

**From:** Eugenia Newberg <newbergs@atlanticbb.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 5:08 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.

Eugenia Newberg

21601

(UTC)

---

**From:** Diane Burgin <diane.k.burgin@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 1:12 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.

Diane Burgin

M4C 2J6

**From:** keith.w.taylor@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 5:11 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

I am a resident of Texas 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,  
Keith Taylor

**(UTC)**

---

**From:** adriana spighi <aspighi@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 6:05 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 spighi

V9T 1T0

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Alex Brown <alex@bark-out.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:06 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro comments

**To Whom It May Concern:**

The lower Columbia River is at a crossroads. Will it be a mixed use site for industry, ag, and tourism, or will it become home base for the fossil fuel industry? Washington (state and federal) regulators must make some tough decisions about what is appropriate for our special corner of the world, and I sincerely hope that you consider a path forward that does not include fossil fuel exploitation.

I grew up and live in Portland, OR. I am an avid birder, using sites such as the Steigerwald Refuge along Hwy 14 and the proposed rail lines to be used for shipping crude oil for the proposed Tesoro plant. I also canoe on the Columbia River. The risks to human and environmental safety associated with this proposal are enormous, and have no business in our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alex Brown  
3756 SE Lafayette Ct  
Portland, OR 97202

JTC)

---

**From:** Lessye DeMoss <lessye@isp.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 6:58 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.

Lessye DeMoss

35401

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Daniel Beck <fishinbum1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 7:09 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.

Daniel Beck

16417

**(UTC)**

---

**From:** jacques.p.mcgregor@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 7:15 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,  
Jacques McGregor

**From:** jeff.l.evans@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 7:41 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,  
Jeff Evans

(UTC)

---

**From:** brent.g.akers@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 7:49 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,  
Brent Akers

**From:** cathy carleton <carletonkathy@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 7:49 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.

cathy carleton

12835

**JTC)**

---

**From:** douglas.r.taylor@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 8:03 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,  
Doug Taylor

**JTC)**

---

**From:** joseph.e.paris@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 8:27 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,  
Joseph Paris

**From:** jeremy.l.johnson@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 8:36 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,  
Jeremy Johnson

**From:** lianne.d.mcclure@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 8:36 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,  
Lianne McClure

**From:** Joshuabiamonte@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 9:46 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Kenai, 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.

Joshua Biamonte

Sincerely,  
Joshua Biamonte

**UTC)**

---

**From:** brandon.w.plank@tsocorp.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 9:50 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from Washington State 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,  
Brandon Plank

## Docket EF-131590

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#28118

**UTC)**

---

**From:** C. Wagner <clwagner167@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 9:51 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

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.

C. Wagner

48174

**UTC)**

---

**From:** quigleyolymp@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 9:52 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

I am a Tesoro employee from WA State 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,  
margaret quigley

**From:** Lucia Mack <mack1217@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 8:51 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Cc:** 'Don Steinke'  
**Subject:** No Crude Oil in Vancouver WA

**Importance:** High

If you approve this commercial project, you will be undermining the very thing that makes Clark County such a desirable place to live. A proposed increase of 80 jobs due to this project can never justify the eventual decline of the county in which we live. The environmental risks to the surrounding neighborhoods near the train tracks and holding facilities would increase exponentially in terms of air quality, not to mention potential land and water quality destruction.

Why would anyone want to take that chance with one of the few remaining urban areas that shares the rare quality being environmentally sound and forward thinking?

In essence, any small increase in job production now would be offset by the eventual decrease of jobs as this unique area would begin to experience the same environmental issues and quality of life problems of other more highly industrialized areas.

I come from the East Coast and when people visit us here they are amazed at the beauty, cleanliness and progressive doctrine shared by the community here. It is a subtle but powerful brand that many people may not Clark County enjoys, and is the reason why its population has expanded so greatly in the last 20 years.

Job growth? Change the identity of this little city by making it like every other opportunist burg which has sold its soul to commercial, big interests without taking into consideration how it will really affect it in the long term will get us 80 jobs now while losing 800 in the future.

This is Vancouver Washington. One of the best kept secrets in the Country. This will not last for long, however if you choose to change our reputation to that of an "Oil and Petrochemical facility town".

Think about the future you will be inviting; need a chemical facility?—use Vancouver, they all ready transport and store Crude. Need a refinery?- let's look at Vancouver, they already store the stuff and move trains and vessel of it through the town all day and night. Need a nuke plant?-Vancouver is a leader now in the storage and transport of all kinds of crap, no one wants to live there now anyways since the oil spills , air pollution and health issues.

This is not a fantasy. This is how it happens.

Any NEPA research will look into this kind of activity and be more inclined to nod favorably in the direction of allowing these environmentally damaging moves into areas where the progress is headed in that direction already.

Don't allow this.

This is how Port Elizabeth and Port Newark NJ became the crappiest places on the planet.

We like clean air, clean water and progressive actions here in Vancouver. We're nice, smart and we can find better ways in increase our job situation without throwing the baby out with the bathwater. We aren't that desperate to mortgage our future.

Keep Vancouver free of Crude Oil transportation. We do not want to become part of the problem.

Sincerely,

Lucia Mack;

Retired Oil and Hazmat Pollution Responder/Regulator for the US Coast Guard and ex military brat who has live everywhere, seen it all and chooses to live in the best city in the world; Vancouver Washington.

**From:** Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of JAMES STENGLE <jstengle@frontier.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:05 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 16, 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.

I have major concern with impacts to federal and state listed species and critical habitat especially to our listed salmon, steelhead, and Pacific smelt. Construction activities will destroy and impact designated critical habitat for numerous listed species. Operations and maintenance will adversely impact listed species. What mitigation measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to listed species have been proposed? What funds (if any) have been dedicated to mitigation for adverse impacts to listed species and critical habitats?

Cultural resources will be impacted by construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed facility. Has this project been consulted on with affected Tribes? Has the proposed undertaking had any consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act with federal and state authorities?

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. JAMES STENGLE  
730 SE 33rd St  
Troutdale, OR 97060-3401  
(503) 492-3632

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Craig Warnock  
<craigwarnock@reddotcorp.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Craig Warnock  
2424 62nd Ave NW  
Gig Harbor, WA 98335-7220

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Joan S. Childs  
<joanschids@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Joan S. Childs  
1600 SE Division St  
Portland, OR 97202-1143

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bonnie Gretz <bgwhaluv@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Bonnie Gretz  
507 NE 4th St  
Coupeville, WA 98239-3597

(UTC)

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Joan Wattles  
<nineteenravens@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Joan Wattles  
1925 42nd Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98116-2004  
(206) 935-4938

e, Gail (UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Margaret Quentin  
<peggy.quentin@redcross.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Margaret Quentin  
3830 NE 64th Ave  
Portland, OR 97213-4416  
(503) 201-4657

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Linda Patrick <linda.patrick@stmaryspdx.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Linda Patrick  
2626 NE Klickitat St  
Portland, OR 97212-2548  
(503) 287-2749

**UTC)**

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Teresa Mcqueen <waterhythms@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Teresa Mcqueen  
1531 Belmont Ave Apt 3  
Seattle, WA 98122-3753

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lindsay Hope Kern <belfayan@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Lindsay Hope Kern  
2435 NE 37th Ave  
Portland, OR 97212-5257

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Deanna Bailey  
<dmidgley@humboldt.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. Deanna Bailey  
0103 SW Meade St Apt 9  
Portland, OR 97201-4799

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jason Peralta  
<cloud9shrooms@rocketmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Jason Peralta  
673 Red Hill Rd  
Oakland, OR 97462-9652

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lauren Kelley  
<chariotofwingedhorses@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Lauren Kelley  
3829 SE 66th Ave  
Portland, OR 97206-3650

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Robert Bonar <kenw@scattercreek.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Bonar  
PO Box 1596  
Kalama, WA 98625-1401

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gloria Hatrick <glorihat@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Gloria Hatrick  
333 W Main St  
Hillsboro, OR 97123-3947  
(503) 530-8116

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gary Bennett  
<garyeunicebennett@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Gary Bennett  
1436 Toledo St  
Bellingham, WA 98229-5301  
(360) 676-4460

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Barbara Danko <bajpd@peak.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Barbara Danko  
24376 Columbine Dr  
Philomath, OR 97370-9001  
(541) 929-6021

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mary Langlois <marylanglois909@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Mary Langlois  
7780 NW Mitchell Dr  
Corvallis, OR 97330-2817  
(541) 758-0139

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Patricia Schwartz  
<patricia.schwartz@homeforward.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 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.

I live on the river, one spill would ruin the ecosystem for everyone and everything! Don't Do it!

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Patricia Schwartz  
10612 NW Lower River Rd Slip 1  
Vancouver, WA 98660-1046

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Anne Garvey <anneg345678@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Anne Garvey  
421 25th Ave  
Longview, WA 98632-1321

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Hildie Cuddigan <hildiec@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Hildie Cuddigan  
3841 NE 68th Ave  
Portland, OR 97213-5118

Docket EF-131590

Tesoro Savage CBR  
Scoping Comment  
#28141

(UTC)

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Nina Rollow <nrollow37@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Nina Rollow  
1333 SE Nehalem St  
Portland, OR 97202-6627  
(503) 232-1445

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Bruce Cooley  
<bcooley@teleport.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Dr. Bruce Cooley  
2734 University St  
Eugene, OR 97403-1645  
(541) 345-1550

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mary Chase  
<mary@drmarychase.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Dr. Mary Chase  
4485 SW Laurelwood Ave  
Portland, OR 97225-2238  
(503) 804-2418

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lisa Schmidt  
<lisa.schmidt@drmartens.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Lisa Schmidt  
5432 NE Siskiyou St  
Portland, OR 97213-3374

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Eric Olson  
<eric.olson@nike.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

3) The transportation and public health impacts of additional unit train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route. This includes evaluating emergency response capabilities in Vancouver, where oil trains would deliver and store oil, and other communities along the rail and shipping route.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Eric Olson  
420 NW 11th Ave Unit 606  
Portland, OR 97209-2961  
(503) 929-8749

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gordon Radovich <gradovich@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Gordon Radovich  
6052 Chico Way NW  
Bremerton, WA 98312-1146

---

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dan Fiala <d.fiala@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Dan Fiala  
1472 W Lake Sammamish Pkwy NE  
Bellevue, WA 98008-3316  
(425) 746-2450

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Joelle Craft  
<joellecraft@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Joelle Craft  
7738 14th Ave SW  
Seattle, WA 98106-2038  
(206) 383-7566

**From:** Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sharon Gaglia  
<sharongaglia@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 10:12 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC)  
**Subject:** Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 16, 2013

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

Dear Mr. Posner,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Sharon Gaglia  
3411 SE 16th Ave  
Portland, OR 97202-2823  
(503) 726-9826

**From:** Carol <carolellispokane@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 16, 2013 6:52 AM  
**To:** EFSEC (UTC); Kernutt, Matt (ATG); Carol  
**Subject:** train accidents Oct 2008-2012

From the U.S.A. and pertinent Canadian accidents on Wikipedia, excluding some crossing accidents and some light rail urban accidents, but including all derailments, runaway trains, train to train collisions, bridge failures, equipment failures, acts of nature (floods, rain, landslides, tornados) and human error (speed, missed signals, repair failures, drugs if known):

10/14/08 - Decatur, IL - Night train derails, conductor dies.  
11/20/08 - Kent, OH - 119 car coal train derails, damages bridge.  
12/15/08 - Marysville, WA. - Amtrak strikes car, driver critical.  
12/31/08 - Villery, Quebec - 33 cars derail on propane freight. 70 evacuated.  
1/7/09 - Cincinnati, OH. - 2 of 4 derailed cars carry propane, 1/2 mile radius evacuated.  
5/9/09 - Palm Coast, FL. - 2 engines and 37 cars derail due to kink in rails. Hydrochloric acid carried on some cars.  
6/5/09 - Oshawa, Ontario - 2 engines and 27 cars derail in backyards and school yard during recess.  
6/19/09 - Rockford, IL. - Rain deluge causes 14 ethanol tankers to derail, explode, 1 dies, others burned.  
6/22/09 - DC - Metro electronic module fails, 1 train hits another. 9 die.  
7/9/09 - near Detroit, MI - Amtrak hits side of car, 5 in car die.  
11/24/09 - Houston, TX - 116 cars derail, US highway closed several days.  
2/12/10 - DC train derails, 1 hospitalized.  
2/25/10 - near Quebec City, Canada - Train derails, 4 injured, homes significantly damaged.  
3/15/10 - Houston, TX - Metro train hits Metro bus, 20 injured.  
3/30/10 - Pickering Ontario - 3 engines and 9 cars off track.  
9/30/10 - Two harbors, MN - 2 ore trains collide, 5 crew injured.  
3/27/11 - Port Hope, Canada - 20 cars derail, 1 car burns, 20 homes evacuated  
3/28/11 - Newton Falls, OH - 12 cars derail, 3 off a bridge onto Center Street. Evacuation of center. Most roads into town closed.  
4/17/11 - Red Oak, Iowa - BNSF coal train derails. Fire. 2 crew die. 10 cars on maintenance train derail. Route closed 24 hours.  
6/3/11 - Chicago - BN collides with Amtrak - 5 injured, 1 train derails.  
6/24/11 - Reno, NV - Crossing collision, driver and conductor die, more injured.  
7/11/11 - N. Berwick, Maine - Truck hits train, 1 dies, 1 train car on fire.  
10/7/11 - Tiskilwa, IL - 26 cars derail, 800 evacuated.  
10/12/11 - Oakland, CA - Amtrak passes red signal, hits stopped train. 17 injured.  
1/16/12 - Porter County, Indiana - 3 freight trains collide. Fire. 2 injured, possible HAZMAT.  
1/17/12 - Northeast MT - BNSF freight hits truck, 10 cars derail.  
1/21/12 - Wainright, Alberta - 17 out of 31 derailed cars total fall off bridge.  
2/1/12 - Leoni Township, MI - 2 engine cars derail, 6 injured.  
2/26/12 - Burlington, Ontario - Derailment. 3 engineers. die. Dozens injured.  
6/24/12 - Goodwell, OK - 2 trains collide. 3 die. Diesel fireball.  
7/4/12 - Glenview, IL. - Coal train derails, collapsing freeway overpass. 2 killed on road by falling coal and falling cars.

7/11/12 - Columbus, OH - Derailment. Explosion of ethanol. 1 mile wide evacuation. 2 injured.  
7/21/12 - Barton County, MO - Freight train hits BNSF coal train. Derails. 2 injured.  
8/21/12 - Ellicot City, MD - Coal train derails, buries, kills 2.  
10/1/12 - near Bakersfield, CA - Truck hits train, 3 cars derail, 50 injured.  
10/29/12 - West Point, KY - 13 freight cars derail. Tank car catches fire. Explosion. 2 km evacuated. 3 injured.  
11/15/12 - US train hits float, 4 die.  
11/30/12 - Paulsboro, NJ - Train derails on bridge recently rebuilt after 2009 crash. Vinyl chloride leaked, 40 treated.  
12/7/12 - Everett, WA - BNSF derails when landslide strikes.  
5/17/13 - Fairfield, CN - Train derails, hits 2nd train. 60 injured, 5 critically.  
5/25/13 - Southeast MO - UP train T-bones BNSF train, causing highway overpass to collapse. 5 injured in cars, 2 on train.  
5/28/13 - Rosedale, MD - Freight train derails after hitting garbage truck. 2 cars catch fire. Explosion damages buildings. 20 block radius evacuated.  
6/20/13 - Calgary, Alberta - Rail bridge collapses, weakened by recent floods.  
8/5/13 - Lawtell, LA - 20 cars derail.  
9/16/13 - IL - Bridge collapses, freight train derails.  
9/19/13 - Southampton Co., VA - Train derails, Fire. 2 injured.  
10/11/13 - Randolph Co., W VA - Log truck collides with train. Driver dies, 23 injured.  
10/19/13 - Edmonton, Canada - 13 crude oil and liquified petroleum gas railcars derail. Fire. Locals evacuated. 23 injured.  
10/24/13 - Sanford, FL - 4 cars derail. 1 dies.  
11/8/13 - Pickens Co. AL - 90 car crude oil train derails, explodes, fire left to burn itself out.  
11/30/13 - Silver city NM -Train derails. 3 engineers die.  
12/1/13 - Bronx, NYC - Train derails, 4 die, 63 injured, engineer "dazed."  
12/5/13 - Two Harbors, MN - Runaway ore train rear-ends second ore train. 2 crew hospitalized.