

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Jim Cronin <jjcro2112@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 4:29 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Public comment

To whom it may concern:

As a resident who resides near the rail lines in downtown Spokane, Wa., I oppose increasing the amount of crude oil for rail shipment/export. This activity would increase the chances for contamination of the area I live in (as well as other areas in the Northwest). Also, it encourages fracking and environmental degradation of Montana and North Dakota. I oppose increased rail noise pollution and the proposed tar sands transportation of crude. Instead we as a society should focus on cleaner forms of energy development.

James Cronin  
2525 Maxwell Ave  
Spokane, Wa. 99201

**UTC)**

---

**From:** lance.m.necessary@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:00 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Lance Necessary

**From:** Joseph Robustelli <robustja@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:01 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.

Joseph Robustelli

28739

(UTC)

---

**From:** james.w.farrer@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:02 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
James Farrer

UTC)

---

**From:** marilu.c.moreno-jones@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:05 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Marilu Moreno-Jones

JTC)

---

**From:** kevin.d.condren@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:09 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from California and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Kevin Condren

(UTC)

---

**From:** cameron.r.hunt@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:18 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Cameron Hunt

**From:** Joe.C.Hughey@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:21 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

I have been a Tesoro employee for 13 years and know we highly value and protect our environment in Alaska. We strive to do our work in a safe manner at all times at our refinery and I am sure the same can be said about our sister refinery in Anacortes. Yes, this distribution terminal will greatly benefit Tesoro, but it will also greatly benefit the communities involved and our country as a whole. We owe it to ourselves to be proactive in making the most of our natural resources in a responsible manner. Our country's people need jobs, infrastructure and energy to build our way into the future. I did not want to just send a form letter, I wanted you to hear from me. Please give this project a fair shake and don't let those who would try to derail it take away the focus on what is best for our country.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Joe Hughey

**(UTC)**

---

**From:** micheal.d.ussery@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:22 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Micheal Ussery

UTC)

---

**From:** richard.m.malston@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:24 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Richard Malston

UTC)

---

**From:** leander.g.menefee@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:42 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Texas and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
L. Garrett Menefee

UTC)

---

**From:** Chiliparra1@me.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:44 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Alaska and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Albert Parra

UTC)

---

**From:** Diane Krell-Bates <diane\_krellbates@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:46 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Diane Krell-Bates

92122

---

**From:** Jennifer Harris <jennharris1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:49 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.

Jennifer Harris

03609

---

**From:** Tide Tide <unstoppable\_tide@riseup.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 6:23 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.

There should no longer be any question that we must block and deny anything which threatens the climate systems in which life as we know it has evolved and to which that life is adapted. We cannot exist without the global climate system we have and the edible plants and animals supported by it, which in turn support us.

Thank you.

Tide Tide

98104

---

**From:** Tina Bowers <ctrrbowers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 6:42 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.

Tina Bowers

21029

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Danielle Davis  
<davis.daniellea@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 7:27 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 10, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(UTC)

---

**From:** Nancy Hedrick <nancy@getbodysmart.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 7:48 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Proposed Oil Terminal in Vancouver

Dear Mr. Posner & Council,

The implications of having Vancouver the "hub" of oil exports are huge beginning with some obvious reasons:

- Undermines new growth of downtown retail businesses
- Stops new mixed-use construction projects that are crucial to any healthy city
- Reduces current and future property values
- Severely impacts people's mobility who live and work in downtown Vancouver and along the waterways and rail routes
- Potential oil spills that would pollute the Columbia River ruining animal and fish habitats and endangering plant life

And what about the Columbia River Gorge? It is one of the most beautiful scenic areas in Washington and Oregon if not in the United States! Driving this scenic highway parallels the railroad for miles. Tourists would seldom experience the tranquility and magnificent views of the Gorge with trains constantly rumbling through it not to mention the huge negative impact on the region's residents and businesses.

I have lived in the Northwest all my life and have always believed that Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Alaska and Montana were committed to preserving this part of our country. As North westerners, we take pride in the natural beauty of our forests, ocean beaches and rivers. We are the stewards of keeping these landscapes clean and healthy and to protect the wildlife. The Northwest has always put quality of life as number one. What a depressing legacy we would leave to future generations by allowing ugly, noisy oil tankers to crisscross our Northwest. One rail or barge accident would be an environment disaster and ruin the pristine beauty of the Columbia River Gorge for decades.

Thank you for your time to compile the public responses to this incredibly important environmental issue and weighing the many factors affecting our Northwest communities.

Nancy Hedrick

**From:** Karen Curry <pink50peony@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 9:00 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:

Please 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. Please, no.

Thank you.

Karen Curry

99163

UTC)

---

**From:** ray aisen <raisen1@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 9:04 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

ray aisen

60062

**From:** Nicole Holstein <nic.holstein@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 9:34 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Nicole Holstein

20008

(UTC)

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Robert Swope <frhn@nwinfo.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 9:44 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 10, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council  
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

Dear Leaders of Washington and Oregon States,

It does not make any sense to export oil and coal through our states to be burned without any concern for the environment in Asia. The jobs doing so would create are simply not worth the pollution that would take place transporting the fuel across America and the pollution created in Asia that would be spread across the world. .

Please, only the very few people owning the coal and oil businesses will gain from the selling of coal and oil. Everyone else will gain if this scheme of supplying energy to Asia is denied.

Thank you,

Robert E. Swope

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Swope  
16191 Tieton Dr  
Yakima, WA 98908-8021  
(509) 965-2561

UTC)

---

**From:** Sarah Tiers <sophia.tiers@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 9:51 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.

Sarah Tiers

81131

**From:** Robert Ellis <iwanttobelieve67@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 9:56 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.

Robert Ellis

43402

(UTC)

---

**From:** joshua.d.billman@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 4:58 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Tesoro employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience of how important safe, clean, and efficient operations are to Tesoro.

This terminal will also contribute to energy independence in the United States. Because of my job, I understand the market demand for moving crude oil to West Coast refineries. This terminal will make the transportation of crude oil from the Bakken and other regions more accessible and reduce the amount of crude U.S. refineries are currently forced to purchase from international sources. By allowing U.S. crude to move through a U.S. terminal to U.S. refineries, Tesoro and Savage are supporting U.S. energy independence and creating U.S. jobs.

I urge the committee to bear in mind the positive impact this terminal will have on the U.S. economy. As a Tesoro employee and an American job holder, my family depends on the strength of the oil and gas industry in the U.S. To keep this project moving forward on a schedule that will allow for its timely approval, please keep the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility. This balanced approach is consistent with Washington's SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Joshua Billman

(UTC)

---

**From:** Kevin Goodwin <dagood4@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 10:40 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.

Kevin Goodwin

45439

UTC)

---

**From:** ernesto garcia <agarciami@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 11:21 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.

ernesto garcia

33138

UTC)

---

**From:** William.R.Cooper@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 11:30 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

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

As a resident, I believe the safety and environmental reviews are extremely important and will help ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. As such, I would request that the scope of the SEPA environmental analysis be purposefully focused on potential impacts from the proposed facility. The scope of the EIS must be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation. I ask that EFSEC consider the following site-specific impacts in preparation of the SEPA Environmental Impact Statement:

- Risks caused by earthquakes
- Spill prevention and spill response requirements that protect the environment
- Ability to comply with state and federal air quality emission standards
- Protection of Columbia River water quality and fish and wildlife resources
- Impact of the facility on local transportation infrastructure and public services
- Facility design that meets all relevant safety standards

I am concerned that conducting a SEPA EIS that looks beyond site-based facility impacts is an overreach that could dilute the core focus on this facility and have a dampening effect on transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Vancouver, Clark County and the state of Washington.

This balanced approach is consistent with SEPA statutes and regulations and will protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
William Cooper

**JTC)**

---

**From:** Rosalie Malik <rslmalik60@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 1:48 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Rosalie Malik

95409

UTC)

---

**From:** Rosalie Malik <rsImalik60@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 1:48 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Rosalie Malik

95409

---

**From:** Beatrice Clemens <BeatriceBC@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 3:57 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

I urge you to assess the full impact of Tesoro Savage's proposal to ship 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver and the Columbia River. 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.

Beatrice Clemens

63105

**From:** Trevor Samuelson <tresam@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 5:00 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Trevor Samuelson

85027

UTC)

---

**From:** Marija Minic <killahchik@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 10:56 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.

Marija Minic

89129

**I am here tonight to urge you to deny the proposal by Tesoro Savage to build the giant crude oil transit terminal at the Port of Vancouver. I don't want any more rail oil tankers going through Spokane than already do.**

**I am concerned about the increased rail traffic through Spokane and the many smaller communities on the way from North Dakota to the coast. I understand that if it were approved, 4 trains, each a mile and a half long would be rolling through Spokane. I live not far from here- close to Pines and Trent in the Spokane Valley, an intersection I use frequently. The lineup of cars waiting for the long trains to pass is impressive and would be formidable if this port is put into operation. It is more than an annoyance; it's also a safety hazard, delaying emergency vehicles which need to cross the tracks.**

Speaking of safety- I am quoting from an NBC Newsinvestigative report:

**"For two decades, federal officials have warned that the tank car that carries oil and ethanol, known as the DOT-111, has a serious design flaw and can split open in an accident, turning a derailment into a fiery catastrophe. At least five times since 1991, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) has raised concerns about the car's design, including its relatively thin metal skin and the possibility that cars could tear holes in each other during accidents, creating a domino effect of spills."**

**" "If we don't start upgrading these cars soon, my concern is that we will have a catastrophic event in the near future,"" said transit safety expert John Goglia, who served on the NTSB's board from 1995 to 2004."**

The government has done little, allowing the oil industry to go about business as usual despite the increasing probability of more **spills and** possibly loss of life.

**I am also against this proposal because it involves oil obtained through fracking and tar sands mining, both processes which use huge amounts of water and ruin the environment.**

**Finally, we don't need more oil; we need more renewable resources. Why feed an industry that is not sustainable?**

Linda Greene, 15313 E Jacobs Rd. Spokane, WA 99217  
greenpeace@gmail.com

**RECEIVED**

DEC 11 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

(UTC)

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Kelvin Lindgren <coyoteridge@tds.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 7:14 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 10, 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,

Dr. Kelvin Lindgren  
2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd  
La Center, WA 98629-3728  
(360) 263-2521

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Ian Shelley <ianjs@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 7:44 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 10, 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. Ian Shelley  
50 SW 97th Ave  
Portland, OR 97225-6902  
(503) 816-5466

(UTC)

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of marguery lee zucker <lee@thelocomotive.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 10:44 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 11, 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,

Mrs. marguery lee zucker  
1966 Orchard St  
Eugene, OR 97403-2040

(UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of virginia jarvis <virginia\_jarvis@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 10:44 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 11, 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. virginia jarvis  
13000 Linden Ave N Apt 211  
Seattle, WA 98133-7572  
(206) 922-3213

(UTC)

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Jay Russo <stellarjay1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 11:14 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 11, 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 Russo  
1262 Duncan Creek Rd  
Stevenson, WA 98648-6177

(UTC)

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of John Reynolds <john@reynoldsaudio.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 10, 2013 11:14 PM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 11, 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. John Reynolds  
12737 SE 25th Ave  
Milwaukie, OR 97222-7938



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

COMMENT FORM

Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

SEPA Public Scoping Meeting – Spokane, Washington,  
December 11, 2013

Name: Marian Hennings

Address: 27 E. Broad Ave., Spokane WA 99207  
(Please include your Zip!)

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Please write any comments you have with respect to the  
Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal  
Informational & Scoping Comments

Leave this sheet in the Comment Box today, or mail it to:  
EFSEC, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

Comment letters must be postmarked by Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

I have multiple concerns regarding transport  
of crude oil through Spokane on its way to the  
port, but I will address just a few of them:

- 1) There is high danger of derailment, which  
would have a devastating effect were the oil to  
be spilled into waterways, in downtown Spokane,  
or onto the freeway. Derailments have occurred  
here in the past. An explosion would be likely if derailment were  
to occur.
- 2) As was recently reported in the Chicago Sunday  
Tribune, more than 50% of the cars used to transport  
this oil are older cars which are not equipped with

Use the back of this form if you need more room for your comments.

For more information about EFSEC's review of these project changes, please contact:  
Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Siting Specialist, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172,  
call (360) 664-1363, or e-mail [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov).

adequate seals to handle heavy loads such as thousands crude.

3) These loads are extremely heavy and would damage the infrastructure or require expensive upgrades which would be charged to the local communities, which can't afford the expense when they derive no financial benefit from these transports.

4) Multiple train shipments would interfere with other traffic, which would be delayed for these trains. First responders would be delayed, possibly causing loss of life.

Thank you for considering these issues. I do not want what happened in Quebec and Nabama earlier this year to happen in my community.



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

COMMENT FORM

Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

SEPA Public Scoping Meeting – Spokane, Washington,  
December 11, 2013

Name: Cathy Gundersen

Address: 2427 E Sharp, Spokane, WA 99202  
(Please include your Zip!)

Please write any comments you have with respect to the  
Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal  
Informational & Scoping Comments

Leave this sheet in the Comment Box today, or mail it to:  
EFSEC, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

Comment letters must be postmarked by Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

The total impact should be considered before approval.

Not only amount of trains, real condition of cars,

and upgraded track maintenance. What upgrades

to the tracks will be done to support this

amount of train travel?

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Use the back of this form if you need more room for your comments.

For more information about EFSEC's review of these project changes, please contact:  
Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Siting Specialist, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172,  
call (360) 664-1363, or e-mail [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov).



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

COMMENT FORM

Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

SEPA Public Scoping Meeting – Spokane, Washington,  
December 11, 2013

Name: Suzi Hokanson

Address: 1315 W Woodside Spok 99208  
(Please include your Zip!)

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Please write any comments you have with respect to the  
Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal  
Informational & Scoping Comments

Leave this sheet in the Comment Box today, or mail it to:  
EFSEC, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

Comment letters must be postmarked by Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

Please expand study to include  
rail issues the entire length of  
the route. Coal & oil will greatly impact  
all - especially

- diesel engine parkouls
- train accidents
- delay for fire & health emergencies

This brings little economic benefit to the areas  
Use the back of this form if you need more room for your comments. *where the train travels.*

For more information about EFSEC's review of these project changes, please contact:  
Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Siting Specialist, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172,  
call (360) 664-1363, or e-mail [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov).



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

COMMENT FORM

Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

SEPA Public Scoping Meeting – Spokane, Washington,  
December 11, 2013

Name: Carol Ellis

Address: 2015 E. 36th Ave Spokane, WA. 99203  
(Please include your Zip!)

carlellis@spokane@hotmail.com

Please write any comments you have with respect to the  
Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal  
Informational & Scoping Comments

Leave this sheet in the Comment Box today, or mail it to:  
EFSEC, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

Comment letters must be postmarked by Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

Health Impacts

Schools & Hospitals on route from MT, ID, WA

1 block to Union Gospel Mission housing

6 blocks to St. Luke's rehab

3 blocks to LC High School

3 blocks to Deaconess Hospital

6 blocks to Sacred Heart Hospital

4 blocks to Libby Gospel Dist. Schol

9 blocks to Shenden Gale School

10 blocks to M. King Hall Start & Center

Cheng - 1 block to trailer parks, homes

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Use the back of this form if you need more room for your comments.

For more information about EFSEC's review of these project changes, please contact:  
Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Siting Specialist, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172,  
call (360) 664-1363, or e-mail [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov).

(UTC)

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Brian Manning <bmannings@greenpeace.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 12:14 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 11, 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. Brian Manning  
303 NE 16th Ave  
Portland, OR 97232-3088

## Docket EF-131590

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#27696

**(UTC)**

---

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of mary n <seagoddess75@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 12:14 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 11, 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. Mary N  
14005 SE 38th St  
Vancouver, WA 98683-3908

December 9, 2013

Honorable Governor Jay Inslee  
Office of the Governor  
PO Box 40002  
Olympia, WA 98504-0002

Director Maia Bellon  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

Commissioner Peter Goldmark  
Washington State Department of Natural Resources  
PO Box 47000  
Olympia, WA 98504-1000

**RECEIVED**  
DEC 11 2013  
ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

**RE: Concerns over crude oil by rail shipments in the Northwest**

Dear Governor Inslee, Director Bellon, and Commissioner Goldmark:

Thank you for your leadership on the important issue of the clear negative impacts of proposed coal terminals, and their associated train traffic, on the economy, environment, and human health of Washington State.

We the undersigned write today to express our concern over new and growing crude oil shipments in the Northwest and to call for a moratorium on permitting new oil transportation infrastructure, at least until a programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) can be proposed and approved.

In recent months, the public has expressed increasing concerns over the dramatic rise in transport of crude oil by rail, and in Washington an even more dramatic rise in the number of terminals to receive crude oil trains. Washington is simply not ready in terms of spill preparedness or transport safety, and neither is the aging and outdated fleet of rail cars used to transport crude by rail and which would facilitate the rapid and unsafe growth of that industry in our state.

As a matter of fact, at the close of the public comment period (December 5<sup>th</sup>) on the advance notice of proposed rulemaking from the Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), some 100,000 Americans, many of which were Washingtonians, sent a clear message that rail car safety in light of increased proposals

for oil shipment infrastructure is paramount. Official comments were submitted to PHMSA, and were signed by many of the signatories of this letter. Those comments are attached.

PHMSA oversees the structural and some operational requirements for railroad tank cars used to transport hazardous materials on US railways. Of particular concern to our groups is the continued use of the puncture-prone DOT-111 tank car to transport crudes that tend to explode or sink in water upon derailment (Bakken crude and sinking tar sands (diluted bitumen), respectively).

The train derailment and explosions in Lac-Megantic, Quebec this summer, the pipeline breach along the Kalamazoo River in 2010, and the grounding of the Exxon-Valdez tanker in 1989 are reminders that accidents happen and have devastating consequences when it comes to transporting oil.

Together, the oil companies' ten proposed or in-process projects for Washington would be capable of moving nearly 800,000 barrels of crude oil per day through the state of Washington. This would be done via approximately 12 loaded crude oil trains a day entering the state in northeastern Washington and traversing south and west to the various proposed terminal locations, with some subset of trains traveling north through Pierce, King, and Snohomish counties, along the landslide-prone route bordering much of Puget Sound. Each "unit train" of 100 tanker cars, carries approximately 70,000 barrels and is over a mile in length.

Starting east and moving west, communities like Spokane, the Tri Cities, Longview, Vancouver, Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Tacoma, Seattle and Bellingham would be impacted by the increase in train traffic and the issues associated with that. Add that to the proposed increase in coal train traffic and these communities would be asked to bear a load that is quite possibly unfeasible both structurally and economically.

In Spokane County, communities such as Spokane Valley, Spokane and Cheney would see the brunt of this increase as the proposed 12 crude oil trains would make their way from Sandpoint, ID through Spokane County before departing in various routes to the coast. This is a significant proposition as rail lines through Spokane County are already operating near capacity, especially during summer harvest months.

These figures are only taking into account the proposed facilities in the state of Washington. There are additional projects proposed in the state of Oregon that would increase these figures, meaning even more crude oil trains traveling through Spokane en route to Oregon.

Beyond concerns over rail capacity and that impact on communities, here are key aspects of our concerns related to these proposals in the state of Washington:

**Spill readiness:** We simply aren't ready for spills by rail, per Ecology's own account. Much of the rail route parallels waterways like the Spokane River, Columbia River, Chehalis River, Grays Harbor Estuary, and Puget Sound. With respect to tar sands, we have no meaningful response

plan that acknowledges the fate of tar sands in marine or fresh aquatic environments. Current rail standards allow transport of explosive Bakken crude in old and outdated cars--a risk Washingtonians shouldn't have to take.

**It isn't for us:** In total, the new rail terminals substantially exceed Washington's refining capacity, which already receives all the crude needed by vessel and Kinder Morgan's Puget Sound Pipeline. While each of the terminals is nominally intended to receive domestic Bakken shale oil, many have already been demonstrated to be actively soliciting tar sands business from Alberta. In fact it is doubtful that the proposed expansion would make economic sense for Bakken crude alone. With Alberta's tar sands representing the second largest oil deposit on the planet, international market demand will inevitably pressure Washington's crude by rail terminals to become nothing but transshipment points for Canadian crude to the world—leaving us with all the risk and no reward.

What would be the economic effect of a massive spill or rail explosion in our state? Washington can create real jobs and real prosperity by dedicating our resources to meet transportation needs without an increase of crude flowing into the state--transit, efficiency, conservation, walkable communities, electric car manufacture, all are viable options that keep jobs at home and support responsible development.

**The terminals endanger the Columbia River, Chehalis River, and Puget Sound:** While some of the crude has a chance of being used locally at the refineries, both the new merchant terminals and refinery terminals mean a vast increase in crude oil transiting our waterways--on the way out of our state. Although its clear intent was to protect Puget Sound, the Magnuson Amendment to the Marine Mammal Protection Act only limits incoming crude by ship. That means there is no effective limit, other than rail capacity, on the transit of tar sands into world markets or Bakken into domestic markets. Washington gets all risk, no reward. (Note: current restrictions on US crude export are under attack by the American Petroleum Institute through WTO rules. If oil companies win on that issue, the flood of exports from tar sands and Bakken becomes doubly problematic.)

**The terminals would slow Washington's economic recovery:** Committing large volumes of rail capacity for raw energy export is bad for Washington jobs and retards economic growth. Mixing coal, Bakken, and tar sands on the rails is a recipe for increased derailment and catastrophic disasters; likewise, repeated risk exposure through a vast increase in crude and bulk carrier vessels in the Columbia or Puget Sound virtually guarantees a devastating oil spill of a size that could easily exceed the two Puget Sound spills that generated so much outcry from citizens ten years ago. Ecology estimates a single major oil spill in Puget Sound to cost our economy \$10.8 billion and impact 165,000 jobs.

**Ocean acidification:** Opening up the taps to Alberta's tar sands, which these rail terminals would eventually do (each of the three terminals on the Columbia have had conversations with tar sands producers), effectively opens up the taps to the second-largest oil deposit on the planet. This has been described as "game-over" for defending against catastrophic climate

change. Even if this oil is burned elsewhere, the sheer scale of the reserves can easily be traced to dramatic local climate change and ocean acidification effects.

Governor Inslee, Director Bellon, and Commissioner Goldmark, we urge you to declare a moratorium on permits for new oil transport infrastructure until Ecology can conduct a programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that adequately describes the risk the new infrastructure represents. This EIS should take in account not only the proposals for the railroad crude oil terminals, but also for the proposed coal export terminals. These projects, though independent of each other, should be looked at cumulatively to understand the threat they pose to the state of Washington.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bart Mihailovich  
Director  
Spokane Riverkeeper

Matt Krogh  
Campaign Director  
ForestEthics

Mike Petersen  
Executive Director  
The Lands Council

Chris Wilke  
Executive Director  
Puget Soundkeeper Alliance

Arthur (R.D.) Grunbaum  
President  
FOGH (Friends of Grays Harbor)

Sue Patnude,  
Deschutes Estuary Restoration Team

Amy Carey  
Executive Director  
Sound Action

Darlene Schanfald  
President  
Friends of Miller Peninsula State Park

Kim Abel  
President  
League of Women Voters of Washington

Stephanie Buffum  
Executive Director  
Friends of the San Juans

Leslie Ann Rose,  
Citizens for a Healthy Bay

Lehman Holder  
Sierra Club

Crina Hoyer  
Executive Director  
RE Sources for Sustainable Communities



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

COMMENT FORM

Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

SEPA Public Scoping Meeting – Spokane, Washington,  
December 11, 2013

Name: SOUTHWEST COUNTY COALITION

Address: PO BOX 127 MARSHALL, WA 99020  
(Please include your Zip!)

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Please write any comments you have with respect to the  
Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal  
Informational & Scoping Comments

Leave this sheet in the Comment Box today, or mail it to:  
EFSEC, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

Comment letters must be postmarked by Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

THE SOUTHWEST COUNTY COALITION  
IS CONCERNED ABOUT HANGMAN CREEK,  
MARSHALL CREEK, QUEEN LUCKS LAKE,  
MINI CREEK. WE ARE BEING HORRIBLY  
IMPACTED BY TRAIN TRAFFIC WE  
WILL NOT ACCEPT THE DANGERS OF  
OIL TRAIN TRAFFIC WORSENERD BY  
OIL TRAIN. HOW MANY ELK, DEER  
MOOSE, AND OTHER WILDLIFE WILL  
BE KILLED. INCLUDING OUR CHILDREN

Use the back of this form if you need more room for your comments.

For more information about EFSEC's review of these project changes, please contact:  
Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Siting Specialist, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172,  
call (360) 664-1363, or e-mail [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov).

Mitchell Smith, South West County Coalition  
P.O. Box 127; Marshall, Washington 99020 (509) 999-8513

The South West County Coalition (SWCC) is a diverse alliance of Spokane County families and individuals organized to address public concern. SWCC is committed to bringing to light the concerns of our South West County neighbors, family, and friends when the actions, or inaction, of the public or private sector adversely affect southwest county citizens.

### **Oil Train Losers**

1. Increased oil and coal train traffic will adversely affect our Southwest County neighbors and friends.
2. The known dangers of crude oil tank cars passing through, or sited in local neighborhoods and near family farms, is unconscionable.
3. The SWCC does not believe the risks could ever be mitigated enough to prevent an inevitable tragedy.
4. Noise pollution alone will significantly impact those living within two miles of the tracks, particularly when considered cumulatively with other proposals by greedy exploiters.
5. All oil passing through Washington State should be at the safest means possible and that would be via pipeline.
6. The increased pollution of additional oil trains must be substantially addressed to protect those living within two miles of a track.
7. The increased RR traffic will block local access and stifle local commerce while we wait for these trains to pass. (Drive through downtown Cheney, WA when a train comes through.)

### **Other Concerns**

- Who is responsible when emergency response vehicles are delayed or rerouted by long trains, unable to reach those in dire need of assistance in a timely manner?
- An emergency response vehicle delayed by just one minute will make the difference between life and death; whether someone's home becomes a total loss.

MITCHEL SMITH, SWCC

- As proposed increased oil train traffic will adversely impact thousands of individuals living close to the tracks... Denying us the full use and enjoyment of our property.
- SWCC is adamantly opposed to this proposal as local neighborhoods already suffering from increased train traffic will now live in fear of a oil train derailment or terrorist attack on railroads.
- We no longer have to worry about terrorists getting hold of a bomb... The rail road will be delivering the bombs right to our front doors.
- The cumulative effects of this proposal are enormous and must be addressed in conjunction with the coal train proposals.
- Every train should be required to have armed guards and cabooses with emergency response equipment stationed within 5-minutes along every point in the tracks.
- Emergency response capabilities sufficient to meet the worst case scenario – all cars erupting into a giant fireball.
- SWCC is convinced our public officials are ignoring local neighborhoods and entire cities in favor of a political agenda that places money ahead of public safety and health.



Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

COMMENT FORM

Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

SEPA Public Scoping Meeting – Spokane, Washington,  
December 11, 2013

Name: Carol Ellis

Address: 2015 E. 36<sup>th</sup> Spokane 99203  
(Please include your Zip!)

Please write any comments you have with respect to the  
Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal  
Informational & Scoping Comments

Leave this sheet in the Comment Box today, or mail it to:  
EFSEC, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

Comment letters must be postmarked by Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

Here's my report on rail problems over lakes  
(Pend Oreille) & rivers (Spokane, Clark Fork  
(Coeur d'Alene)

RECEIVED

DEC 11 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

*Use the back of this form if you need more room for your comments.*

For more information about EFSEC's review of these project changes, please contact:  
Sonia Bumpus, EFSEC Siting Specialist, PO Box 43172, Olympia, WA 98504-3172,  
call (360) 664-1363, or e-mail [efsec@utc.wa.gov](mailto:efsec@utc.wa.gov).

9/30/13 and 10/15/13 BY CAROL ELLIS

*e 12/11/13*

*from Sandpoint*  
Sat 9/28/13, I drove along Lake Pend Oreille and the Clarkfork River to Superior MT, following the rail tracks.

#### ISSUES:

The Spo/Rathdrum SOLE SOURCE aquifer begins at the S end of Lake Pend Oreille and serves 1/2 Million folks

The Clarkfork River aquifer is alongside and below the tracks, likely under the tracks as well

Trestles cross Pend Oreille Lake 4-5 times VISIBLY near the s end - likely more I could not see

Trestles and bridges cross Clarkfork River 5 times, likely more

At Thompson Falls the track is parallel to the state highway thru town.

ALSO THE OIL REFUEL seems to be at Thompson Falls IN THE CITY. Missoula also has refueling tanks, how close to University and hospital in the middle of town?

The parallel track system DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE ADEQUATE FOR THE VOLUME OF TRAINS TO PASS EACH OTHER. The public needs this info on the length of switching and parallel tracks

#### CONCLUSION

EPA ought to be involved on a 4 state basis for water drainage and aquifers!

Commerce Department ought to be involved for interstate rail issues.

3 of 4 governors can appeal for Army Corps of engineers not doing adequate system-wide EIS, and separating from WA DOE. (

4 states NEED MORE INFORMATION ON RAILROAD INFRASTRUCTURE, PARALLEL TRACKS, SWITCHING YARDS, AND FUELING DEPOTS.

RAILWAY CAPACITY OBSERVATIONS 10/1/13

Observations made on Oct 1, 2013 driving to Missoula from Superior by a citizen with a Master's Degree in Math

Near Loseau, 10-12 miles 2 trains were passing on a double track.

At Alberton, 30 miles, a train was waiting on a double track.

At Frenchtown, 45 miles, a train was waiting on a double track.

At Missoula, 57 miles, a train was waiting on a double track

Coming back we also saw waiting trains. I do not know how typical this is since my observations are only anecdotes. However it raises the possibility that the route is already near capacity.

*Card Eltes' friend*

## Superior to Missoula

Oct 1, 2013

You might be interested in an observation I made on Tuesday going to Missoula.

Near Loseau, 10-12 miles 2 trains were passing on a double track.

At Alberton, 30 miles, a train was waiting on a double track.

At Frenchtown, 45 miles, a train was waiting on a double track.

At Missoula, 57 miles, a train was waiting on a double track

Coming back we also saw waiting trains. I do not know how typical this is since my observations are only anecdotes. It may have been an unusual circumstance.

However it raises the possibility that the route is already near capacity.

Tim Spangler, Superior MT

Masters in Math

**JTC)**

---

**From:** Michael Camp <madmiker5d4@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 11, 2013 2:42 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Michael Camp

05404