

**From:** Betty Hittler <betthitt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 7:25 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Vancouver Oil Terminal Comments

A friend of mine wrote this and sent it to you. He did such a wonderful job of expressing how I feel and what I think need to be addressed.

Please give special attention to his statement as he speaks for many of us.

Betty Hittler  
2615 NE 359th Ave  
Washougal WA 98671

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Marc Chamberlin <[marc@marcchamberlin.com](mailto:marc@marcchamberlin.com)>  
**Sent:** Wed Dec 18 10:52:40 PST 2013  
**To:** [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov)  
**Cc:** Ed Averill -- ACM <[eda@acm.org](mailto:eda@acm.org)>, Steph Chamberlin <[steph@marcchamberlin.com](mailto:steph@marcchamberlin.com)>  
**Subject:** Vancouver Oil Terminal Comments

Marc Chamberlin  
35519 NE 30th St.  
Washougal, Wa 98671

I think that by now you understand that there is a vast majority of people who are opposed to the usage of our rails, rivers, and other means of transportation of fossil fuels through the Columbia River

basin, for shipments destined to foreign ports. I too join in opposition, mainly because I have deep concerns about the continued usage of fossil fuels on our planets weather and ocean environments. However, I am also pragmatic and while I remain in fierce opposition to

the continued usage of coal as a fuel and think that the burning of coal should be stopped immediately, I do understand that oil is the best solution we have for our mobile energy requirements. We simply do not

have the technology yet to replace gas, diesel, and jet fuel with an alternative source of energy for much of our mobile applications. Therefore, I would like you to consider the following things in your scoping process as you decide whether to permit the Vancouver Wa. oil

terminal to be built.

1st a compromise should be forged between those who believe that we need the terminal to provide jobs and improve our economy, and those who are

strongly opposed to the terminal because of its environmental and social

impacts. If we are going to increase our infrastructure for handling oil brought through our country, then we should stipulate that any oil we handle must be refined within our own country, and consumed here or in

Canada (since it is the source of this oil) as well. Do not allow our transportation infrastructure to be used for the benefit of people who live outside our country (except Canada), unless it is for humanitarian

purposes. This will best benefit Americans, on a much broader basis, by supplying more jobs here, more spending power here, and more economic growth here.

2nd, as you frame the scope of requirements for authorizing a permit to

build this terminal, take into consideration that we are fast approaching the tipping points at which the impacts from global climate changes and ocean acidification is going to force a collapse of the fossil fuel industry and perhaps our very civilization. Who will clean

up the oil terminal and it's mess left behind, and pay for it, after demand for oil drops below levels which make it impossible to continue the usage of the oil terminal? What kind of legacy and planet do you/we

wish to leave to our children?

3rd, please consider the very real and high risks of immediate damage to our environment, river, salmon, forests, cities, and social infrastructure from the possibility of oil spills and/or explosions.

Please consider the impact of an ever increasing number of trains through our region, on communities along the railroad tracks. How can these be mitigated and who is going to pay for the costs? I do not believe this should be a burden placed on taxpayers.

4th, I believe there is a social contract between businesses who benefit from American social institutions, government, laws, and protections; and the American citizens who live, work and support our country. I also

believe that most corporations, these days, are violating this social contract and not paying back a fair share into our communities, for the benefits they receive. Please consider in your scoping process whether

ALL the corporations, who will benefit from building the oil terminal in Vancouver, will return a fair and just portion of their profits back into our communities, in order to benefit all us regular citizens

equitably. Another question I would like to see ask, in particular, is

how are these oil companies, who will benefit from the Vancouver oil terminal, helping us to reduce our usage and dependence on oil? I think this should be part of their social contract with us citizens, and they

should be providing far more substantial aid towards building a more sustainable and green energy future. And my last question on social contracts, how are these companies going to help substantially more people gain employment and achieve a rewarding lifestyle? As of the

moment I see them only offering a pitiful few jobs with a management focus on lowering wages and ever fewer numbers of workers needed.

5th, finally I think it should be within your purview to consider whether the production of oil from the tar sands of Canada is in our

best interest. This is a dirty and expensive process and I think there are better ways to meet our oil needs than via the usage of this particular source of oil. Do we really want to increase our oil transportation infrastructure just to support this particular form of

oil production technology, and if so how will the environmental impacts be mitigated? I personally do not see how that will be possible, but I would like to see the question asked and answered before we become a

part of this particularly nasty and destructive process of producing oil.

Sincerely yours,

Marc Chamberlin

--

Sent from my Android phone with K-9 Mail. Please excuse my brevity.

## Docket EF-131590

---

**From:** Catherine Warwick <bwarwick@softcom.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 02, 2013 9:39 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.

Catherine Warwick

95638

**From:** Sean Edmison <sedmison@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:57 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. Transporting oil by rail and exporting oil 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 the process of extraction through the process of combustion.

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.

Sean Edmison

98052

## Docket EF-131590

---

**From:** Mary Gardner <KATHY49@mchsi.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 02, 2013 11:32 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Mary Gardner

50707

Docket EF-131590

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Public Comment  
#012

---

**From:** Nancy Baker-Krofft <nbakerkrofft@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 4:14 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Oil Terminal Testimony

Dear Siting Authorities of Washington State:

I wish to add to the many voices of concern at the environmental danger of allowing the oil transport to be allowed on the Columbia River.

I am an Oregonian who traveled from Salem to attend the hearing, and heard all sorts of folks crying out against this project.

Decisions made this coming year on going forward will be of long term consequence, and I ask You to carefully examine all options that would allow a stop to this dangerous project for the health of citizens and our planet.

Thank you.

Nancy Baker-Krofft  
676 Catterlin St. NE  
SALEM, OR 97301

---

**From:** Judith <judithiams@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 4:22 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Cc:** Judith

I live in Vancouver, Washington. I am very concerned by the possibility of oil being transported via rail and/or barge along the Columbia River. The Northwest is a part of the country which is prone to seismic events this and/or the possibility of derailment needs to happen just once to cause disasterous enviorment consequences from salmon runs to drinking water.

Allowing even the possibility of this happening is irresponsible. We need to be investing in new, safe energy; rather than extracting fossil fuels which, regardless of how they are transported, produce a negative a long-term impact on our planet.

I urge you to halt this process and spend your valuable time developing ways to insure a clean-energy future.

Judy Iams

700 Washington St. #921  
Vancouver WA. 98660  
Sent from Windows Mail



**From:** Gary Collins <garyc@sdslumber.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 6:11 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Oil terminal

I would like to send my comments about having and transporting crude oil or coal down this Columbia river. There is thousands of gals and ton that go up and down by rail & barge daily !! I don't feel that there has been any problems ! Are country needs more local resources and jobs ! I'm all in favor of this project !! Gary, Have lived in gorge all my life .

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** paul.m.mcwaid@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 7:55 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

**Categories:** Teal

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,  
Paul McWaid

**From:** Madison Briggs <princessandthepeke@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 9:15 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

**Categories:** Teal

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.

Madison Briggs

OX15

**From:** Claire Mikalson <clairemikalson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 1:28 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

**Categories:** Teal

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.

Claire Mikalson  
E 302 Washington st  
POBOX 135  
Farmington, WA 99128

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Claire Mikalson <clairemikalson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 1:53 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01  
**Categories:** Teal

Dec 19, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Claire Mikalson  
PO Box 135  
Farmington, WA 99128-0135  
(509) 333-1984

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Marc McDermid <noipecac@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 1:53 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01  
**Categories:** Teal

Dec 19, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Marc McDermid  
22731 NE 92nd Ave  
Battle Ground, WA 98604-4129



## Docket EF-131590

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Public Comment  
#020

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Anne Bachmann <anniedelrio@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 4:53 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01  
**Categories:** Teal

Dec 19, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Anne Bachmann  
376 N Tomahawk Island Dr  
Portland, OR 97217-7920  
(503) 285-1370

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Wendy Cornell <toadlet5@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 5:23 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01  
**Categories:** Teal

Dec 19, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

- 1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.
- 2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- 3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- 4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.
- 5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Wendy Cornell  
8132 Island View Dr NE  
Olympia, WA 98506-9753

**From:** Christine Browne <chrisebrowne@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 6:16 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

**Categories:** Teal

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.

Christine Browne

98051

**From:** Maggie Jahn <mmmingtoy@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 6:19 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

**Categories:** Teal

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.

Maggie Jahn  
703 N 105th St Apt#1  
Seattle, WA 98133

**From:** Maria Bohmhauer <maria.bohmhauer@web.de>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 6:51 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

**Categories:** Teal

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.

Maria Bohmhauer

31855

**From:** James Long <phoenix.james.long@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 7:27 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

**Categories:** Teal

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.

James Long

55362



---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Philip Chanen <pchane@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 12:53 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01  
**Categories:** Teal

Dec 19, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Philip Chanen  
2573 Shoreland Dr S  
Seattle, WA 98144-5632  
(206) 721-0422

## Docket EF-131590

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Kathy McKinney <kathy010148@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 12:23 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Teal

Dec 19, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Kathy McKinney  
11939 NE Davis St Apt 229  
Portland, OR 97220-2168  
(503) 504-7821

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bruce A. Knight  
<b.a.knight@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 19, 2013 10:55 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01  
**Categories:** Teal

Dec 19, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

- 1) The potential safety and environmental impacts of a large train-related oil spill or explosion along the rail route in Washington and beyond. Recent derailment disasters in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec and Alabama have shown that these risks are far too real. The tragedy in Quebec, in particular, highlighted the extreme danger of the same type of oil and tankers that would be traveling through our communities. Forty-seven people died in that explosion, which also devastated the town.
- 2) The increased risk of an oil tanker spill on Washington State waters and along the shipping route.
- 3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.
- 4) The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil as well as tar sands oil from cradle to grave.
- 5) The impact of the project's cradle-to-grave CO2 emissions on the viability of the large oyster industry in Washington State.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Bruce A. Knight  
3553 SE 42nd Ave  
Portland, OR 97206-3134  
(503) 774-3832