

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30301

UTC)

From: Kyle ledington <kyle.ledington@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:27 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

This is my future that we are taking into account here and 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.

Kyle ledington
11510 NE 112th Dr. Apt#11
Vancouver, WA 98662

(UTC)

From: Suzanne Cravey <suzq07@ecoisp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:39 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.

This is not the route to take. The PNW offers spectacular beauty for tourism that supports the states.

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.

Suzanne Cravey
541 Olmstead Lane
Olympia, WA 98512

From: Jill Janow <jilljanow@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:42 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.

Jill Janow
18708 Robinwood Rd. SW
Vashon, WA 98070

UTC)

From: Zandra Saez <critters1@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:54 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.

Zandra Saez
1805 E. 34th Ave.
Spokane, WA 99203

(UTC)

From: Charles Bell <bellchas@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:07 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.

Charles Bell
5242 37th Avenue SW
Seattle, WA 98126

(UTC)

From: drod1987@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:17 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
David Rodriguez

(UTC)

From: Peter Rimbos <primbos@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:29 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.

Peter Rimbos
19711 241st Ave SE
Maple Valley, WA 98038

UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Andrew Grossman <andrew_grossman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:39 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

I was employed by Bureau of Land Management as an Alaska Pipeline Corridor Natural Resource Specialist in 1978-79. We worked on a number of oil and diesel spills on gravel work pads, along the Haul Road (Dalton Hwy) and other areas. Fortunately, almost all were contained from riverine systems. I drafted one of the District's first oil spill contingency plans. In 1979, I transferred to US Fish and Wildlife Service in Juneau, AK. I participated as an agency representative under the On-Scene Coordinator during a number of drills for oil spills in coastal waters. When the Exxon Valdez oil spill occurred in March 1989, despite much training and honed coordination and communication drill, the event was literally an unmitigated disaster. Our joint industry and agency efforts completely failed to contain, ameliorate damage, and rehabilitate the terrible impacts of widespread oil contamination of Prince William Sound and Kodiak Island. The damage to birds of all types, sea otters, and many coastal terrestrial species was the most heartbreaking experience that I have ever known. Scientific studies have shown that impacts to marine species, including commercial fisheries, continue from residual oil, which remains in the gravel and rocky shoreline areas almost 25 years later.

If a transport train wrecked or if the storage facility or processing equipment dumped oil at the proposed facility, contamination would likely impact all downstream life within the Columbia River, its estuaries, and the Oregon and Washington coasts. It would impact wildlife refuges, state and federal parks, beaches, tourist facilities, and world class fisheries for an indeterminate number of years, at least over 25. There can be no economic justification for a project that places our entire economy at such high risk of total devastation.

Sincerely,

Mr. Andrew Grossman
PO Box 284
420 SW Vancouver Av
Stevenson, WA 98648
(509) 427-4640

(UTC)

From: t.odegaard@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:39 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear Stephen Posner

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Tom Odegaard

From: christian.m.rimando@tsocorp.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Christian Rimando

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30311

(UTC)

From: chey richmond <cheylynn@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:46 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

chey richmond

32503

JTC)

From: yoga.anand@tsocorp.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:48 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Yoga Anand

(UTC)

From: Mariska Voronovszky <m.voronovszky@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:11 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.

Are there ANY limits on the extraction and depletion of our natural resources at public cost for private profit? And if so, what might they be?

Thank you.

Mariska Voronovszky
4806 NE 316th Court
Camas, WA 98607

UTC)

From: Mariska Voronovszky <m.voronovszky@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:11 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.

Are there ANY limits on the extraction and depletion of our natural resources at public cost for private profit? And if so, what might they be?

Thank you.

Mariska Voronovszky
4806 NE 316th Court
Camas, WA 98607

(UTC)

From: Richard.A.Bradford@tsocorp.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:15 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Rick Bradford

From: Lisa Duke <lisacustomrenewal@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:27 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.

Lisa Duke
6112 N. Park Ave
Tacoma, WA 98407

(UTC)

From: robert.f.lamm@tsocorp.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:29 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Robert Lamm

UTC)

From: Marie Weis <marieweis@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:43 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.

Marie Weis
248 Shorewood Ct
Fox Island, WA 98333

UTC)

From: Bevan.J.Tighe@tsocorp.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 3:57 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Bevan Tighe

(UTC)

From: Patti Gorman <rampgk@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:01 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.

Patti Gorman
1824 East McGraw Street
Seattle, WA 98112

From: Heather.K.Harriss@tsocorp.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:16 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Heather Harriss

(UTC)

From: marjorie curci <rainbowbend@olypen.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:22 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

marjorie curci

98305

UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Cecilia Frey <crfrey@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:39 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would transport 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. Thank you for considering these comments and including them into the official record.

I am concerned about the condition of the rail system and its ability to carry an increasing number of trains transporting oil. A derailment could foul both the land and the Columbia River. I do not have any faith in big business to care for the environment or to clean up their mess when things go awry.

I would prefer that an investment be made in renewable resources:
solar, wind, wave technology.

Sincerely,

Ms. Cecilia Frey
101 N Knoxville Way
Vancouver, WA 98664-1419

From: Eliette Bozzola <lili.dylle@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:39 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Reference Application No. 2013-01/Docket No. EF-131590: Please reject the proposed Tesoro Savage oil export terminal project

Dear Governor Inslee and Washington EFSEC:

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

Eliette Bozzola

13310

From: kathryn alexandra <kalexandra@cmcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:43 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.

kathryn alexandra
4311 ginnett rd
anacortes, WA 98221

(UTC)

From: Catherine Russell <cr53@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:52 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.

Catherine Russell
3321 Cherry Blossom Dr, NE
Olympia, WA 98506

(UTC)

From: Sara Bhakti <sarabhakti@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 4:56 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: EIS Scoping comments for Tesoro Savage proposal in Vancouver

Dear

The environment is my top priority.

I am opposed to 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.

The scoping should include considerations of public safety, environmental impacts, and the health of our communities. 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.

The effect on climate change of encouraging and promoting anything that exacerbates the problem, such as using more fossil fuels and transporting them to countries like China whose citizens already are wearing masks in order to breath.

Protecting the planet should not be decided by big oil companies who care most about their profits above everything and everyone else.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sara Bhakti
521 7th Ave
Kirkland, WA 98033

UTC)

From: Alison Schmidt <alisonkschmidt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:02 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.

Alison Schmidt
3605 NE 155th St
H1
Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

From: lizette.i.macias@tsocorp.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:09 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal

Dear EFSEC Commissioners

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Lizette Macias

UTC)

From: Alison MacKenzie <alisonmcknz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 5:11 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.

Alison MacKenzie
2811 NW 92nd St
Seattle, WA 98117

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Will Skinner
<will_skinner@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:45 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. Will Skinner
804 NE 91st St
Seattle, WA 98115-2818
(347) 463-8631

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Chris Connolly <chrisconnolly@gorge.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:45 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. Chris Connolly
PO Box 827
White Salmon, WA 98672-0827
(509) 493-1711

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of summer scriver
<summer@rockisland.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:45 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. summer scriver
467 Elliott Rd Unit C
Lopez Island, WA 98261-8624
(360) 468-3831

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lari Larimer
<mickilarimer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:45 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. The impact of such a spill on the fishing and tourism industries just isn't worth the risk.
- 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. Lari Larimer
4053 149th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98006-1645
(425) 562-8921

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Lila Parton
<dollyparton@centurylink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 1:45 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. Lila Parton
PO Box 243
370 Bayview Ave #22
Neah Bay, WA 98357-0243
(360) 640-8673

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Peter Sergienko <petersergienko@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:09 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

The proposed Tesoro Savage project would light a fuse into large oil reserves and involve the transport of 360,000 barrels of oil per day through the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. I have grave concerns about this proposal and its impact on the environment.

The State of Washington, through the reserved powers doctrine, is bound by the Public Trust Doctrine to protect the atmosphere as a public trust asset from the adverse effects of greenhouse gas emissions.

Based on the best available climate science, which is well documented and of public record, anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions have significantly altered the chemistry of Earth's atmosphere, causing rapid and irreversible global warming. Global warming is causally linked to melting glaciers, changes in precipitation patterns (timing, amounts, distribution), sea level rise, forest health, agricultural productivity and numerous other adverse effects all of which currently threaten the health, safety and well-being of the State's citizens.

These adverse effects will continue to get worse unless and until anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to a level that allows the climate and ocean conditions to stabilize, which will not occur until several decades after emissions reach equilibrium. To use the bathtub analogy, the tub is overflowing with anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, resulting in harm to the atmosphere, the oceans, and surface waters. Because we need to turn the spigot off to reach equilibrium, and because unchecked global warming will threaten the survival of all life on Earth, including all future human generations, any project that would open the spigot wider by adding yet more greenhouse gases to the atmosphere must come under especially strict scrutiny.

The State's legal duties under the Public Trust Doctrine extend to all agencies of the State and to the processes of implementing, interpreting and enforcing State statutes and regulations. Therefore, the scope of review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) must include an analysis of the proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions and their contribution to global warming. Additionally, the proposed project's greenhouse gas emissions profile must include the full life-cycle emissions from the proposed project, including burning the oil transported to, stored at, and shipped from the proposed oil terminal facility. The failure to consider the proposed project's full greenhouse gas emissions profile would represent an abdication of the State's legal responsibilities to protect the health, safety and well-being of its citizens in violation of The Public Trust Doctrine and common law.

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Peter Sergienko
2127 NW Irving St Apt 101
Portland, OR 97210-5242

UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Monica Donley <monica8425@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:09 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oil by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Monica Donley
1010 W 28th Ave
Eugene, OR 97405-2344

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Ian Shelley <ianjs@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:09 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oil by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mr. Ian Shelley
50 SW 97th Ave
Portland, OR 97225-6902

(UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Patricia Young <visiongraphix123@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:09 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Increased air pollution from train diesel emission. The Gorge already suffered from smog and visibility impairment up to 95% of the time.

- Rail expansion into sensitive areas. Rail lines in the Gorge are currently near capacity. This proposal and other oil by rail and coal export proposals would result in rail infrastructure expansion into sensitive areas in the Gorge, including wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, rare plant habitat, and cultural resource sites. These likely impacts must be included in the scope of review.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Patricia Young
1585 D St NE
Salem, OR 97301-2662

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sybille Vital
<sybillevital@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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. Sybille Vital
206 Easy St SE
Rainier, WA 98576-9581
(360) 584-7263

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Susan Shouse <sshouse64@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:11 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. Susan Shouse
14011 Puget Sound Blvd
Edmonds, WA 98026-3526
(425) 743-5628

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30342

UTC) Docket EF-131590

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Leslie Scott <lesliedscott@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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. Leslie Scott
25320 Lake Fenwick Rd Apt B204
Kent, WA 98032-4717

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Dina Kovarik
<dina.kovarik@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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,

Dr. Dina Kovarik
341 N 102nd St
Seattle, WA 98133-9117
(206) 352-2301

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Sandra Siegner <ssiegner3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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. Sandra Siegner
9640 SW Lancaster Rd
Portland, OR 97219-6349

TC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Carol Dewald
<rwdewald@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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,

Mrs. Carol Dewald
629 E 15th Cir
La Center, WA 98629-5566
(360) 263-7174

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Joan Robbins
<robbinsjart@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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. Joan Robbins
4900 S Hudson St
Seattle, WA 98118-2080
(206) 725-2001

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30347

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Janis Ensman <janensman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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. Janis Ensman
33 Barbrook Way
Warnbro, W.A., WA 61690
(089) 593-1196

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30348

UTC)

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Mona Mcfarlane <monamcfarlane@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:15 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,

Mrs. Mona Mcfarlane
1954 SW 23rd Ct
Gresham, OR 97080-9600

UTC)

From: David Graves <dgraves@npca.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:25 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Scoping Comments on the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Project



December 17, 2013

Stephen Posner, EFSEC Interim Manager
Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
P.O. Box 43172
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W.
Olympia, WA 98504-3172
efsec@utc.wa.gov

Dear Mr. Posner:

The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) appreciates the opportunity to submit scoping comments on the Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Project (Tesoro Savage), Application No. 2013-01, Docket No. EF-131590. NPCA is concerned with the possible impacts of the proposed Tesoro Savage project on units of the National Park System from transporting crude oil by rail to the port and out by ship on the Columbia River.

NPCA is an independent, nonpartisan voice working to address major threats facing the National Park System. We represent more than 800,000 members and supporters and work to protect and enhance our national parks.

NPCA would like to see the following areas receive particular analysis in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS):

1) Impacts to Natural Resources

NPCA is concerned about potential negative impacts to natural resources, including lands, plants, and wildlife, that could result from oil spills or other accidents occurring during transportation either by rail or ship near national park units. These units include Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (NHS), Lewis & Clark National Historical Park (NHP), and the Ice Age Floods National Geologic Trail (NGT). Many important and protected species of plant and animal are found in and around these national park units and are adjacent or near the rail lines and shipping lanes used to transport the crude oil. Trains and ships hitting and killing wildlife is a real threat that will only increase as traffic from this proposed project increases. A close analysis of the risk to these national park units from increased rail traffic and shipping traffic caused by this proposed project, which will escalate the possibility of harmful oil spills or discharges that would greatly damage park natural resources, must be undertaken.

2) Impacts to Cultural Resources

NPCA is also concerned about potential negative impacts to cultural resources, including buildings and archeological resources, from an increased possibility of oil spills and derailments. Of special concern is Fort Vancouver NHS which will be impacted by both increased rail traffic and shipping traffic due to its location. Fort Vancouver NHS also contains some of the most important collections of cultural resources in the country. A detailed analysis and evaluation of the risk to these important resources must be done.

3) Visitor Use and Enjoyment

A careful evaluation of the potential impacts to visitor use and enjoyment of these national park units must also be completed. The sense of "stepping back in time" at Fort Vancouver NHS and Lewis & Clark NHP could be severely impacted by the sights and sounds of increased trains and/or ships related to this proposed project. Furthermore, the views and ability to take in the landscape along the Ice Age Floods NGT could suffer greatly from increased rail and shipping traffic.

4) Public and NPS Staff Safety

The safety of the public and employees of the National Park Service is of great concern to NPCA. Increased rail traffic and ships adjacent to and near multiple national park units increases the risk of harm to both the public and NPS employees in these areas from oil spills or derailments. A detailed analysis of the potential risk to the public and NPS employees must be undertaken.

5) Air Pollution and Climate Change

NPCA is concerned with the negative impacts to the air and climate potentially caused by this project. Train and ship emissions may have an impact on the visibility and air quality of several national park units. Natural gas fired boilers proposed for Vancouver will increase air pollution at Fort Vancouver NHP and the surrounding area. The eventual refining and burning of the crude oil being transported through this potential project will increase air pollution, reduce visibility at numerous national park units, and release tons of harmful greenhouse gases that will contribute to climate disruption. An analysis of these potential impacts must be completed.

In conclusion, NPCA is concerned with numerous potential negative impacts to national park units located adjacent or near the increased rail and shipping traffic that will result from this project. Careful analyses of all these impact must be completed in the EIS.

NPCA appreciates the opportunity to submit these scoping comments and we look forward to reviewing and having an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

David G. Graves
Northwest Program Manager
Northwest Regional Office

National Parks Conservation Association
1200 5th Ave, Suite 1925
Seattle, WA 98101
PH: 206-903-1645
Cell: 206-462-0821
FX: 206-903-1448

Tesoro Savage CBR
Scoping Comment
#30350

(UTC)

From: Friends of the Columbia Gorge <Advocacy@GorgeFriends.org> on behalf of Jan McCreary <cascabel@gilanet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:39 PM
To: EFSEC (UTC)
Subject: Docket No. EF-131590 Application No. 2013-01 Tesoro Savage Vancouver Energy Distribution Terminal Comments

Dec 17, 2013

Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
WA

Dear Site Evaluation Council,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Ms. Jan McCreary
PO Box 3042
Silver City, NM 88062-3042