

JTC)

From: Adriana Lanziotti <alanziotti@yahoo.com.br>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 8:07 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.

Adriana Lanziotti

22220-030

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27852

UTC)

From: philip.g.pulas@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 8:34 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

JTC)

From: dave506@frontier.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 8:35 AM
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,
David Groves

From: robert.k.patterson@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 8:39 AM
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,
Robert Patterson

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27855

(UTC)

From: keith.a.chism@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 8:55 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Keith Chism

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27856

Docket EF-131590

(UTC)

From: Mike Schiller <MSchiller@Portvanusa.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:05 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Mailing list

Hello:

Please include me on the email distribution list of actions and activities relating to the TS Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

Regards,
Mike

Mike Schiller

General Manager - Operations

3103 NW Lower River Road, Vancouver, WA 98660

Direct: 360.992.1113 | Cell: 360.518.1257 | Fax: 360.735.1565

mschiller@portvanusa.com | www.portvanusa.com

 **Port of Vancouver USA**

JTC)

From: thadd.stricker@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:22 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Thadd Stricker

From: NM Porter <nmp_yellowsub@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:33 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.

NM Porter

48197

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of L F & Carole Warneke <warnekesc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:39 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 12, 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.

Mr. L F & Carole Warneke
71 E Hofaker Rd
Allyn, WA 98524-8712
(360) 275-6989

(TC)

From: mark.oconnor@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:47 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Mark O'Connor

UTC)

From: ken Schlichte <kensforsoil@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:48 AM
To: ClimateSceptics@yahoogroups.com
Cc: Kramer, Becky; EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing - The Spokane Spokesman-Review

Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing

Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Hearing, by Becky Kramer and in the December 12 Spokane Spokesman-Review link at <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2013/dec/12/fears-about-oil-train-safety-impacts-voiced-at/>, begins as copied below.

Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Hearing

Becky Kramer The Spokesman-Review

A proposal to ship North Dakota crude oil through Spokane by train drew mostly opponents at a hearing Wednesday night.

About 75 people showed up for the state hearing on a proposed oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver that could result in up to four oil trains daily passing through Spokane.

“I see the trains go over the Latah Creek Bridge from my patio,” said Pauline Druffel, a retired psychotherapist, who lives less than a mile away.

Besides concerns about public safety and the potential for oil spills in the Spokane River, “my primary resistance is global warming,” she told members of Washington’s Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. “It’s insane that we keep taking this stuff out of the ground and putting it into the atmosphere.”

Other speakers echoed Druffel’s comments on climate change.

Pauline Druffel and the other speakers and participants at Wednesday night’s hearing in Spokane would be much less concerned about global warming in Washington state if they were made aware of the official climate data from the NOAA National Climatic Data Center Climate at a Glance site at www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/ indicating that Washington state’s annual temperatures have actually trended downward at a rate of 2.2 degrees F per decade over the last 10 years.

Ken Schlichte

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27862

UTC)

From: aaron.c.essman@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:50 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a 10 year Tesoro employee from Tacoma, Washington 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,

Aaron C. Essman

Sincerely,
Aaron Essman

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#27863

JTC)

From: jbarr.contractor@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:52 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am President of JR

Sincerely,
John Barr

From: Yvonne Fast <yvonnefast@stofanet.dk>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 9:58 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.

Yvonne Fast

90000

JTC)

From: kris arnaouti <kris-jimmy@cytanet.com.cy>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:06 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.

kris arnaouti

5380

From: smittyjr2@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:12 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Savage employee and am writing in support of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal. As a Savage employee, I stand behind the company's commitment to safety and the environment. I have firsthand experience how important clean, efficient and safe operations are to Savage. A terminal run by Savage in Vancouver will bring the community jobs like mine. And I'm proud to say I work for this company, and I'm also proud of our impressive track record of integrity and social responsibility.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Samantha Smith

UTC)

From: kerry whitsitt <kerritjuice@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:43 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: No oil trains, please!

Hello Mr. Posner,

I was unable to attend last night's hearing on the oil train transport through WA state, but want to add my comments in hopes they, along with others, will help influence the committee's decision to NOT allow the terminals to be built on the west side of WA.

I live in Spokane, WA, was born and raised here and chose to make my home here because of the clean water and air, and easy access to outdoor activities. My concerns are the same as most opponents, that being the problem of oil train transport safety, and the continued use of non-renewable resources that are proven to contribute greatly to the degradation of our air, water, environment, and thus, sustained economic stability. Sure, there might be a short term increase in job creation, but we need to start working on long term job creation and long term economic stability. Our continued collective denial of climate change, it's causes and it's consequences, both financial and environmental (it's all connected), has got to stop.

I implore you to vote NO on the building of oil terminals on the West side of WA and NO on the transport of oil through WA.

Kerry Whitsitt

From: james.l.chapple@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:55 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

UTC)

From: S.J. Lindwood <niki7wood@peoplepc.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:03 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.

S.J. Lindwood

80226

UTC)

From: Elaine Hogan <elainehogan_2003@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:04 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.

Elaine Hogan

95521

UTC)

From: Cheryl Ziemak <Bunniepucker@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:07 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.

Cheryl Ziemak

34289

From: Melania Padilla <melpadillapag@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:20 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.

Melania Padilla

15034

UTC)

From: Sally Overholser <sallyoverholser@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:24 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil Trains

I am very much opposed to oil trains going through Spokane. Keep up the good work. I hope you get a lot of response on this subject. Sally Overholser

JTC)

From: gary.j.petersen@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:26 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

UTC)

From: Alice Robbins <robbinse@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:33 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.

Alice Robbins

19087

JTC)

From: Rob Smith <rsmith@npca.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:45 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Mailing list

Categories: Mailing List

Please add my name and address for matters regarding this project.

Thank you

Rob

Rob Smith
Northwest Regional Director

National Parks Conservation Association
1200 5th Avenue, suite 1925
Seattle, WA 98101

O 206-903-1125
C 206-817-0007

rsmith@npca.org

Protecting Our National Parks for Future Generations

From: David.C.Graham@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:48 AM
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,
David Graham

(UTC)

From: elise jesper <kerick@q.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:53 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.

elise jesper

80120

From: dustin.d.blume@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 11:54 AM
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,
Dustin Blume

From: Cathy Gillett <cathy.gillett@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:13 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)

Dear Council Members,

I live in Otis Orchards, WA and I also live within a one mile radius of two train tracks. I have many concerns about crude oil by rail coming to Spokane:

1. Spokane Valley experiences stagnate air quality (no burning allowed). Diesel soot kills 21,000 people each year.
2. Dirty uncovered coal trains are also already traveling these same rails. The topical sprays are not working!
3. All of Spokane depends on the aquifer which is shallow and extremely sensitive to all environmental impacts. Even a dead animal is a threat.
4. The Spokane river has not recovered from silver mining run which has taken decades of cleanup. Transporting large quantities of coal and oil would certainly cause further pollution to our waters even IF we had no accidents or spillage.
5. Property values plummeting.
6. Needed infrastructure at the expense of local tax payers.

I am having great difficulty understanding why this mode of transportation is even being considered. We now have enough scientific FACTS to understand what deadly effects these products are having on our environment. I realize that allowing these plans to proceed will create some jobs, but at what cost to the state of Washington, and its peoples health. Is this Bean Counting (how many will die at what profit) for the profit of big oil/coal corporations?

I urge you not to sell this beautiful state and to keep Spokane safe.

Sincerely,
Cathy Gillett
5308 N Drury
Otis Orchards. WA 99027
509-924-9714

From: Janice Messer <jcmesser60@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:15 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Janice Messer

28560

From: Joseph McCullough <jerseyman01@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:16 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Joseph McCullough

19094

From: Robert Bohlen <rbohlen31@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:41 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Oil Trains Through Spokane

Again we Spokane residents are responding to more trains rolling through our beautiful city. This time it's oil trains.

As a resident of Spokane and a property owner on Pend Oreille Lake in Northern Idaho, I am very much against this type of rail traffic. These trains will be traveling along Lake Pend Oreille, in northern Idaho, the Spokane River in Washington, over Spokane's sole source aquifer, and through the city of Spokane.

ONE accident in any of these locations will affect thousands of residents for an extended period of time, possibly years. Much safer routes must be found or a new refinery solution.

Robert C. Bohlen

UTC)

From: Lee Hettema <leezerhett63@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:41 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.

Lee Hettema

97301

JTC)

From: Hal.G.Mortimer@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:46 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,
Hal Mortimer

From: Barbara Morrissey <taslin10@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 1:11 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage scoping

Hi

Has anyone checked with the BPA about the effect of tar sands crude on turbines in their dams?? The stuff is gunky and has some corrosion issues. It would be one thing for one tanker car of Bakken to slide into the Columbia, say above John Day, the Dalles, or Bonneville. Might be more serious if it were twenty cars, thirty or ??? from North America. I understand it is possible that some of this could be routed through the US on it's way to a refinery, OR China. It is a different beast than the Bakken oil.

Barbara Morrissey
Taslin10@comcast.com
P.O. Box 1045
Spokane, WA, 99210

JTC)

From: Cathy Gillett <cathy.gillett@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 1:14 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro"s Proposal

12/12/2013

Dear Council Members,

I live in Otis Orchards, WA and I also live within a one mile radius of two train tracks. I have many concerns about crude oil by rail coming to Spokane:

1. Spokane Valley experiences stagnate air quality (no burning allowed). Diesel soot kills 21,000 people each year.
2. Dirty uncovered coal trains are also already traveling these same rails. Topical sprays are not working to eliminate airborne particles.
3. All of Spokane depends on the Aquifer which is shallow and sensitive to all environmental impacts. Even a dead animal poses a threat.
4. The Spokane river has not recovered from silver mining run off which has taken decades of cleanup. Coal and oil pollution will damage our waters further even IF we have no accidents or spillage.
5. Property values plummeting.
6. Increased Infrastructure need to be paid for by local taxpayers.

I am having great difficulty understanding why the transportation of these products by rail are even being considered as we now have scientific knowledge as to the scope of environmental damage and death that coal, crude oil and diesel are causing. I realize that jobs will be created, but at what cost to the citizens of Washington. Are we bean counting (ration of damage/death to profits) for corporations?

I urge you to save our beautiful state.

Sincerely,
Cathy Gillett
5308 N. Drury
Otis Orchards, WA 99027
509-924-9714

JTC)

From: mary ann cone <marysquat@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 1:40 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: OIL TERMINAL IN VANCOUVER

Mr. Stephen Posner,

I am registering my opposition to allowing an oil terminal in Vancouver 'Wa. I live above the port of Vancouver. I am quite concerned about the safety as well as the pollution from this giant storage facility. I also am greatly concerned about the number oil trains running through the gorge as well as our town. The city is trying to revitalize the downtown area and create more jobs and housing. The trains create a possible and potential hazard. The creation of 120 permanent jobs does not make up for negative effects. A thriving downtown area would be much more effective for the economy without ruining the quality of life and environment we have come to expect and worked on.

Thank you,

Mary Ann Cone
1723 N.W. Trillium Ln.
Vancouver, Wa 98663

JTC)

From: chris.t.kennedy@tsocorp.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 1:43 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.

Chris Kennedy

Sincerely,
Chris Kennedy

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Esther Kronenberg <wekrone@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 4:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Categories: Purple Category

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. Esther Kronenberg
36 ave NW
Olympia, WA 98502

(UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Robert Innes <eigo2@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 6:16 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, the City of Lyle, the City of Bingen, the City of Stevenson, the City of Washougal, the City of Camas, and downtown Vancouver. Much of the oil will be carried in old tank cars of a type (DOT-111) that the National Transportation Safety Board first identified as prone to split open in derailments in 1991. I am concerned that this project will pose unacceptable environmental risks and public safety hazards in the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, and the Cities of Bingen, Stevenson, Washougal, Camas, and Vancouver. The risk of a fiery derailment starting forest fires also warrants careful study. The horrible explosions at Lac Megantic, Quebec, earlier in 2013, are a reminder of how dangerous unit trains carrying crude oil can be.

To address these concerns, the scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) should be broad enough to consider the environmental, public safety, and aesthetic impacts of both the construction of an oil terminal for distribution of oil through the region and of the means employed to ship oil to and from the proposed terminal. The EIS should examine the extent to which the safety-challenged DOT-111 tank car would be used to transport oil rather than safer, newer model tank cars. Aesthetic impact should include consideration of the impact of frequent unit train arrivals on new residential and office development in the downtown areas of all the cities along the BNSF line through the Columbia Gorge.

The risks of the project should be weighed against the need for crude oil in the Northwest. Is the project appropriately sized, or is it bigger than the need for oil in the Northwest? Existing Federal law does not allow exports of crude oil, so there is no reason for a project with capacity greater than local demand. It also makes little sense to build capacity to handle shipments to refineries in California since California's needs will in the long run be more cheaply met by construction of new pipelines and/or the development of the enormous Monterey shale deposits.

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. Robert Innes
428 W Dogwood St
Washougal, WA 98671-5170

(UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Dan Sherwood <dsphoto@spiritone.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 7:16 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. Dan Sherwood
1719 SE 35th Ave
Portland, OR 97214-5038

(JTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Derek Gendvil <dgendvil@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 10:16 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 12, 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,
Derek Gendvil
Las Vegas

Sincerely,

Mr. Derek Gendvil
9030 W Sahara Ave # 360
Las Vegas, NV 89117-5744

From: MICHAEL BEASLEY <beasleymichael55@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 8:04 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Crude oil trains through Washington comment

I appreciate your concern over our environment. Please stand with us on this issue. This was my testimony on last night Crude oil train hearing on Dec. 11th in Spokane.

Railroad infrastructure in Northern Idaho and Eastern Washington has not been upgraded to meet the demand for the proposed train traffic.

Adding more traffic to a system that is already at it's limits is absurd and will contribute to train derailments.

I also don't want to contribute to climate change and environmental devastation with tar sand oil.

We are not adversaries of railroad employees but it only takes 1 derailment of oil and other toxins hauled by these trains to devastate our city and result in loss of life.

I want a positive future for railroads but it won't last long with 20th century fossil fuels. We need to think long term and train commerce will continue without oil trains. Even Wall Street and Bloomberg Business News says this is short sited, bad economics.

An EPA impact study is a no brainer and we also need an emergency contingency plan when a derailment happens.

No more oil trains is the only solution that will guarantee our clean environment and safety.

Now is the time to move forward and stop allowing oil companies to stop progress on clean, sustainable energy and kill the future for our children.

Many of us in this audience feel this hearing is to patronize us and big money will rule as always. Oil corporations have shown over and over that their only goal is record profits with no concerns with the long terms effects.

As a panel, your determination can support or deny tar sand oil trains through our state. Ask yourself, how will you feel when a train with oil or other toxins derail and devastate our community because it is only a matter of time.

I challenge you to help Washington State lead the way and do what is right for the people and the environment.

Corporations are not people!

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Richard Schramm <rpschramm@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 8:20 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 12, 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. Richard Schramm
3024 NE Bryce St
Portland, OR 97212-1718
(503) 288-8912

From: phil brooke <oldbrickhousefarm@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:16 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC); Posner, Stephen (UTC)
Subject: Vancouver Crude Oil Export Terminal Scoping/Site Selection Process
Attachments: Coal and Crude Oil Exports The Lesson of Kosmos, Washington 12122013.docx

Categories: Red Category

Dear Mr. Posner:

Public comment is attached to this email regarding the proposed crude oil export terminal in Vancouver for inclusion in your process. The MSDS sheet for this Bakken region crude oil is readily available online. If you review this, you will discover no less than a dozen known or suspected carcinogens exist in this brew, along with other serious health hazards. This crude oil carries an NFPA flammability rating of 4, making it more flammable than gasoline. This all explains the severity of recent disasters as crude by rail has escalated in the last 2 years.

Respectfully submitted,
Phil Brooke
Centralia, WA

PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING VANCOUVER CRUDE OIL EXPORT TERMINAL SCOPING.

DELIVERED VIA EMAIL ON 12/12/13 to: EFSEC@UTC.WA.GOV, stephen.posner@utc.wa.gov

Attn: Stephen Posner

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council

P.O. Box 43172

1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.

Olympia, WA 98504-3172.

cc: Jay Inslee, Governor of Washington

Coal and Crude Oil Exports: The Lessons of Kosmos, Washington



I reside in the historic railroading community of Centralia, Washington, where rich history, pillared mansions, and tree-lined streets combine to denote a place which matters to many. I've been following the debate over coal and crude oil export terminals with a keen interest, and offer the following perspective:

There once existed a small logging town in Washington State named Kosmos. It was located due east of Chehalis, nestled in the foothills of the Cascade Mountains of Lewis County. In 1968, after many decades of debate, which included not one, but three trips to the U.S. Supreme Court, the waters of the Cowlitz River were allowed to rise over Kosmos, as Riffe Lake took shape behind the newly completed Mossyrock Dam. Today, the Dam supplies about 40% of the clean hydro-electric Tacoma Power customers and businesses rely on, vital flood control for our surrounding lowlands, recreational opportunities and stable family-wage jobs in numbers higher than ever inhabited Kosmos. Those re-located to make way for the dam were compensated for their sacrifice. Even with the now obvious cost-benefit, the decision to wipe tiny Kosmos from the map was not taken lightly. Indeed, it's a good case study in how difficult decision-making is approached in a modern democracy.

Recently, the Pacific Northwest has been inundated by a plethora of coal and crude oil export schemes. These proposals include life-altering impacts to communities along rail corridors: businesses, fisheries, outdoor recreation and the natural environment. Health, safety and property values impacted. Large swaths of our natural environment will face an uncertain future. Since industry is unwilling to study the most subtle and long-term impacts to individuals and health, they remain less clear.

The sheer scale of these proposals is giving even the most ardent of railroading towns great pause. If all proposals were to move forward, the schedule of full and empty coal and crude oil trains visiting us could approach or exceed 100 daily, many up to a mile and a half long. A number of Washington's great cities would suffer direct and immediate impacts including: Blaine, Burlington, Camas, Centralia,

Chehalis, Cheney, Edmonds, Kent, Marysville, Monroe, Mt. Vernon, Puyallup, Seattle, Sedro-Woolley, Spokane, Sumner, Tacoma, Washougal and Winlock. A rundown of the “benefits” we’d be welcoming into our communities includes, but is not limited to:

- Blocked intersections hobbling commerce and emergency response.
- Highly flammable and combustible cargo passing through our neighborhoods creating risk.
- Over capacity of our rail lines, resulting in higher transportation costs to export Washington’s agriculture, value-added and high-tech products.
- Upwards of 50,000 fishing industry jobs will be placed at risk; as will employment in recreational areas and pass-through communities.
- Reduction in property values of up to 20% for those owning property within 600 feet of any tracks carrying coal and/or crude.
- Using history as a guide, Taxpayers will be asked to fund an average of 95% for any rail overpass projects.
- Premature deterioration of expensive infrastructure will occur due to persistent coal dust corrosion.
- Health impacts from exposing populations, especially the young and elderly, to persistently high levels of fine particulates, benzene, hydrogen sulfide, mercury, and other known or suspected carcinogens and health hazards.
- Environmental impacts ranging from the rail and terminal-based point source pollution to the carbon dioxide emissions efficiently making their way back to us over the Pacific.

For our sacrifice, companies engaged in exporting coal or crude oil will receive anywhere from 20 to 100 permanent jobs per export terminal. In fact, their job numbers are gradually being projected downward, as more is disclosed regarding the high level of automation for proposed terminals.

“Front groups” for Big Oil will tell you unfinished crude oil exports are currently banned by federal law, and can’t be exported. Don’t believe it for a moment! What they fail to mention: 1. Canadian crude oil falls outside of this ban and may flow without limit through Washington. 2. The crude oil export ban is so full of loopholes, it is gradually being rendered useless. 3. The international energy lobby is openly and aggressively advocating elimination of the oil export ban, using item 2. as their justification.

Then there are coal exports. Coal has recently gone through a sophisticated re-branding and we’re now told it’s ‘clean’. You may have heard the ads on radio or TV. The problem is, as well-known liberal rag **Popular Mechanics** points out: “Coal will never be clean, *and is* still bad news for the environment and human health.” When you study the fine print, as one group of North Puget Sound cities did, you will find many of these export schemes don’t cap the size of future operations. Industry journals talk openly about cashing in on the surge in demand for dirty energy in China and the Far East. What we’re witnessing is an export “play” in the dirtiest of energies, at the expense of Washington’s health and safety.

Unlike the demonstrated benefits of the Mossyrock Dam, local communities receive worse than nothing from the prospect of these terminals. Unless you sell asthma drugs for a living, you probably won’t see

a benefit. No net gain in jobs, energy creation or benefit to local businesses. In fact, a recent study released by the largest city in our region demonstrate observable negative impacts outstripping industry-claimed benefits by a factor of 10 to 1. If it were not for the undisclosed millions being spent to convince us otherwise, there is a certain bizarre reality we would consider for even a moment sacrificing so much of Washington's economic vitality, quality of life and unique beauty.

The way I see it, almost 50 years ago ample supplies of clean hydro-electric power and family wage jobs were made possible by the sacrifice of tiny Kosmos. In contrast, these coal and crude oil export schemes represent a massive regression in human progress. Robert Kennedy famously cautioned us not to excuse those willing to build their lives on the shattered dreams of others. When it comes to proposed coal and crude oil export terminals, we shouldn't. Too much is at stake.

Respectfully & sincerely,

*Phil Brooke,
Centralia, WA*

(Phil Brooke is a resident & business owner in the Edison District of Centralia, Washington. He's a life-long Washingtonian, Risk Manager by profession & raises Swiss dairy goats.)

Photo credit of Mossyrock Dam, courtesy of Panoramio.

UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Shaul LEVI, Ph.D <shaul_levi@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:50 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 12, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

Ladies and Gentlemen of the EFSEC

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 and the broader implications of encouraging the use of fossil fuels globally. 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 assess 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. Shaul LEVI, Ph.D
2661 NW Lovejoy St
Portland, OR 97210-2807

(UTC)

From: MICHAEL BEASLEY <beasleymichael55@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 10:55 AM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Crude oil train

I am sending this a second time because I forgot to give you my name and address.

April Beasley
4023 E Fairview Ave
Spokane, WA 99217

I appreciate your concern over our environment. Please stand with us on this issue. I have hope you will be one of the few who represent us to have the courage to say no.

Railroad infrastructure in Northern Idaho and Eastern Washington has not been upgraded to meet the demand for the proposed train traffic.

Adding more traffic to a system that is already at it's limits is absurd and will contribute to train derailments.

I also don't want to contribute to climate change and environmental devastation with tar sand oil.

We are not adversaries of railroad employees but it only takes 1 derailment of oil and other toxins hauled by these trains to devastate our city and result in loss of life.

I want a positive future for railroads but it won't last long with 20th century fossil fuels. We need to think long term and train commerce will continue without oil trains. Even Wall Street and Bloomberg Business News says this is short sided, bad economics.

An EPA impact study is a no brainer and we also need an emergency contingency plan when a derailment happens.

No more oil trains is the only solution that will guarantee our clean environment and safety.

Now is the time to move forward and stop allowing oil companies to stop progress on clean, sustainable energy and kill the future for our children.

Many of us in this audience feel this hearing is to patronize us and big money will rule as always. Oil corporations have shown over and over that their only goal is record profits with no concerns with the long terms effects.

As a panel, your determination can support or deny tar sand oil trains through our state. Ask yourself, how will you feel when a train with oil or other toxins derail and devastate our community because it is only a matter of time.

I challenge you to help Washington State lead the way and do what is right for the people and the environment.

Corporations are not people!

From: robert@benze.com
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 12:19 PM
To: ken Schlichte; global-warming-realists@googlegroups.com
Cc: Kramer, Becky; EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Re: [GWR] Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing - The Spokane Spokesman-Review

Almost everything carries some degree of risk — including the long- established impacts of railroad traffic. However, we are now so far into the weeds worrying about virtually insignificant effects that the rest of the world must question our sanity. Years ago I had a recording by a comedian named Brother Dave, who suggested the only safe course of action was to stay in bed, assume the fetal position, and turn the electric blanket up to 9. Perhaps that is where we are headed.

The problem with this nonsense, as most GWR members recognize, is that it has major adverse consequences on the world's standard of living. And the misguided advocacy to eliminate carbon is just one issue of many.

I just commented to Newsmax on the wrongness of their latest email news alert titled: *GMO food is worse than we thought* — pointing out that such efforts to eliminate GMO food impact the the ability of of poor people around the world to dramatically improve their lives. An example is the movement to prevent the use of Golden Rice, which has been modified to include Beta Carotene to counter the awful effects of Vitamin A deficiency in the diets of millions of poor people worldwide.

Apparently facts are no longer important, causing us to abandon the concepts of relative risk, statistically valid epidemiological studies, and the other proven scientific approaches to providing reliable information upon which to base policy? Who would have guessed 50-years ago that advocacy-influence public opinion would be how the U.S.A., with its history of technology and innovation, would handle scientific issues in the 21st century.

Simply amazing.

Bob Benze
Environmental Engineer

From: ken Schlichte <kensforsoil@comcast.net>
Date: Thursday, December 12, 2013 at 9:49 AM
To: <global-warming-realists@googlegroups.com>
Cc: <beckyk@spokesman.com>, <efsec@utc.wa.gov>
Subject: [GWR] Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing - The Spokane Spokesman-Review

Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Spokane Hearing

Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Hearing, by Becky Kramer and in the December 12 Spokane Spokesman-Review link at <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2013/dec/12/fears-about-oil-train-safety-impacts-voiced-at/>, begins as copied below.

Fears About Oil Train Safety, Impacts Voiced at Hearing

Becky Kramer The Spokesman-Review

A proposal to ship North Dakota crude oil through Spokane by train drew mostly opponents at a hearing Wednesday night.

About 75 people showed up for the state hearing on a proposed oil terminal at the Port of Vancouver that could result in up to four oil trains daily passing through Spokane.

“I see the trains go over the Latah Creek Bridge from my patio,” said Pauline Druffel, a retired psychotherapist, who lives less than a mile away.

Besides concerns about public safety and the potential for oil spills in the Spokane River, “my primary resistance is global warming,” she told members of Washington’s Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. “It’s insane that we keep taking this stuff out of the ground and putting it into the atmosphere.”

Other speakers echoed Druffel’s comments on climate change.

Pauline Druffel and the other speakers and participants at Wednesday night’s hearing in Spokane would be much less concerned about global warming in Washington state if they were made aware of the official climate data from the NOAA National Climatic Data Center Climate at a Glance site at www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/ indicating that Washington state’s annual temperatures have actually trended downward at a rate of 2.2 degrees F per decade over the last 10 years.

Ken Schlichte



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

--
You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Global Warming Realists" group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to global-warming-realists+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com.
For more options, visit https://groups.google.com/groups/opt_out.

UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Melanie Rabier-Gotchall <rabier.melanie@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 1:21 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 12, 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. Melanie Rabier-Gotchall
6685 SW Sagert St
Tualatin, OR 97062-8349