred.

From: Patrick Inwegen <pvaninwegen@whitworth.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I also urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities.

That said, I also strongly implore you to not be so narrowly focused that you miss the big picture. We can't keep burning fossil fuels at the rate we are currently. Making it easier and cheaper to do so by building this new terminal only makes it that much more difficult to wean the world off of fossil fuels. We can't knowingly do the things that we know will come back to haunt us very soon. Ultimately, the function of government is to be aware of these things and protect us from ourselves. If you fail in this capacity, you have failed in your reason for existing.

Thank you.

Patrick Inwegen
607 W. Cleveland Ave
Spokane, WA 99205

JTC)

From: Leigh McKeirnan <lmckeirnan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:53 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Coal in the Northwest

Even China is looking for alternatives for coal. Some chinese friends in Portland who work for Intel said none of their friends are returning to china because of the pollution. And even worse it would be transported along the Columbia River...think of the damage with one derailment...and there is always one..Not to mention that thin layer that's left protecting the earth....tell me you are educated people who won't be bought off please....Leigh McKeirnan...

Wildlife Watchers of America said Washington's biggest asset even over the timber industry is tourism....you can kiss that goodbye if coal comes in.

(UTC)

From: James Day <jamesday99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

Reader: as an employee of the state of Washington last year I spent many hours observing train operations along the Columbia gorge from Plymouth to Bonneville. I am very concerned about the use of this public right of way for coal and oil freight. I have observed trains traveling both directions on the single track, while opposing trains wait on sidings. This rail line is at or beyond safe capacity leaving little time for maintenance crews to work on those same tracks.

The Amtrak trains along this corridor are also very difficult to use since they receive the lowest priority and are often many hours late due to freight traffic. It is hard to imagine that Amtrak passenger service will be possible at all if the number of trains in daily use in this area is increased. As a public resource has Amtrak taken a position on the impact of coal and oil trains on its service? This would undoubtedly impact Amtrak service on the main north south corridor as well. I would suggest that someone should confirm what Amtrak's position is on coal and oil trains!!

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

James Day
865 high prairie rd
202
Lyle, WA 98635

UTC)

From: Carol <carolellispokane@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:02 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC); Kernutt, Matt (ATG); Carol
Subject: rail bridge accidents

By no means is the Wikipedia list I've compiled exhaustive. Today when I quickly googled rail bridge accidents I came across 3 on the first page not even on the Wikipedia list; the 5/25/13 MO bridge collapse was the only one on the first page already on my prior list. Extrapolating one may assume many other bridge accidents are not on my first lists.

7/4/12 - Glenview, IL - railroad bridge collapses due to "extreme heat" of rails. 2 die.

5/19/13 - Colorado River bridge, TX - fire first day, collapse second day. Fire fighters unable to squelch fire.

6/2/13 - Sudbury, Ontario - trestle broke, maybe due to a wheel bearing failure. 3 or more cars in river.

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30657

Docket EF-131590

UTC)

From: Kris Bishop <bsslap75@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:21 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil plant

Im opposed to an oil plant in vancouver i think its unsafe for the people who live and work in the are. Also it could have some impacts on the enviorment please do not build this plant for our health and the safty to our enviorment

Thank you

Kris Bishop

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30658

Docket EF-131590

(UTC)

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:19 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because I am convinced that another degree C of warming will be catastrophic. We cannot enable the continued consumption of petroleum fuels.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

(UTC)

From: Claudette Longoria <calongoria@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:40 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil trains

To Whom It May Concern;

I am adamantly opposed to the transportation of oil by rail. A prime example is what happened in Quebec. My concern is the pollution of a spill to any aquifer along the train route.

And I do vote!

Claudette A Longoria

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30660

UTC)

From: Sandy Polishuk <polishuk@easystreet.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: comment on the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner,

I write to ask the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to deny the permit for the Tesoro Sabage Vancouver Oil Terminal for a number of reasons.

Perhaps the most important is that we must stop enabling the increase in carbon fuels at a time when not doing so is committing mass suicide of our species via climate disruptions. I do not rely upon that reason exclusively as I know that reason will not be seen as specific enough to this project.

Then let me say that transporting crude oil by rail is risky business as we know from what happened in Lac Megantic. Everyone always assures us that their project will be safe but accidents happening is a rule of life. The terminal can rightly be denied on safety grounds especially given Tesoro Savage's safety record. They lack credibility and we the public just say "NO" to them.

In addition to the risk of moving this oil by rail, once it is shipped from the terminal the potential tragedy of a marine spill is too much to risk as well. Even one spill would spoil our beautiful Pacific NW. I am not only concerned about the beauty, of course, but of our natural resources, the ocean as habitat. Many species that would be endangered are listed under the Endangered Species Act. That fact alone should be enough to say NO to this project.

Then there is the adverse effect on the air and water quality of the region.

Common sense and science both tell us this is not a project for the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to ratify.

Sincerely,
Sandy Polishuk
1610 NE Tillamook St., Apt. 3
Portland, Oregon 97212
USA

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Oil Vancouver

To EFSEC
Regarding the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal
Attention Tami

Tami, I assume that you and your associates have created a chart and are entering tally marks for each concern mentioned.

For the life of me, I can't think of a concise column heading to use for the concern I'd like addressed.

Here is that concern:

The major auto makers already have 22 plug-in hybrids and all-electric vehicles that exceed 80 MPGe. If the oil terminal is built, how will that impact people's incentive to buy those alternatives?

Don Steinke
POB 822393
Vancouver, WA 98682
360 892 1589

(UTC)

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

- To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because of the threat of oil spills to Columbia River salmon. This toxic petroleum should not be allowed near the Columbia. Of the recent known oil spills: Valdez, Deep Water Horizon, Kalamazoo, Mayflower Arkansas, none have been effectively cleaned up. Especially with respect to fish and other water life. A spill of crude oil into the Columbia or adjacent watershed is a risk to salmon that cannot be balanced or compensated.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

UTC)

From: Kris Bishop <bsslap75@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:21 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil plant

Im opposed to an oil plant in vancouver i think its unsafe for the people who live and work in the are. Also it could have some impacts on the enviorment please do not build this plant for our health and the safty to our enviorment

Thank you

Kris Bishop

(UTC)

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:19 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because I am convinced that another degree C of warming will be catastrophic. We cannot enable the continued consumption of petroleum fuels.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

JTC)

From: Claudette Longoria <calongoria@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:40 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil trains

To Whom It May Concern;

I am adamantly opposed to the transportation of oil by rail. A prime example is what happened in Quebec. My concern is the pollution of a spill to any aquifer along the train route.

And I do vote!

Claudette A Longoria

From: Sandy Polishuk <polishuk@easystreet.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: comment on the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner,

I write to ask the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to deny the permit for the Tesoro Sabage Vancouver Oil Terminal for a number of reasons.

Perhaps the most important is that we must stop enabling the increase in carbon fuels at a time when not doing so is committing mass suicide of our species via climate disruptions. I do not rely upon that reason exclusively as I know that reason will not be seen as specific enough to this project.

Then let me say that transporting crude oil by rail is risky business as we know from what happened in Lac Megantic. Everyone always assures us that their project will be safe but accidents happening is a rule of life. The terminal can rightly be denied on safety grounds especially given Tesoro Savage's safety record. They lack credibility and we the public just say "NO" to them.

In addition to the risk of moving this oil by rail, once it is shipped from the terminal the potential tragedy of a marine spill is too much to risk as well. Even one spill would spoil our beautiful Pacific NW. I am not only concerned about the beauty, of course, but of our natural resources, the ocean as habitat. Many species that would be endangered are listed under the Endangered Species Act. That fact alone should be enough to say NO to this project.

Then there is the adverse effect on the air and water quality of the region.

Common sense and science both tell us this is not a project for the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council to ratify.

Sincerely,
Sandy Polishuk
1610 NE Tillamook St., Apt. 3
Portland, Oregon 97212
USA

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30667

Docket EF-131590

UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Oil Vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding the proposed Tesoro Savage Vancouver Oil Terminal

Attention Tami

Tami, I assume that you and your associates have created a chart and are entering tally marks for each concern mentioned.

For the life of me, I can't think of a concise column heading to use for the concern I'd like addressed.

Here is that concern:

The major auto makers already have 22 plug-in hybrids and all-electric vehicles that exceed 80 MPGe. If the oil terminal is built, how will that impact people's incentive to buy those alternatives?

Don Steinke
POB 822393
Vancouver, WA 98682
360 892 1589

From: James Plunkett <jimplunkett66@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 2:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage terminal

- To the Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council :

I oppose the Vancouver oil terminal because of the threat of oil spills to Columbia River salmon. This toxic petroleum should not be allowed near the Columbia. Of the recent known oil spills: Valdez, Deep Water Horizon, Kalamazoo, Mayflower Arkansas, none have been effectively cleaned up. Especially with respect to fish and other water life. A spill of crude oil into the Columbia or adjacent watershed is a risk to salmon that cannot be balanced or compensated.

With respect,
James Plunkett
7112 SW 53rd
Portland, OR

UTC)

From: Joan Enslin <jjcamano@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:34 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Joan Enslin
1320 Beach Drive
Camano Island, WA 98282

(UTC)

From: Benton Elliott <benton.elliott@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:41 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Public Comment: Tesoro Savage Proposal

I am writing in opposition to the Tesoro Savage project for the reasons outlined below, and urge EFSEC and Governor Inslee to refuse it as bad for citizens and the environment.

- Tesoro Savage proposes transporting 360,000 barrels of crude oil along the Columbia River by rail and then ships. This would involve at least four, mile-and-a-half long trains every day. We're talking about roughly half the amount of oil proposed in the controversial Keystone XL project.
- The terminal would receive oil, or any other petroleum product, via trains passing through downtown Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, the City of Vancouver, and other cities on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail line.
- This project is so big that Governor Inslee will make the final decision to deny or approve the terminal. The Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) will make a recommendation to the Governor.

(UTC)

From: patricia o'shea <patricia.oshea@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Please stop the Tesoro Salvage Energy Distribution Project

I oppose this gigantic oil transfer project for several reasons. Trains carrying crude run on diesel and spew pollution into the environment all along their run. As a person with lung issues called reactive airway disease, I am hypersensitive to hydrocarbon pollutants, and particulate matter.

We know this project would increase air pollution, hurt people with asthma, emphysema and lung diseases of all kinds. Recent research at the Harvard School of Public Health has shown linkage between diesel pollution and the development of autism and children. This major report was published first in June 2013. Do we really want to poison the brains of the next generation?

The Columbia Gorge is a national treasure. It is one of the most beautiful places in the world. I say this after having lived in a number of countries.

Economics. There is a thriving tourist industry on both banks of the Columbia in Washington and in Oregon. Very close to the tracks. These bed-and-breakfasts, hotels, restaurants, hiking sailing and so on facilities would be adversely affected by oil trains. Noise pollution, dirt. Not appetizing for tourists. Long trains also would slow down the response time for medical emergencies because crossing the tracks would be a problematic issue in a number of communities. Then how about the possibility of train derailments? Big environmental messes are still being resolved in Canada and Alabama after major oil train derailments this very year. Let alone loss of innocent life.

We must be good stewards of our land and rivers and the animals that inhabit it. I ask you what would an oil spill do to the Columbia River and the precious salmon runs?

I know you know already about global warming. Every community needs to do their part to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. If Washington wants to be a leader in environmental awareness and responsibility, how could you possibly allow this kind of dangerous project to develop?

Thank you for the consideration of my thoughts.

Sincerely yours,

Patricia O'Shea

UTC)

From: tndgardens@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Citizen Comments - Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver, WA

Thousands of people are in our unique national scenic area, the Columbia River Gorge, every day for a variety of reasons. The Gorge and its resources are a major economic driver of the region. People use the Gorge for, for example:

- * water sports - wind surfing, kite boarding, waterskiing, boating
- * outstanding scenery, views, endemic species, wildflowers, and thus hiking, photography, biking, sightseeing
- * fishing - salmon runs are an important source of revenue as are sturgeon.
- * the Gorge is a major east-west corridor and there are several small communities stretched along the river, i.e., along the railroad tracks
- * native Americans have unique fishing rights in the Columbia River.

All this will be put in jeopardy if there should be an oil spill or explosive fire from crude oil trains passing through the area en route to the terminal in Vancouver. The Gorge has many hazards, among them:

- * landslides, for example, Wind Mountain is known for its slides and slumps that sometimes overwhelm the tracks
- * earthquakes - the Northwest is in an earthquake prone zone
- * a build-up of coal dust on the tracks from existing coal rail traffic; plus, two more coal terminals are proposed for Bellingham (18 trains/day) and Longview (16 trains/day)
- * accident - for example, car/truck collisions at one of the many at grade crossings in the Gorge or with large animals such as deer or elk
- * general soil failure, where a portion of the fill material under the tracks, the alluvial soil, or steep slope adjacent to the tracks fails and slips. This is evidenced by numerous slumps visible on the pavement of Highway 14
- * the added risk of using outdated rail cars (the T-111 and T-111A cars that the Association of American Railroads has called for replacing) instead of newer, safer ones.

In the EIS please consider the necessary safety and security steps this project will have to take to address each of these hazards adequately and protect our amazing environment and the lives of so many people.

Thank you.

Diana L. Gordon
642 I Street
Washougal, WA 98671
360-835-7748
tndgardens@comcast.net

December 18, 2013

UTC)

From: patricia o'shea <patricia.oshea@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:58 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: NO to the Tesoro Project

Hi Mr. Posner,

I just wrote you a rather long note on my deep opposition to this this energy distribution project .

If you want to know I am legitimate, please note my name is Patricia O'Shea. I live at 4122 N. East Hazelfern Pl., Portland, OR 97232. I have a brother Carbery O'Shea and Janet O'Shea his wife who live Redmond WA. Along with another household of Mary Kay and Michael O'Shea also living in Redmond. We also have Brian O'Shea living in Seattle. We are all opposed! Very opposed.

Sincerely,

Patricia O'Shea

Sent from my iPad

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 3:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern: Dwindling reserves and National Security

Oil is a precious resource and is not renewable. When the cheap supplies are gone, we'll wish we had made more of an effort to switch to alternatives and choose more efficient cars.

How will our National Security be affected long term, by dwindling reserves?

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

UTC)

From: jrgauer@nalco.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:11 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,
Jason Gauer

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30676

UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:14 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern: Energy Independence not

Last week, the Wall Street Journal reported that EXXON is seeking to export American Oil.

The proposed Tesoro Savage oil terminal is not about energy independence, it is about making money as fast as possible. Tesoro will sell the oil wherever the price is highest.

Please prepare a study regarding how we will obtain energy independence if we use up our oil as fast as possible.

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

JTC)

From: tndgardens@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:16 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Citizen Comments - Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver, WA

While I do NOT see a terrorist or arsonist under every rock, the passage of trains full of crude oil bound for the proposed oil terminal in Vancouver, Washington, poses a threat of oil spill or explosive fire. Here are a few places close to home that I prefer a terrorist not place an IED:

- * under the I-5 Bridge in Vancouver, the Bridge of the Gods and other bridges over the Columbia and its tributaries like the Washougal River

(I assume the 205 Bridge in Vancouver could withstand an explosion.)

- * near any of the numerous downtown areas in small communities along the Gorge and therefore along the tracks

- * in the Camas Paper Mill (the track actually goes through the mill yard - lots of combustible material around)

- * anywhere near Bonneville Dam or the Hanford Nuclear Reservation or power plant

- * in the Steigerwald National Wildlife Refuge in Washougal, Franz Lake Refuge, Beacon Rock State Park, Catherine Creek Nature Reserve, forested areas along the Gorge, etc. (In 2012, we lost 47 acres of Steigerwald to a wildfire - it was an exceptionally dry year and we have had several fires in the Gorge in the last few years)

- * in Vancouver itself, especially near the terminal.

In the EIS please study the need for security in areas other than just the Port of Vancouver. If someone wanted to make mischief, a train composed of outdated rail cars (T-111 and T-111A that the Association of American Railroads has recommended replacing) carrying a highly volatile cargo could be a tempting target.

Thank you.

Diana L. Gordon

December 18, 2013

642 I Street
Washougal, WA 98671
360-835-7748
tndgardens@comcast.net

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30678

JTC)

From: Christine Hart <christine.el.hart@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:21 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Oil Terminal

Concerning the Tesoro-Savage Oil Terminal proposed in Vancouver, WA,

An environmental assessment would demonstrate high risk for chronic and sustained bio-accumulation of petrochemicals in the columbia river gorge, via water contamination, and air pollution. In 1996, the results of the National Human Adipose Tissue Survey showed nearly the whole population exhibited measurable amounts of carcinogenic petro-based chemicals like benzene, styrene, and toleune.

To grant the permit for this oil terminal in Vancouver is to pollute the Columbia River Gorge and to Pollute Our Body and Our Health.

There is a Roman adage, "If touch all, all must agree."

This is a risk the communities - the people who live in the gorge - do not consent to.

NO to the Vancouver Oil Terminal.

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30679

UTC)

From: michael.j.madden@tsocorp.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:25 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,
Michael Madden

UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:36 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern 1: Shipwrecks in the Columbia, and along the Northwest coast
Imagine the Exxon Valdez type of accident along the Oregon and Washington Coasts or in the Columbia River. Accidents happen.

Concern 2: Landslides, derailments, and the salmon industry

My Coast Guard friends say that one train derailment in the Columbia Watershed could wipe out our salmon industry for decades. What are the chances of a landslide over the tracks and derailment of an oil train?

Concern 3: Forest Fires in the Skamania County
Bakken Oil is more explosive than regular crude. Sensors fail, and wheel bearings on rail cars over heat. What is the risk of a forest fire in Skamania County?

Concern 4: Water and land impacts of the fracking industry in the Bakken Formation.
I asked my friends working for a non-profit called *Food and Water Watch*: Why are you opposed to fracking? She told me "It jeopardizes the water supply of America."

Concern 5: Do the benefits of the oil terminal outweigh the risks?

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

UTC)

From: tndgardens@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Citizen Comments - Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver, WA

The proposed oil terminal at Vancouver, Washington, would bring at least four 1 and 1/2 mile long trains a day down the Columbia Gorge, along with many problems and more potential problems.

To start with, local communities, according to recently revealed rulings, would be financially liable for overpasses and up-graded crossings for the increased rail traffic. Towns that could not afford these upgrades, would have limited access to areas these trains would cut off for vehicles such as fire and ambulance. Some businesses would be cut off from potential customers every time a train would come through. Also, diesel exhaust from these trains would add more pollution.

All along the route these trains would travel, including the Columbia River Gorge, the possibility of a derailment and explosive fire such as in Lac Megantic, Quebec, Canada, or in Alabama in November, 2013 exists. Vancouver, Bonneville Dam, and the I-5 Bridge are just a few examples of towns, dams, and bridges these trains would pass through and by, putting them in peril, as well as the oil terminal itself.

Please include these concerns in your EIS.

Thank you.

Thomas N. Gordon
642 I Street
Washougal, Washington 98671
360 - 835 - 7748
tndgardens@comcast.net

December 18, 2013

(UTC)

From: Bunny & Ray Witter <bwit555@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:47 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil terminal in the Port of Vancouver

Dear EFSEC,

I am writing to express a comment regarding the proposed oil terminal in the Port of Vancouver, Washington.

I oppose this project for many reasons. Primarily because the economic benefit does not in any way justify the hazard created by handling dangerous crude oil in our community or along the rail travel route to get here. A derailment during transit would be very serious, possibly polluting major rivers and streams such as the Columbia and leading to loss of life. The location of this terminal is subject to major damage in case we have a major earthquake which could result in the release of the oil stored in the Port of Vancouver. Even though the railroad claims they are a very safe way to transport, just one accident could be catastrophic. The consequences are so serious that it doesn't justify the risk.

Please do not allow this terminal to be built in the Port of Vancouver or anywhere for that matter.

Raymond L. Witter

1407 SE 196th Ave

Camas, Washington 98607

(UTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:50 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro savage vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern a: Lack of transparency

The oil industry has a history of obfuscation. When a pipeline leaked 1.1 million gallons of diluted bitumen aka dilbit into the Kalamazoo River in 2010 it allowed the clean-up team to think that all the oil had been cleaned up, when in truth, there were more than one million gallons of heavy tar sands crude which were submerged out of sight and drifting downstream during flood stage. Bakken crude floats, but dilbit sinks after the solvents evaporate.

Concern b: Oil barges are not regulated as carefully as tanker ships.

Concern c: Oil trains are less regulated than oil pipelines.

Concern d: Emergency response plans are vague, inadequate, and unfunded.

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

JTC)

From: Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 4:58 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro savage vancouver

To EFSEC

Regarding Tesoro Savage Vancouver

Concern: Insurance coverage and financial responsibility

How adequate is the insurance coverage in the event of each of the potential disasters.

Don Steinke
4833 NE 238 Ave
Vancouver, WA 98682

(UTC)

From: Susan Monson <semonson@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 5:00 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal

As a life long resident of Portland, Oregon I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding the potentially disastrous effects that could occur if a thorough study is not undertaken on the proposed Tesoro Savage Petroleum Terminal.

At a minimum the following impacts should be scoped:

What will be the impacts on human health along this corridor and in North Dakota where fracking is known to poison water supplies.

How will this affect animal species along the corridor What will be the costs to taxpayers to develop the terminal or pay for environmental "accidents".

How will this in its entirety affect climate change.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Monson