

(UTC)

From: Helen Drwinga <drwingahl@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 2:40 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.

Helen Drwinga

37069

UTC)

From: Alan Kittelson <alankittelson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 2:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Categories: Purple Category

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.

Alan Kittelson

05491

(UTC)

From: Mallery Crews <MalleryCrewsJD@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:15 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Mallery Crews

32208

UTC)

From: marin quezada <quezadamarin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:20 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

marin quezada

60640

UTC)

From: Eileigh Doineau <edoineau@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:21 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.

Eileigh Doineau

97232

From: Sandra Sobek <s.sobek@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:24 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.

Sandra Sobek

01341

UTC)

From: Tara Sinclair <tsinclair228@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:25 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.

Tara Sinclair

02777

From: Symone Ma <symonema@wildmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:44 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.

Symone Ma

50613

From: Barbara Graper <barbie12@tcsn.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:45 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.

Barbara Graper

93465

UTC)

From: don green <dongreen05@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:45 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.

don green

94602

UTC)

From: Alessandro Raganato <alessandroraganato@hotmail.it>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:52 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.

Alessandro Raganato

90016

UTC)

From: Gloria Ladum <glovo@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:52 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil-by-Rail Shipments through the Gorge

Please recommend denial of the Tesoro-Savage permit to develop the oil pipeline in Vancouver, WA.

This project would pose a direct risk of contamination to the Columbia River and potential disaster to Columbia Gorge communities.

UTC)

From: mclaren@iinet.com
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of Vancouver Washington and would like to express my feelings in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. The proposed project appears to both receive and ship North American crude oil to US refineries which will replace foreign imports, plus what appears to be a declining production in both Alaska and California. This crude will be refined in US refineries which is important to our local and national economy. It appears this would be a boost to America's energy security, will bring economic benefits and valuable jobs to our local community.

As a resident here for over 51 years, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. I know a request has been made for the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis to be focused on impacts from this proposed facility. I agree that the scope of the EIS should be limited to only potential impacts related to the facility design and operation. I suggest 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
- 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 the site-based facility impacts, could dilute the core focus of this facility. We don't want a dampening effect for transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of the state and Vancouver, Washington.

I believe that 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.

Wade McLaren
3818 Oregon Drive
Vancouver WA 98661

Sincerely,
Wade McLaren

From: Patricia Pritchard <sunsets52@att.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:59 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.

Patricia Pritchard

06460

From: Akura Pardington <akura.email@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:11 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.

Akura Pardington

34238

(UTC)

From: Fred Suter <frsuter@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:12 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Proposed Vancouver, WA Oil Terminal - DON'T DO IT

To - Energy Facilities Site Evaluation Council:

I am opposed to creating an oil terminal in Vancouver, WA for the following reasons:

1. In the last 4 months, there have been two derailments involving trains carrying oil from the Bakken oil field in North Dakota (one in Alabama and the other in Quebec). Oil has been transported from this oil field by rail only since the end of 2010. Two disastrous rail accidents have occurred in this short a period of time. This is a safety record that is unacceptable. The death toll in these two events is 47 people and unaccounted for damage to homes, businesses, infrastructure, and the environment. These two events have raised questions about the corrosiveness and volatility of the crude oil coming from the Bakken oil field. But the oil industry continues to transport the oil without satisfactorily addressing the concerns that have been raised.
2. There are numerous communities along this new proposed rail route, there is the amazing Columbia River, and there is Vancouver itself. All deserve better than this tarnished safety record indicates that they will receive. While oil industry companies publicly state that safety is their highest priority, their actions continue to demonstrate a willingness to prioritize profit over public welfare. This happens time and time again, whether it is the Exxon-Valdez ship wreck, or an oil rig explosion in the Gulf of Mexico, or a pipe line failure in Mayflower, Arkansas, or a train derailment in Lac Megantic, Quebec. This is a long, tainted, and consistent history.
3. The public is forced to assume the risk. The safety record of the oil industry speaks all too clearly and its actions continue to speak louder than its empty promises. The industry has not cleaned up its act. There simply is too much at stake to allow the oil industry to transport oil by rail through the Pacific Northwest. It hasn't earned the privilege.

Sincerely,

Fred Suter
Vancouver, WA

UTC)

From: jesse boeri <jboeri@usamedia.tv>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:15 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

jesse boeri

96161

JTC)

From: Erik Sneibis <sneibis@live.se>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:21 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.

Erik Sneibis

74236

From: J Bliss <blissjb@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:22 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.

J Bliss

86001

UTC)

From: Brandon Brown <brandon.brown@cdph.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:35 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.

Brandon Brown

94530

From: Dr Lawrence S. Roberts <lawrencesroberts@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:45 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.

Dr Lawrence S. Roberts

99999

From: Jacqueline Edmundson <ernestedmundson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:45 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.

Jacqueline Edmundson

70125

UTC)

From: David Vassar <Vassardavid@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:16 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

David Vassar

10027

UTC)

From: Ruth McCauley <charlizabet@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:05 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.

Ruth McCauley

0602

UTC)

From: Mark Nolan <mnstretch@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:21 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.

Mark Nolan

87110

UTC)

From: Pamela Wolfe <p.wolfe@wolfe-web.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:25 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.

Pamela Wolfe

10580

UTC)

From: Amanda Lavictoire <amanda_l@live.ca>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:40 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.

Amanda Lavictoire

L6T 2X6

(UTC)

From: Lester and Judy Hoyle <jalh2@frontiernet.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 5:57 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Lester and Judy Hoyle

97523

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27229

(UTC)

From: Michelle Walters <aherbievore2@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:29 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.

Michelle Walters

46613

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27230

(UTC)

From: Carol Lynn Harp <calliopy@juno.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:00 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Carol Lynn Harp

98010

From: Denise Fry <fdeni22@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:31 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.

Denise Fry

48082

From: James Baron <jredbaron@earthlink.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:04 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

James Baron

98223

JTC)

From: ryan trammell <rytramm@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:05 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.

ryan trammell

46033

JTC)

From: Sue Jackson <sue_jackson@optusnet.com.au>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:36 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.

Sue Jackson

2125

UTC)

From: Richard Vultaggio <richvultaggio@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:47 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Richard Vultaggio

13850

From: Sue Elkevizth <selkevizth@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:53 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.

Sue Elkevizth

44256

(ITC)

From: Louise Guthrie <loumkg@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:57 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Louise Guthrie

3136

(UTC)

From: Susan Cannon <sube_cannon@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 7:59 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Susan Cannon

33982

UTC)

From: Achmad Chadran < dunia.deeds@gmail.com >
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 8:24 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 strongly 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.

Achmad Chadran

01451

From: cynthia waite <waitecw@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 8:25 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.

cynthia waite

80402

From: Elizabeth Fitzgerald <widgekit@embarqmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 8:47 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Elizabeth Fitzgerald

22936

(UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of William O'Brien <wobobr123@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:32 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 6, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development in Vancouver that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oil by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S. Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on the Columbia River Gorge and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Mr. William O'Brien
12520 SW Gem Ln Apt 202
Beaverton, OR 97005-1360

(UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Jay Humphrey <blue1jay@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:32 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 6, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development in Vancouver that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oil by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S. Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on the Columbia River Gorge and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jay Humphrey
25525 S Laura Ln
Estacada, OR 97023-9417

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Monica Gilman <monicagilman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 3:32 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 6, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

Please deny the permit for the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. The scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include the following:

What is the purpose of the project? The purpose statement must not be narrowly worded to only include the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region. The purpose should be broad enough to include providing for the energy needs of the region and providing opportunities for appropriate waterfront development in Vancouver that benefits the local community.

Is there a need for this project? There is not. This proposal, in conjunction with other existing and pending oil terminals, would result in a glut of oil in the Northwest that would far exceed current consumption. There are alternative waterfront development opportunities that would create jobs and generate greater benefits for the local community.

What are the alternatives? A "no action" alternative; an alternative relying on other oil terminals that already exist, are in the permitting process or under construction; and reducing reliance on fossil fuels all must be considered as viable alternatives. Transport routes that do not pass through congressionally protected areas, like the Columbia River Gorge also must be included in the alternatives analyses. The EIS should also consider reasonably foreseeable waterfront development opportunities that would be incompatible with an oil terminal, such as mixed use development with waterfront amenities.

What are the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposal, including transportation impacts on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, such as:

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.
- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oil by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

- Likelihood of accidents. Current coal train traffic in the Gorge has resulted in massive amounts of coal dust escaping the open topped rail cars, which weakens the train ballast and causes accidents. The U.S. Surface Transportation Board has determined that coal dust is a "pernicious ballast foulant," weakening rail lines and resulting in derailments. The likelihood of oil train derailments, the likely effects on the Columbia River Gorge and the impacts on communities must be analyzed.

- Adverse effects to resources protected by the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. The project's indirect and cumulative effects on the scenic, natural, cultural and recreation resources of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area must be included in the scope of review.

In conclusion, SEPA requires that the EIS address impacts to sensitive or special areas, such as the Columbia River Gorge, and the degree that the proposal would conflict with state, local, and federal protections for the environment, such as the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act. WAC 197-11-330(3)(e)(i), (iii). State law also requires the Governor and all state agencies to carry out their respective functions in accordance with the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area Act.

RCW 43.97.025. EFSEC and the Governor are required to review projects for their impacts on the Columbia River Gorge and to take actions to avoid those impacts.

Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

Sincerely,

Ms. Monica Gilman
25525 S Laura Ln
Estacada, OR 97023-9417

(UTC)

From: Chase <chase.james@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:22 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: Jim and Mary Chase
Subject: Comments: Vancouver Oil Terminal - Contingency Plans
Attachments: Contingency Plans.docx

Categories: Red Category

Comments attached.

Jim Chase
(home) 503-224-5461
(mobile) 503-962-9237
3446 NW Vaughn St.
Portland OR 97210

Contingency Plans

Proper contingency plans must be required of the applicants in advance of approval of any permits. This is simply good business practice and regulatory responsibility. Spills, leaks, derailments, fires and explosions are not a question of "if", only of when and where. We all know that from recent events in Quebec and Alabama.

So the analysis and contingency plans must include emergency response plans for these calamities at:

- All locations along the train route from the source to the Terminal.
- With special emphasis on areas:
 - Where the train tracks pass within 100 meters of any community, residence or roadway.
 - Where the train tracks are immediately adjacent to the Columbia River or any other waterway along the route.

These contingency plans must include:

- A legal requirement for immediate notification of all authorities and the public of any spill, leak, derailment, fire or other incident – no matter the magnitude. This must include a requirement to report "near misses". I would suggest that "immediate" be defined as "within one hour of the time when the occurrence of such an event is known to the carrier".
- Clear definition of the responders who will deal with these events, and analysis of their capability and capacity to deal with such events.
- Clear procedures for dealing with any such event.
- Clear and legally binding definition of the limits placed on the carrier and responders for dealing with such events. For example, "You may not bulldoze the wreckage and oil into the river – no matter what!" (Sorry. I have a hard time coming up with the right words for this, but I hope you get the idea!)
- Clear and legally binding definition of fiscal responsibility for the cost of dealing with any such event.
- Clear and legally binding indemnification for the financial cost of dealing with any such event.
- The contingency plans and indemnification must cover both immediate response actions and long term remediation.

Personal perspective and insight.

I am retired. During my working career I once built and managed a chemical plant. Some of the chemicals were explosive, some mildly toxic, some utterly harmless. We built many great safety features into the plant. As I recall, these accounted for about one-fourth of the total cost of the plant. Money well spent, in my opinion! As we were about to begin operation I held a meeting with all the newly hired employees - with many leaders and residents of the surrounding community in attendance. I had mounted a very large, red EMERGENCY STOP BUTTON on the wall. My "pre-game" talk was very clear! "If there is any accident, any spill, any danger whatsoever, no matter how minor, hit the EMERGENCY STOP! All shipping, all receiving, all production processes STOP IMMEDIATELY! All hands on deck! Eliminate the risk or danger! No excuses! And I want to know right away – don't mind the clock!"

OK. The big red button was never actually attached to anything. That was just theatrics on my part. But it got my point across. The years passed and we never had a significant accident. The few minor spills were dealt with just as I had hoped.

Please try to require the philosophy of this approach of the applicants. Unless you do, I assure you, nothing is further from their minds!

(UTC)

From: Chase <chase.james@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:25 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: Jim and Mary Chase
Subject: Comments on Vancouver Oil Terminal - Liability and Indemnification
Attachments: Liability and Indemnification.docx

Categories: Red Category

Comments attached.

Jim Chase
(home) 503-224-5461
(mobile) 503-962-9237
3446 NW Vaughn St
Portland OR 97210

Liability and Indemnification

I submitted a separate comment titled "Contingency Plans". In that comment I called for proper definition of financial responsibility and for requirement of adequate third party indemnification for the cost of remediation for damage from oil spills, leaks, fires, explosions, derailments and other accidents. I believe this subject merits further elaboration.

When the oil is in transit in rail cars who owns the oil and who is legally responsible for whatever damage may result from such incidents? Is it the oil company or the railroad? Also, many oil tank cars are owned by companies that service them rather than by the railroads themselves. Who owns these cars? And what is their liability *vis a vis* the railroads and the oil company? This needs to be clearly defined and acknowledged by the oil company, the railroad and any third party car owners before any permit for the Terminal is approved.

And what is the extent to which such parties are liable? This should include death and injury to humans and animals, property damage, and lost wages and income to individuals and businesses affected by such incidents.

What liability would these parties have in the event of **irreparable harm** to the environment? For example, if a substantial amount of oil spills into the Columbia or an old growth forest is destroyed due to a fire caused by the oil transports, it is possible that the damage could be truly irreparable. In such cases it is a good, common practice to require substantial remuneration from the liable parties that can be used for the betterment of the affected areas or parties – even if not to restore them to the original state. The right to such remuneration and the terms and amounts that could be assessed should be legally defined in advance of granting the permits for the Terminal.

Finally, third party indemnification should be required. The railroad and oil company may seem large enough to have adequate financial resources to cover any such liability. However, we cannot rely on that as a solution. I am required by law to carry liability insurance on my car. Why should they be any different?

UTC)

From: Chase <chase.james@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:27 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: Jim and Mary Chase
Subject: Comments on Vancouver Oil Terminal - Clearing Derailments
Attachments: Clearing Derailments.docx

Categories: Red Category

Comments attached

Jim Chase
(home) 503-224-5461
(mobile) 503-962-9237
3446 NW Vaughn St
Portland OR 97210

Clearing Derailments

While living in central Illinois I witnessed how a large derailment was handled. In that case the closed rail cars were carrying grain, and the derailment occurred in the middle of a large, empty field. So it was not nearly as dangerous as for trains carrying oil through sensitive areas. Within hours of the wreck the railroad arrived with big construction equipment and simply plowed grain, railcars and everything into a big heap off the tracks. They made no attempt to save the railcars or salvage the grain. Some of the railcars were hardly damaged but were bulldozed into scrap metal by the railroad! What a waste! Why would they do that? Later I came to understand that the railroad's only priority is to clear the tracks and make them ready for more trains. Nothing else matters!

There was a coal train derailment in eastern Oregon last year, and it was the same thing. Get the cars and coal off the tracks, and deal with it later. In both cases it was **much later** – months before much got done with the rubble.

The tracks through the Columbia Gorge are often right on the side of the River. In many places there is simply no place to go quickly with derailed oil tank cars except into the River. In a number of places the tracks are surrounded by water on both sides! The tracks are also very close to many homes and businesses.

Legal limitations must be in place to prevent the railroad from their normal first response of bulldozing the tracks clear. Unless you act on this, they will do just that!

Oil train derailments are inevitable. The protocol for dealing with them in ways that minimize collateral environmental damage must be clearly defined, legally binding and with oversight by appropriate public officials.

UTC)

From: Chase <chase.james@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:29 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: Jim and Mary Chase
Subject: Comments on Vancouver Oil Terminal - Impact on the Gorge
Attachments: Impact on the Gorge.docx

Categories: Red Category

Comments attached.

Jim Chase
(home) 503-224-5461
(mobile) 503-962-9237
3446 NW Vaughn St
Portland OR 97210

Impact on the Gorge

An in-depth analysis of increased oil and coal train traffic through the Columbia Gorge must be done and must include the impact on tourism (*sic* tourism-related businesses) and residential communities in the Gorge.

The Gorge is a unique, iconic area that draws tourists from all over the world. They come to hike, bike, climb, wind-surf, fish and ski – or simply to just sit back and enjoy the scenery. *National Geographic Traveler* magazine periodically publishes a survey of the top tourist destinations in the world. In this survey the Columbia Gorge ranked SIXTH! Ahead of every U.S. National Park; ahead of the Hills of Tuscany, the Serengeti Plains and Australia's Great Barrier Reef. The Gorge's tourist appeal grows rapidly each year as new trails for hiking and biking are added and as tourism-based businesses start up and prosper.

The Gorge is also growing in appeal as a very attractive place to live. The 11 residential communities within the Gorge offer a peaceful, pastoral, small-town environment amid a beautiful landscape. These townships are becoming more prosperous every year and support a healthy infrastructure of commercial businesses.

The Gorge did not always enjoy this burgeoning tourism and residential prosperity. Twenty years ago the Gorge was economically depressed. Logging had long been the primary economic driver and was dying. Now logging has been replaced with two of the cleanest, most sustainable economic bases imaginable – tourism and residential communities.

However, both of these economies are vulnerable to attack by excessive rail traffic. People will not come to live and recreate in "rail-yards"! The residential areas, hotels, pubs and shops in the Gorge are all close to the rail lines. People will not enjoy homes, sleep in hotels, eat in restaurants and recreate with a constant rumble of trains, blasts of their horns day and night, and the veil of diesel smoke and dirt that accompany them. With increased train traffic tourism will decline and businesses reliant on them will fail. Property values will fall and development of additional residential neighborhoods will grind to a halt. Eventually the existing residential areas will decay as residents flee the noise, pollution and congestion of excessive train traffic.

Please do not approve construction of the oil terminal in Vancouver without at least understanding the devastating effects it will have on the Columbia River Gorge!

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27249

(UTC)

From: Chase <chase.james@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 6:31 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Cc: Jim and Mary Chase
Subject: Comments on the Vancouver Oil Terminal - Incremental Rail Traffic
Attachments: Incremental Rail Traffic.docx

Categories: Red Category

Comments attached.

Jim Chase
(home) 503-224-5461
(mobile) 503-962-9237
3446 NW Vaughn St
Portland OR 97210

Incremental Traffic (comprehensive with coal and other traffic)

The proposed shipment of 360,000 barrels of crude oil per day to the Port of Vancouver will require about 5 trainloads per day (based on 100 cars per train and 30,000 gallons per car). This means 10 trains per day, counting both the full trainloads arriving and the empties returning. At the same time greatly increased numbers of trains carrying coal are being proposed for export terminals in Bellingham WA, Longview WA and Morrow OR. Much of this coal train traffic will use the same tracks as the oil trains. All trains carrying either coal or oil will travel through the Columbia Gorge – on either the WA or the OR side of the River. These increases in traffic cannot be considered individually! The train traffic through the Gorge is already at a very high level. In some opinions it is nearing capacity already. An area-wide analysis is an absolute necessity. It must include all proposed new oil and coal train traffic through the Columbia Gorge for any destination. No permits for the construction of the proposed Vancouver oil export facility should be approved until this is done. Think about it! Up to four terminals could be built without even knowing whether the rail lines have the physical capacity to deliver the coal and oil to them. This analysis must include the impact on other non-oil, non-coal rail traffic. It must also include the increased risk of derailments, spills, leaks, fires, explosions and other damage caused by the greatly increased rail traffic.

ITC)

From: swanjo@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 4:54 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: testimony re: Tesoro-Savage application #2013-01
Attachments: Final TEsora testimony.docx

Categories: Red Category

The League of Women Voters of Clark County, WA wishes to have the attached testimony read into the minutes of the next council meeting relating to the Tesoro-Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. We understand this will take place on December 11, 2013. Thank you for your attention. If it is possible to receive a copy of the minutes from the portion of the meeting relating to this application, please send it to LWVCC %Joann Swanson <swanjo@comcast.net>

**TO: ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL ,
ATTENTION : Stephen Posner**

Page 1 of 2

**FROM: CLARK COUNTY LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS P.O. BOX 5917, Vancouver, WA 98668
RE: Tesoro-Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal, Application No. 2013-01**

The Clark County League of Women Voters requests that the following concerns be fully considered during the processing of the application from Tesoro-Savage joint plan to transport crude oil along the Columbia River to the Port of Vancouver, Washington for storage and transfer by ship to other western ports.

Our League embraces a policy that the public has the "right to know" prior to public agencies' final actions resulting in major impacts to the community and its welfare. The Port of Vancouver's decision to solicit and approve the proposed operation--apparently without the other public agencies or the public in general having any knowledge of the project, deprived citizens of the ability to assess or comment during early deliberations. We consider that a serious matter.

Our League has endeavored to find facts and issues in the process thus far, and have many questions and concerns that need to be addressed. We look at all factors of the transportation of the oil, its storage, and its transfer to the proposed river shipping operations. All are connected in the assessment of the project's viability in this environmentally important area.

The site lies on the Columbia River in the Vancouver Lake Lowlands, which is also the home of Frenchman's Bar County Park on the Columbia River, the County's Vancouver Lake Park, with its swimming beach and the site of the Sailing Clubs and various water events. Fishing and hunting are among the river and lake activities year-round. The large Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge is also just downriver. - A large neighborhood and school are prominent. ALL are closely located downriver and affected by prevailing winds. The location of the storage site is accessible only by one two lane road which passes under the railroad bridge, and avoids crossing the railroad tracks, and a few railroad and bridge crossings. At the present time, rail traffic is substantial enough to block access to and from the area often and for long periods of time.

QUESTION: How will emergency responders to spills, fire, explosions, etc. reach this area when the increased number of trains will result in a higher number of blockages to the few accesses available to this site? What emergency response facilities will be provided at the site? What agency/agencies will be responsible if there is an accident, be it a spill on site or during the rail transportation and transfer to the storage and then to the ships or barges? What happens if a natural disaster occurs that prevents access to the site?

Floods and earthquakes are very possible in this area and would isolate the site even more. With the number of additional trains expected to be added by this project along the Columbia River, through the city of Vancouver, and northward, local traffic to existing businesses and residences will be a major problem. A recent warehouse collapse caused a 10-hour rail shutdown, and a huge backup of trains.

Of serious concern regarding transportation is the condition of the rail cars to be used. There are statistics showing danger to the community regarding DOT111 cars for hauling oil. These cars have valves sticking out of the tanks on the top or bottom that shear off when they derail and overturn, releasing the contents. They also have structural integrity issues that allow them to easily split open and spill contents when derailments and crashes cause them to overturn. According to FOXBUSINESS on 11-14-13, two trade groups, The Association of American Railroads and the American Shortline and Regional Railroad Association, recommend upgrades or phase out on 78,000 older fuel cars and upgrades on 14,000 newer cars made since October 2011. The 78,000 cars are of the DOT 111 series that has been recognized as being unsafe since 1991 in derailments and crashes.

QUESTION: What type of fuel rail cars will be provided for the oil transport, when statistically 84% of all available cars are older and unsafe, and the remaining ones also need upgrading? Who will be responsible for the necessary upgrades? Each customer? or the Tesoro-Savage group as contractor? Will safer cars be mandated?

Another unknown is the type of oil which will be carried by these trains. In response to a question during an online chat sponsored by *the Columbian*, one participant asked if Tesoro and Savage would be able to bring Canadian tar sand oil by train to the Port of Vancouver, Tesoro-Savage states "we haven't yet broken ground on the project, and don't have customer commitments lined up, so it's premature to speculate where they might source crude oil.""we expect the bulk of the crude will come from the Bakken and other fields in the Midwest."

Savage reports that it will have customers other than Tesoro, and that the new facility will handle a maximum of 380,000 barrels a day. We assume that these trains will also be returning to the mines, which doubles the time railways will be occupied. It was mentioned that the empty trains could return via the passes rather than the Columbia River rail lines. We have been told that adding more traffic to those passes may not be possible.

QUESTION: How many fuel trains per day would be needed to transport 380,000 barrels per day? Is the average length of these trains approximately 110 cars? What effect will this have on the many commercial and residential crossings along the Columbia River and Clark County as a whole? How will the noise and vibration effects be mitigated—or what will be the impact on our county citizens? And will we be seeing double the number of trains because of the empty returning cars?

QUESTION: How do you judge the project impacts without knowledge of who the actual participants' customers are, and what the type of crude oils handled will be? How can a permit be granted to hypothetical customers and unknown sources/types of crude oil?

Tesoro-Savage has stated that every ship coming in to accept oil will be boomed to control any oil spills. The number of ships or barges has been estimated to be one a day--if ships, but many more if barges are used.

QUESTION: Since some oils sink, what will prevent the oil beneath the surface booms from travelling down the river with the current, and leaving deposits on the bottom and the river banks? How would this affect fish & wildlife, water quality and drinking water safety of downstream communities?

Emissions from the transport, handling, storage and transferring of oil to ships will present varied degrees and types of pollution to the air, water and ground in the surrounding areas. Note: The only monitoring of air quality was centered in areas some miles away on the higher grounds away from the lowlands area which will be affected by this project. It may be that the sea-level area would be impacted at a higher degree than the uplands areas. Another concern is that there are no standards currently existing for mitigation of the predicted 100,000 tons of greenhouse gases predicted. That amounts to 276 tons per day. Our country is striving to reduce these gases, not increase them!

QUESTION: Beside the daily emissions year-round, will the impact on the neighboring recreational areas be greater during the summer months of high public use? Does the volume of emissions increase and cause deterioration of air quality in warmer weather? Is there any notification to neighbors in the event of excessive amounts? Does the fallout from any of the emissions also affect the water or ground quality, and if so, can it be prevented? How?

In conclusion, we feel it is essential to look at the collective impact from the major potential influx of rail transport of hazardous fuels throughout our State, the potential for spills both on land or river, the addition of tons of greenhouse gases plus other chemical emissions on the proposed site, the air, noise, vibration and blocked- roadway impacts from the added railway traffic and the daily increase of ship/barge traffic on the Columbia River. There are also likely to be monetary costs to the public for necessary infrastructure, which preferably should fall to the user companies.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CLARK COUNTY URGES YOU TO CONSIDER ALL OF THESE ISSUES WHEN DETERMINING THE APPROVAL AND COST/BENEFIT OF THIS MAJOR PROPOSAL. THE IMPACTS ON OUR COUNTRY, STATE, RIVERSIDES, CITIES, CITIZENS AND OUR ECONOMY BEGIN AT THE MINES AND END AT THE FINAL DESTINATION OF THE FINISHED PRODUCT, WHICH COULD BE OVERSEAS.

Respectfully submitted from the Clark County League of Women Voters Action Committee:

Judy Hudson, Dr. Orin and Joann Swanson, Dan and Jane Johnson, Anne McEnery-Ogle 12/06/2013