

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#29951

Docket EF-131590

ITC)

From: Jim Ramaglia <jramaglia@me.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am support the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver.

Thank you.

Jim Ramaglia
box 1508
anacortes, WA 98221

UTC)

From: Jo Harvey <cailinfilii@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:49 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Jo Harvey
204 Eastgate Ave. N.
Pacific, WA 98047

From: Steven Trevallee <trevallee@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:51 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Steven Trevallee
734 Broadway
Seattle, WA 98102

From: tndgardens@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:05 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Citizen Comment - Vancouver Oil Terminal Proposal

I have been concerned about some kind of oil spill upstream of Bonneville dam and its effect on the Dam's operations. This is what I have found out so far.

In the event of a spill, the light, sweet crude will float. If it reaches the Dam, it will coat whatever it lands on. It will burn if it comes in contact with a spark. It can probably be contained by a boom.

However, I fear that this pipeline on wheels may someday be used for heavy, viscous Tar Sands Crude. It is so heavy that it will ball up and sink. If spilled above the Dam, it can gum up the turbines and any other underwater machinery it encounters.

Please study the effect of these 2 kinds of oil on the operation of Bonneville Dam. Needless to say, a spill of the heavier oil would have a huge and immediate effect on electrical production in the Pacific Northwest. Please make the EIS very broad and include this. Although the oil companies are not shipping Tar Sands Oil now, they may want to do so in the future. Please also investigate how to make the rules stringent enough to prevent the possibility of shipping oil from Tar Sands.

Thank you.

Diana Gordon
December 16, 2013
642 I Street
(360) 835-7748
Washougal, Wa. 98671
tndgardens@comcast.net

From: M K Wiebe Keogh <marniwk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:06 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

M K Wiebe Keogh
22015-A 76th Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026

UTC)

From: Jim Gleckler <cjgleckler@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:18 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Jim Gleckler
5149 New Sweden Rd
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

From: Robin Moore <triara@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:29 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Robin Moore
10514 Midvale Ave N #2
Seattle, WA 98133

JTC)

From: Scott Bishop <sbishop@oly-wa.us>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:31 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Scott Bishop
1710 Giles NW
Olympia, WA 98502

JTC)

From: Pat Matheny-White <Patandsid@comcast.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:36 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Pat Matheny-White
3568A Simmons Mill Ct. SW
Tumwater, WA 98512

(UTC)

From: Robert Gabriel <doctorob@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Robert Gabriel
3125C 36th Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

JTC)

From: Barbara Delmestri <babi_slippers@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:47 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Barbara Delmestri
Ottakringerstraße 235/16
Vienna, AZ 1160

(UTC)

From: Debaran Kelso <debarankelso@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:50 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Debaran Kelso
451 E Middlepoint Rd
Port Townsend, WA 98368

(UTC)

From: Meilin Lani <meilinlani@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:58 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Please, I understand the potential for some job development, I understand what you are considering as good for the economy but, what good really, what will we have made when everything that makes our State, Our State is no more. Haven't we learned enough from the death and destruction of so many of our sister states? The dead lakes, the dead flora and fauna native to the area. It is a very simple, our beautiful green state has made it this long. We don't need what you are trying to sell us. I implore you on behalf of your children, your children's children and, mine. Don't do this. Aloha pumehana. Imua, forward toward a better future! Your Hawaiian Warrior Wahine, Meilin C. Lani.
Mahalo no loa, thank you very much.

Meilin Lani
5501-S. Mullen St. #B 3
Tacoma, WA 98409



801 W. Riverside, Suite 100, Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: 509.624.1393 or 1.800.SPOKANE
Fax: 509.747.0077
www.greaterspokane.org

RECEIVED

DEC 16 2013

ENERGY FACILITY SITE
EVALUATION COUNCIL

State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W.
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

Dear Sir or Ma'am;

Greater Spokane Incorporated supports 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.

To prepare for the recent decline in crude oil in the Alaskan Northern Slope, it is critical to seek alternative domestic crude oil sources to alleviate dependence on foreign imports. It is vital to remember that crude oil is refined to produce the products necessary for businesses to remain competitive in the global market, and is needed to provide the conveniences that have allowed the U.S. to be world leader.

Eastern Washington is a large exporter of agricultural products, with \$412 million in domestic exports, and over \$3 billion in international exports. The region is the largest exporter of cattle, wheat, barley, potatoes, apples, peas, and lentils. It is worrisome that someday, we may have to conduct an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for every commodity shipped within Washington State. As such, we ask the scope of the (EIS) be site-specific, and be limited to those potential impacts directly related to the facility design and operation of the proposed location of the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal.

We are concerned that EIS research beyond the site-based facility is an overreach that may dilute the core focus of this facility, and as mentioned above could damper the transportation of other commodities, such as agricultural products, which are vital to the economies of Spokane County, Vancouver, Clark County, and Washington State.

As an organization we believe safety and environmental reviews are extremely important. We will work with Washington State stakeholders to ensure a balanced approach to protect the environment while also ensuring the state's ability to grow its economy.

In Washington State, nearly 40% of jobs are linked to trade – continued private investment is needed to ensure we maintain, grow, and create additional jobs that showcase the products and expertise that is contributed by the Inland Northwest and Puget Sound.

Thank you for considering my comments.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard G. Hadley", written over a horizontal line.

Richard G. Hadley
President & CEO
Greater Spokane Incorporated

UTC)

From: Bruce Shilling <bruceshilling@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 6:45 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

As a community member, I am very concerned about the proposed Tesoro Savage project at the Port of Vancouver. I urge you to fully assess the impacts of this proposal to transport up to 360,000 barrels of oil each day through Spokane, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, Vancouver, and other Northwest communities.

I urge you to include in the scoping of this proposal the implications to public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. These deserve a spotlight in the assessment of the state's largest oil-by-rail terminal proposed. Including,

- * The compounding impact of multiple trains going through communities daily on traffic, community safety, and air quality;
- * The threat of oil spills from trains and marine vessels along the Columbia, the Pacific Ocean, and the Puget Sound;
- * The ability of communities to respond to an oil spill sourced from the Bakken oil fields and the Canadian Tar Sands safely and in a timely manner;
- * The increase in oil tankers and the corresponding increased risk of oil spills throughout Washington waters and beyond;
- * The project's impact on climate change. This analysis should include climate change impacts from crude oil from Bakken to Tar sands, cradle to grave;
- * Safety of crude oil being transported by rail and the risks to communities along the route; and
- * Terminal safety precautions related to the type and source of oil, level of combustion, and air emissions.

Thank you.

Bruce Shilling
7120 Linden Ave. N.
Seattle, WA 98103

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Robert Sendrey
<rsendrey@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 7:13 PM
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.
- 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 train traffic through communities along the proposed oil-by-rail route, including evaluating emergency response capabilities all along the 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 Sendrey
1401 Merrill Creek Pkwy
Everett, WA 98203-7133

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Rebecca Picton <sevenswans7@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 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. Rebecca Picton
311 NW Lewisburg Ave
Corvallis, OR 97330-9601

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Jeana Martin <ladyj68@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 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. Jeana Martin
8338 Division Rd
White City, OR 97503-1157

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Anna Scott <hopischott@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 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. Anna Scott
23rd Ave
Spokane, WA 99203

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Katie Griesar <kgriesar@hevanet.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 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.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Miss Katie Griesar
507 NW 22nd Ave Apt 305
Portland, OR 97210-3283

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Fred Campbell
<campfd@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 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. Fred Campbell
3822b Ashworth Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103-8119
(206) 300-7698

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Elaine Scott <elainescott59@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:43 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01

Dec 17, 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. Elaine Scott
18368 NW Chemeketa Ln Apt 614
Portland, OR 97229-3556
(503) 530-6885

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Terry Lehman <terrylehmansearch@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Terry Lehman
384 W King Tut Rd
Bellingham, WA 98226-9652
(360) 306-1867

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Cassandra Dail <cldail@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Cassandra Dail
19705 112th Ave NE
Apt A104
Bothell, WA 98011-1773

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Corey Wolverton <zombii12@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Corey Wolverton
219 Bellevue Ave E
Seattle, WA 98102-5548

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Corey Wolverton <zombii12@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Comment on Docket No. EF-131590, Application No. 2013-01
Categories: Orange

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. Corey Wolverton
219 Bellevue Ave E
Seattle, WA 98102-5548

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Joseph Lavine <josephlavine@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Joseph Lavine
1292 Board Shanty Rd
Grants Pass, OR 97527-9446

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gwendolyn Sky <bluerider23@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Gwendolyn Sky
300 Fir Dr
Cave Junction, OR 97523-9610
(541) 441-2144

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Elizabeth Ford-Ortiz <fordortiz@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Elizabeth Ford-Ortiz
1975 Northbluff Rd
Coupeville, WA 98239-4408

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Nancy Botta <nbinpt@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Nancy Botta
1240 W Sims Way # 17
Port Townsend, WA 98368-3058

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Molly Brady <jlponder3@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Molly Brady
14607 NE Schuyler St
Portland, OR 97230-4144
(503) 267-7718

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Tim G <timg88@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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. Tim G
1989 Peacock Ln
Oak Harbor, WA 98277-8524

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gary Carone <g-money13@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:13 PM
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 Carone
3507 SE 186th Ct
Vancouver, WA 98683-8249
(360) 885-4742

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Josh Berger <josh@plazm.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Josh Berger
1123 SE 36th Ave
Portland, OR 97214-4302
(503) 490-0004

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Linda Montesi <lindamontesi1530@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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 Montesi
PO Box 1635
Port Townsend, WA 98368-0120

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Gary McCuen <mccuen7691@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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 McCuen
1825 Fairmount Ave S
Salem, OR 97302-5209

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lani O'Callaghan <laniocall@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Lani O'Callaghan
212 Kimeron St SE
Salem, OR 97306-2072
(503) 999-7557

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Stephen Nichols <sdni@fairpoint.net>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Stephen Nichols
13107 Zeller Rd SE
Yelm, WA 98597-9212

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Michael Felber
<michaelfelber@olympus.net>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Michael Felber
5413 State Route 20
Port Townsend, WA 98368-8746
(360) 385-0202

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Marty Robinson <normr123@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Marty Robinson
1191 SE Liberty Ave
Gresham, OR 97080-1013
(503) 665-7919

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Karen Keeney <bewell@aracnet.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Karen Keeney
1112 NE 21st Ave
Portland, OR 97232-2595
(503) 287-7133

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Margaret Nyburg
<meggasis@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Margaret Nyburg
3426 SW 126th Ave
Beaverton, OR 97005-1625
(541) 953-1937

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sharon Price
<jasprice@isomedia.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Sharon Price
3624 22nd Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98106-1119
(206) 935-1532

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sraddha Durand <sraddha1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Sraddha Durand
8311 Quail Hill Rd NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110-3623
(206) 399-6798

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sharon Secord <ssecor9@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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 Secord
2818 SE Colt Dr Apt 185
Portland, OR 97202-9406

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Thaddeus Hostetler <thaddeushostetler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Thaddeus Hostetler
3423 NE Couch St
Portland, OR 97232-3401
(503) 232-6306

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Nathan Reynolds
<lordifso@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Nathan Reynolds
536 Chinook Way
Friday Harbor, WA 98250-7944
(360) 378-2304

JTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Samantha Novak <samminovak19@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Samantha Novak
954 Broadway E Apt 100
Seattle, WA 98102-4562
(425) 885-6900

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Derek Donatelli
<kered99d@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Derek Donatelli
6640 137th Ave NE Apt 474
Redmond, WA 98052-9504
(425) 522-4814

(UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Brenda Hackler
<tanziedevil@frontier.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 2:14 PM
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. Brenda Hackler
2902 SE Glacier Ave
Gresham, OR 97080-9073
(503) 663-1985