

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane, along the Columbia River towns, through downtown Vancouver, to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dina Roberts
30th St
Vancouver, WA 98660

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

teri fox
3610 Densmore Ave N
Seattle, WA 98103

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Eleanor Dowson
2007 Millpointe Drive SE
Mill Creek, WA 98012

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor. As a former resident of the Columbia River Gorge, I am well aware of the devastating effects an oil train derailment/explosion/fire could have on any number of small communities that the BNSF tracks pass through. There is no way the emergency responders could handle an event of this magnitude.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident,

cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Joe Wiederhold
1405 Edwards St
Bellingham, WA 98229

509-493-2367

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ann Spooner
668 D St
Blaine, WA 98230

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Charlie Baker
425 Poplar Lane
Mt. Vernon, WA 98273

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lela Perkins
15109 50th Ave SE
Everett, WA 98208

4255551212

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carolyn Wyman
4225 Forest Beach Dr NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

2532080950

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact Grays Harbor and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk.

I urge you to include these impacts in the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jean Lanz
1600 30th Avenue
Seattle, WA 98122

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Richard Johnson
PO Box 3138
Bellingham, WA 98227

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Denee Scribner
1113 E 2nd Ave
Ellensburg, WA 98926

509 933 2550

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Felicity Devlin
2417 N. Washington St
Tacoma, WA 98406

253 7618066

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lorraine Hartmann
10627 Durland Ave NE
SEATTLE, WA 98125

206-367-1518

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

KAREN CASE
101 NW 381ST ST
LA CENTER, WA 98629

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly agree with the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would positive impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by creating better paying jobs; helping existing businesses and creating new businesses; I strongly disagree that these terminals would be putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk due to the fact that they will be regulated against damage to the following: aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

In today's world no one is going to build a facility that will intentionally harm the environment and I believe the construction and operation of the facility will meet set standards and laws. I urge you to truly review impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects, and follow up with decision that will promote job and economic well being for the citizens of Washington State and the United States.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Harry Westover
2223 Samish Way
Bellingham, WA 98229

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact Grays Harbor and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

Given cases such as the recent oil train derailment and explosion in Lynchburg, VA, these risks are certainly not merely hypothetical.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Joe Mabel
3164 NE 83rd Street
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I am a person who goes to Hoquiam and vicinity every year to enjoy the area and to razor clam.

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. The transport of oil to the site, and then over the marine waters, are far too risky, as events such as recent train derailments and fires have shown. Please consider the risks to the environment, economy and communities and stop crude oil to Grays Harbor, and transport by tanker.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

david berger
4025 50th ave south
seattle, WA 98118

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Good grief! Why does it always take looming catastrophe for us to act in our own behalf for things that will sustain health in air, water, & land !!?? What will it take for us to put the brakes on big oil to spend as much on clean up technology as on advertisements extolling the virtues of such things as fracking which is causing earth quakes and contamination water supplies!!! - to put the brakes on the sources of contaminants that are the cause of climate change which threatens the food supply, the water supply, in fact the possible death of the whole planet' capability to support human life!!!

WAKE UP NOW - ITS ALMOST TOO LATE.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and pleas.

Cornelia Shearer
Auburn Way S.
Auburn , WA 98092

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate and ocean impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sharon Wilson
3240 NE 96th St
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on the environment of our state. I hope that the Environmental Impact Statement for these projects will include looking at the total impact of the proposed projects and all of the potential risks. I am very concerned about this proposal because of all of the recent oil spills and the risk to human life and the environment. We shouldn't do anything to risk our water and soil, not to mention endangering the fishing and tourism industries.

Also, the Bakken crude oil is more explosive, again posing an unnecessary risk. Also, the Environmental Impact statement should include evaluating risks to public health, and also the impact of extra traffic. Also, the impact on climate change should be an important consideration.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy Vandenberg
5021 134th Pl. SE
Snohomish, WA 98296

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

alfred benedetti
3024 133rd pl se
mill creek, WA 98012

425 338 2583

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Ms Toteff,

I recently became aware of the plans for expansion of the oil trains and I'm very concerned about the possibility of environmental damage due to an accident.

It seems inevitable that there will be an accident at some point and the damage could be severe and take years or decades to restore.

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. There are so many reasons that we should all be opposed to it. This is the time when Washington State needs to be doing everything in our power to change over to renewables and protect our coastline, our air and our planet.

Please fight to protect our pristine environment while we can. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

William Purdy
831 Village Circle NW
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carolyn Gregg
524 N 18th Pl
Mount Vernon, WA 98273

360-424-7453

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Delia Surprenant
26107 11th PI S
Des Moines, WA 98198

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

Please use reason, integrity, and science to evaluate this situation. These waters, lands, ecosystems are worth much more than any gamble or promise of profit. You have a responsibility and your neighbors are depending on judicious, thoughtful evaluation.

I urge you to include the above mentioned impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lynne Oulman
816 14th St Bellingham, WA 98225-6304
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Katherine Collinson
4182 Ankar Park Drive 201
Bellingham, WA 98226

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

stephen brklycica
5406 108th st sw
lakewood, WA 98499

2535824802

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Douglas Miller
4629 S. 144TH
TUKWILA, WA 98168

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ray Couture
3755 S 162nd St
Seatac, WA 98188

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ingrid Erickson
1104 E. Maryland St. #1
Bellingham
Bellingham, WA 98226

3602208907

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ingrid Erickson
1104 E. Maryland St. #1
Bellingham
Bellingham, WA 98226

3602208907

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Eric Burr
585 Lost River Rd.
Mazama, WA 98833

5099963101

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Patsy Reynolds
2910 W Yakima Ave
Yakima, WA 98902

509/453/5034

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Galen Davis
9114 8th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Instead of thinking with our wallets, we need to think with our brains--what kind of planet will our children and grandchildren inherit?

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

David & Judith Laws
1718 Valencia Street
Bellingham, WA 98229

360 650-1015

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Andrew Reding
NOYB
Bellingham, WA 98225

9494076257

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Bill Marvin
PO Box 280
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dr jay Sullivan
7710 61rst Ave Nw
Gig Harbor, WA 98335

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Brandie Deal
301 225th St SW
Bothell, WA 98021

425-821-9717

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Antoinette Bonsignore
12411 NE Totem Lake Way Unit #102
Kirkland
Kirkland, WA 98034

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Stuart Mork
7710 31st ave nw
Seattle, WA 98117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Thomas Reidy
9708 10th Pl. SW.
202
Seattle, WA 98106

206-762-1264

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jane Metcalfe
811 NE 55th
seattle, WA 98105

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jo Harvey
204 Eastgate Ave N
Pacific, WA 98047

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gerald Burnett
4336 NE 22nd
Renton, WA 98059

425-271-8753

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nicholas Smit
1099 NW 167th Street
Shoreline, WA 98177

2068509119

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community. The potential for derailment and oil spills is huge and unacceptable, as is the noise pollution from this large number of trains on the communities they will be traveling through. It is unfair to impose these terrible hazards on our environment and the inhabitants of our region, our waterways, and the future of our state.

The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Luba Fetterman
6268 Old Mill Rd NE
Bainbridge Is, WA 98110

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor, other exposed communities such as mine and the state in general.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Toni Reading
POB 372
Sultan, WA 98294

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jerry Liszak
16663 SE 17th Pl.
Bellevue
Bellevue, WA 98008

425 644-0190

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Liz Campbell
605 n 64th street
seattle, WA 98103

206 972 1400

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sarah Sloane
1410 201st Ln Apt 5
Ocean Park, WA 98640

3606650022

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Will Silva
7315 17th Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Maia Sebek
331 N. 78th St
Seattle, WA 98103

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nicolas Guillaume
2253 Gilman Dr W #508
Seattle, WA 98119

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Matthew Boguske
11808 93 Ln NE
302
Kirkland, WA 98034

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mike Schutt
4964 Fire Weed Pl
Langley, WA 98260

(425) 609-1032

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Debbie Morgenstern
1845 Leslie Rd
Richland, WA 99352

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

alysa waters
1466 R Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368

360-379-1206

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Angeline Zalben
2116 13 Ave S Apt. B
Apt. B
Seattle, WA 98144

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Patricia Stimac
533 north 71st
Seattle, WA 98103

206-789-9788

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carole Henry
6109 Seabeck Holly Road NW
Seabeck, WA 98380

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

If these terminals are built, the chance for oils spills will increase dramatically. If you think a train derailment and explosion wouldn't happen here, I would like to ask you to come back to reality. Increasing the shipping of oil via trains and then shipping it through our already polluted waters, is a recipe for disaster. We are not prepared for an oil spill in our fragile waters. If this were to happen, it would be disastrous for our community and the health of our waterways. The people in the PNW DO NOT want more oil and coal shipped through our neighborhoods as it fouls our air and water and then gets shipped off to China where it will exacerbate global warming. Now that the US govt. is in bed with the dirty energy industry, they are more concerned about their profits than protecting our health and environment. This is corruption at its worst so I ask you to evaluate what this increased traffic will do to our air and water quality and how we will be able to travel through our towns with all these trains tying up traffic. Why should we have to suffer for something we are opposed to in the first place?? We want alternative energy, not increased dirty energy. How many times do we have to say it??

Therefore, I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gayle Janzen
11232 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

206 362-9278

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state, as well as global climate. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Suzanne Scollon
4501 Midvale Ave N Apt 201
Seattle, WA 98103

2066321546

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carol Affleck
9144 45th Ave SW
Seattle , WA 98136

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Margaret Graham
7043 23rd Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Betty Chanb
P O Box 65106
Shoreline, WA 98155

206 368 8410

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Charles Morrison
19030 Fremont Avenue North
Shoreline, WA 98133

206-629-4377

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael Healy
13544 23rd Place NE
Seattle, WA 98125

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ken Mincin
11335 red.-wood. rd. ne
Redmond, WA 98052

425 558-5852

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Deborah Lipman
50 Stimson Ave.
Providence, RI 02906

4012734852

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Susie Saalwaechter
3803 155TH AVE SE
BELLEVUE, WA 98006

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Susan Bechtholt
5290 Banner Rd SE
Port Orchard, WA 98367

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ruth Pyren
2154 Jason Court
Ferndale, WA 98248

360-224-9772

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Anthony Buch
6221 35th Ave NE
Seattle,, WA 98115

206-931-8552

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

Recently, I observed a BNSF freight train containing many tank cars with the DOT hazard labeling for crude oil parked on the main north-south rail line just above Ruston Way in Tacoma. It remained parked for many hours at that location which happens to be adjacent to many homes, a heavily traveled city street, and Puget Sound. This is just one example of a potential threat to human health and the environment. The broader concerns are just as serious. These include harmful extraction methods to obtain crude oil such as fracking as well as the end result of increasing the flow of crude oil which increases CO2 emissions along with other harmful byproducts created by burning fossil fuel.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Richard Heggen
6444 Five Views Rd
Tacoma, WA 98407

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Evan Skallerud
1113 Grant St
Port Townsend, WA 98368

360 390 8267

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Those trains would be traveling through Vancouver, along the Columbia, ready to dump their load into the river or to explode in neighborhoods. And the federal Dept. of

Transportation has just announce it will let the railroads keep using the old style tankers for as long as it takes to phase them out, at the leisure of the railroads whose only guideline is the bottom line.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Wesley Banks
P.O. Box 823234
Vancouver, WA 98682

1111111111

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jessica Drummond
13805 23rd ave SE
Mill Creek, WA 98012

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Fay Payton
5902 298th Ave NE,
Carnation, WA 98014, WA 98014

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Since the spills and problems have increased far beyond the increase of oil being moved, it would seem well past the point of merely increasing the scrutiny of pipeline operators and train and truck shippers.

Remember... there is still oil in the shoreline of Prince William Sound, 25 years later.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based

on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kirk Taylor
12525 Morris rd
do a lot of people have two residences?
Yelm, WA 98597

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Heather Haverfield
po box 964
Langley, WA 98260

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dee Arntz
4400 Stone Way N
Apt.517
Seattle, WA 98103

2067838660

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Peter Van Zant
13350 SE 26th St
Seattle
Bellevue, WA 98005

206-524-0637

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Debby Mumm Felnagle
1618 wilton rd s
Tacoma, WA 98465

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. It is time we move away from our major dependency on fossil fuels. It beyond our own time and consider the future. Conservation seems to be losing ground. It is time we make a renewed effort toward conservation of natural resources instead of using them up as fast as we possibly can.

Dan & Pat Montague
647 73rd Ave NE
Olympia, WA 98506

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

marilyn evenson
16016 29th ave ct-e
tacoma, WA 98445

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carolyn Boatsman
3210 74th AVE SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040

206-236-0949

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ruth Darden
900 University St. #401
SEATTLE, WA 98101

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Grant Lindberg
510 NW 146th Way
Vancouver, WA 98685

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ann Dawson
8916 fauntleroy way sw
seattle, WA 98136

2069377265

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Janna Rolland
6227 34th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

206 7297957

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Wendy Bartlett
255 N Forest Street #116
Bellingham, WA 98225

(360) 392-0984

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant negative impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include a thorough evaluation of ALL the costs:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of irreparable oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state. Oil companies have a dismal record in this regard.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carol Hiltner
700 NW 185th St Apt 404
Shoreline, WA 98177

206-525-2101

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rick Romito
4534 Fir Tree Way
Bellingham, WA 98229

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Melanie Kenoyer
708 W 24th St
Vancouver, WA 98660

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kathleen Beavin
22210 17th PI W
Bothell, WA 98021

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Friends of mine live near rail lines that are now or would carry this dangerous cargo. That matters to me very much, but until and unless a way to ship this cargo safely and mitigate

the problems with emergency vehicles ability to respond, etc, etc, are found and the problems solved it is totally irresponsible to send these trains through our communities.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Helen Pegg
3505 Wilderness Dr SE
Olympia, WA 98501

360-491-0324

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Elyette Weinstein
5000 Orvas Court SE
Olympia, WA 98501

360-705-8388

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Recall your history, railroads that do not have public regulation and requirement are merely the tool of colonial masters intent on impoverishing the people.

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Day
865 high prairie
202
Lyle, WA 98635

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

dylan simpson
10304 ne 142nd st
Kirkland, WA 98034

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,
Our family is very worried about the impact of oil on our state.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sarah McCoy
8331 32nd Avenue NW
Seattle, WA 98117

(206) 789-1777

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kimberly Leeper
4742 - 42nd Ave. SW, PMB 379
Seattle, WA 98116

206-419-1836

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

kevin orme
502 N 80th
seattle, WA 98103

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Timothy Byrnes
12740 33rd ave NE apt 405
apartment 405
seattle, WA 98125

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jane Hadley
1725 30th Ave
Seattle, WA 98122

2063287605

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lin Sunseri
16220 S Sherman Rd 1
1
Cheney, WA 99004

509-443-8586

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Joe Neumann
6015 California Ave SW
Apt 203
Seattle, WA 98136

773 273 5712

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Marianne Edain
Box 53
Langley, WA 98260

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jonathan Walter
6531 dennis pl sw
TUMWATER, WA 98501

3608789220

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I am strongly opposed to the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These terminals would negatively impact the Grays Harbor community as well as the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion, increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters, harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders. All of this would put our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would also damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts in the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy Dahlberg
1757 NW 59th St., #301
Seattle, WA 98107

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

mary wickwire
1416 E Roy
seattle, WA 98112

2043221219

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lisa Thomas
14137 235 th ST SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

4253916793

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

BOB ROLSKY
PO BOX 348
SUQUAMISH, WA 98392

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lisa Silverman
2945 McLeod Rd
Bellingham, WA 98225

3606470599

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact the community of Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Patricia Warden
8848 129th Place SE
Newcastle, WA 98056

425.277.4079

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Francis Wood, MD
412 36th Street
Seattle, WA 98122

206-323-2296

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

robert fulmer
3902 13th Ave. S.
seattle, WA 98108

(206) 749-9122

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Consuelo Larrabee
1805 Queen Anne Ave N
Seattle, WA 98109

206 281-8677

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Albert Bechtel
4131 11th Ave NE Apt 109
Apt 109
Seattle, WA 98105

206-290-6212

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor.

The trains used to carry the oil tie up traffic and are prone to explode putting populations centers all along the route at risk. We simply have to consider the risk to nw life as more valuable than a private companies ability to make profit while jeopardizing all of us.

The biggest jeopardy of all is that the amount of oil proposed for trafficking, once burned will add an unsustainable amount of carbon into the atmosphere creating environmental risk to the whole planet. The president's report on Climate Change that unaltered we are on a course for 10 degree temperature increase by the end of the century. That would mean an end to all life on the planet. It is people like you making the decision you have to make about this that will decide our future. Each piece of the puzzle counts. We can no longer afford to say: "It is only one piece."

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lynn Fitz-Hugh
2210 NE 92nd St #307
seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Forrest Rode
1616 Summit Ave. 502
Seattle, WA 98122

(206) 920-6117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kristina Peterson
13510 n creek dr
Mill creek, WA 98012

4252050007

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Martha Spencer
2826 NW62nd St
Seattle, WA 98107

206-782-0110

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I am also offended by the smell that comes with oil. The smell is definitely not friendly. I wouldn't want to continuously have to get a whiff of oil every time I turned around. It stinks. I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Scott Species
1922 9th Ave. # 401
Seattle, WA 98101

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

An oil train explosion has already levelled one Canadian small town. Do we need this in Washington?

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Martha Koester
10015 2nd Ave S

Seattle, WA 98168

206-762-6417

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up. I know about this things as I spent much of my young years working on the rails across North Dakota all the way west to Washington.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Denny Redman
27318 NE 116th Street
Duvall, , WA 98019

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Margaret Wenke
1432 29th
Anacortes, WA 98221

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Alexa Eans
5221 45th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98136

3605613422

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. We don't need this mess here!

The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects can't be a blank check. It must include rigorous and unbiased evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region, the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – more vessel traffic and more oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Alison Loris
1005 Warren Avenue
Bremerton, WA 98337

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Laura Goldberg
9225 N Cedarvale
Arlington, WA 98223

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

lydia garvey
429 s 24th st
clinton, OK 73601

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pamela Keeley
4402 S. Ferdinand St.
Seattle , WA 98118

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carol Linscott
2508 19th Avenue South
Seattle, WA 98144

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sandra Bowman
6528 38th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Baron
20822 79th Drive NE
.
Arlington, WA 98223

3604355274

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

William Donnelly
Fairview Avenue East, Slip 6
Slip 6
Seattle, WA 98102

206-213-5858

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Keith Cowan
3709 SW Trenton St
Seattle, WA 98126

2069329064

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

Oil tanks are being used that are not safe for the speed or distance they travel. And those who manufacture those tanks do not want to spend the money for upgrading the present ones or building new ones. This is another reason that we should not be allowing the trains to travel along our rivers or our cities.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Margie Goulden
4710 129th Ave. E.
Edgewood, WA 98372

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

It introduces the risks of potentially catastrophic spills to some of the state's most iconic rivers, best-known salmon runs and world-renowned fishing destinations.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Madya Panfilio
P O Box 2552
Vancouver, WA 98668

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Trina Cooper
2239 sw 331st st
Federal Way, WA 98023

7132057070

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Trina Cooper
2239 sw 331st st
Federal Way, WA 98023

7132057070

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Diane Smith
1234 Chuckanut
Bellingham, WA 98229

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

The recent history of oil train explosions and other accidents make it clear that on any given route, it is not a matter of if, but when an accident will occur. The federal government has recently confirmed that the railcars currently in use are not adequate to safely

transport oil, and, the industry apparently agrees with that opinion. They are not, however, planning to stop using them, nor are they in any hurry to upgrade them. Remind anyone of General Motors and the 57 cent life-saving fix that they declined to make because the bottom line was apparently more important than the human lives that it could have saved.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Robert Tank
P.O. Box 266
Greenbank, WA 98253

(360) 678-8394

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Debby Mumm Felnagle
1618 wilton rd s
Tacoma, WA 98465

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mr. Shelley Dahlgren, PhD
4449 242nd Ave. S. E..
Issaquah, WA 98029

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

melody risner
1040 michael way
camano island, WA 98282

360-387-7556

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Penny Derleth
PO Box 421
Deer Park, WA 99006

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

S. J. Jacky
2411 Lexington St
Steilacoom, WA 98388

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Barbara Keyt
80 W Bulldozer Flats
Shelton, WA 98584

360-426-6261

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I would like this proposal to be evaluated on the risks to the communities these oil trains move through as they traverse to the Washington coast.

The increasing train traffic must be studied by outlining the emergency response that would be required in the "worst case scenario". What would the effect of a train derailment, explosion, or crash be on the waterways such as the Columbia river, Gray's Harbor, or along the coast of the Pacific ocean. The scope must include the dangers of creating pollution that could not be mitigated.

The deleterious effects of increased train traffic on the health and safety of humans and other animals that live near the rail corridors must be addressed thoroughly. Noise and sleep disruption are well known torture tactics. The increased volume of the trains with their excessive horn honking by individual Engineers blasting through the night silence wake up everyone in their wake.

This is not good for mental health, sleep deprivation can cause heart problems, it can disrupt the immune system and mental anguish.

The emissions from the diesel exhaust, and the metal dust from brake pads introducing toxic materials into our environment must be studied.

The cost to future generations due to climate change by burning all of the oil transported by these trains must be studied. The environmental costs of mining/harvesting the raw materials must be evaluated for cost to the environment, how does the method of extraction contribute to destruction of habitat, are there any toxic areas left after the oil is removed? Are there threats to clean water?

Alternatives must be explored, what benefits would the world accrue if the oil and gas was left in the ground and used slowly over time, over millennium as opposed to the current rush to burn it now. Fondly known as "Combustapallusa".

The communities costs must be studied, the cost of creating crossings, or the cost in time as more people sit and cars idle for longer and more trains. How many towns will these trains cross through? This needs to be quantified. The number of schools and hospitals that the tracks are near or would cut off if a train was delayed or there was an accident must be in this study.

Who really benefits from the increased shipment of oil, would this allow selling oil offshore? What would this do to the price of domestic fuel oil, and gasoline for automobiles to American consumers?

The increased ship traffic along the Pacific coast and the effects on Marine life must be studied. The number of ships, where they come from and where they will be going must be studied. The health of our waterways and the potential for introduction of noxious and

invasive species must be addressed.

These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Laura Brakke
585 Pleasant Bay Rd
Bellingham, WA 98229

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Diana Covington
719 S Orchard
Tacoma, WA 98465

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carol Stanley
8629 137th Ave. NE
Redmond, WA 98052

425-883-8229

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Laura Finkelstein
14th Ave W
Seattle, WA 98119

none

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ronald Hawk
PO Box 33207
Seattle, WA 98133

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael Smith
28139 192nd Pl. SE
Kent
Kent, WA 98042

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kerry Moore
P O B 781
Toledo, WA 98591

3608644232

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Cheryl Schuelke
PO. BOX 473
VAUGHN, WA, WA 98394

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

As a professional biologist gravely concerned about climate change and ongoing fossil fuel extraction, transport and use and frequent visitor to Washington state for vacations, I fully endorse this letter below.

Mona Mehdy, PhD
Austin TX

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mona Mehdy
5004 Smokey Mountain Drive
Austin, TX 78727

5122501882

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Mulcare
1110 Benjamin St
Clarkston, WA 99403

509-758-3934

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Diane George
19610 290th Ave SE
19610 290th Ave SE
Hobart, WA 98025

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy Lee Farrell
4005 N. 24th St.
Tacoma, WA 98406

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dorothy Jordan
1407 Abbott Rd
Lynden, WA 98264

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

William Mead
2419 NW 65th St
Seattle, WA 98117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Cathy Seay
402 Park Place
Everett, WA 98203

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Liz Gaspar
161 E Heron Cv
SHELTON, WA 98584

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on the community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways and what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lynette Weick
7631 Westlund Rd
Arlington, WA 98223

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Dallas
2141 66th Ave NW
Olympia, WA 98502

3608667149

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jerome Onufer
16129 Tiger Mtn. Rd. SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Peggy Page
24324 Miller Rd
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Peggy Page
24324 Miller Rd
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Suska Davis
5721 Libby Rd NE
Olympia, WA 98506

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sara Early
1760 NE 62nd St.
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jennifer Astion
3828 ne 93rd st
seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

elizabeth younger
5265 w mercer
mercier island, WA 98040

2062325108

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ronald Mazza
916 Virginia St
Bellingham, WA 98225

3606714408

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Heidi Larsen
5114 Sunset Dr NW
Olympia, WA 98502

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jane Steadman
5612 7th ave nw
Seattle, WA 98107

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gordon Hait
503 Mission Dr.
503 Mission Dr.
Olympia, WA 98506

3607014535

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Terry Nightingale
13724 34th Ave NW
Marysville, WA 98271

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

john guros
2644 s. 226 st.
des moines, WA 98198

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Robin Hirsch
PO Box 193
520 Foster Point rd
Orcas, WA 98280

2062457353

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Leonard Parks
2717E18thAve
Spokane, WA 99223

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Linda Swan
P O Box 224
Snohomish, WA 98291

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jan Rexroth
Ken Lake Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98512

253-468-1571

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Don Worley
1949 Hwy 25 South
Kettle Falls, WA 99141

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kristin Jensen
2121 6th Ave.
Seattle, WA 98121

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

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

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Janet and Richard Wright
318 Halvorsen Rd
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Bob Gillespie
107 Schafer Street
Condo 8A
Wenatchee, WA 98801

509-679-9829

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Please forward my comments, as I live next to BN tracks in Skamania County WA and oppose oil terminals being pushed onto the Columbia River as well as the ones at Grays Harbor.

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

The oil and coal trains are absolutely effecting the quality of life in the Columbia River Gorge. They are traversing both sides of the River and make so much noise it is impossible to ignore them. If you look at a map, you can quickly see how many rural towns the BN rails pass through. It is shameful that this is happening. The danger of transporting volatile sludge from fracking, plus coal which is also volatile is very frightening. My home is 1/4 mile from the Burlington Northern track in Washington. The Gorge is an echo chamber. Kindly include these impacts I state in your FULL EIS. Thank you..

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Judith Nappe
4 Shady Oak Lane
North Bonneville, WA 98639

509-427-7981

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

R A Larson
109 S 27th Street
Mount Vernon, WA 98274

360-280-7396

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kathleen Lowney
4541 244th Place SE
Issaquah, WA 98029-657

425-557-8571

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael Goforth
8025 LAKERIDGE DR SE
OLYMPIA, WA 98503

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact Grays Harbor and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Barb Nichols
P.O.Box 343
Freeland, WA 98249

360-331-5033

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Marjorie McNae
871 Blue Spruce Place
Oak Harbor, WA 98277

3606755289

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lisa Hagen-Potts
15101 50th Ave SE
Everett, WA 98208

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Tom Dorosz
6207 Madrona Dr NE
Tacoma, WA 98422

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

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

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Denise R. Ballard
6523 California Ave. SW
Seattle, WA 98136

206-937-0758

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Matthew Anderson
13522 Densmore Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kyra Dyer
808 15th Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up. How can we know that an accident won't happen?

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Robert Brown
1443 Edwards Avenue
#301
Fircrest, WA 98466

253-302-4480

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

As a person who has lived in an area that was impacted by an oil spill, I can tell you the effects are devastating to the environment, wildlife, people and the economy in the region.

It's not a question of if the oil spill will happen. The question is when will the oil spill happen.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jane Kurzeja
PO Box 661
Snohomish, WA 98291

800-667-4663

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jeff Guay
202 S. 2nd West
chewelah, WA 99109

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

k g
3
orting, WA 98360

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mana Iluna
4415 145th Ave.NE
H-2
Bellevue, WA 98007

425 882-2503

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Brian Larson
6553 25th ave nw
Seattle, WA 98117

2065513118

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Joan Robbins
Hudson
Seattle, WA 98118

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dennis Reid
14741 aurora ave n. suite 103
14741 Auoroa Ave N.
SHORELINE, WA 98133

206 762-7298

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Faith Martian
19310 93rd Drive Northwest
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

john griffith
735evansrd
sequim, WA 98382

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Leonard Obert
15426 SE 116th St.
Renton, WA 98059

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pam Harris
3404 s 176th
Seatac, WA 98188

206-246-6192

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Alexander Lozano
9414 60th Ave W
MUKILTEO, WA 98275

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The entire west coast of the United States of America should do an exhaustive study of not just the oil which is being transported, and the type of transportation that will be used. After the several recent disastrous oil spills and fires caused by the transportation of said oil there is clearly and definitively a problem not just with the oil, which is apparently highly flammable, but also with the railway cars used to transport it. The cars are not made to transport this type of material.

Just as horrifying is the fact that these trains used for transportation run through so many of our towns and cities where businesses and citizens are destined to be devastated by the consequences of both the oil and its' transportation.

Please please please do an exhaustive and all encompassing study of this plan.

It is so much more than a few jobs created. It has the potential to kill many more people along the way as it does to create work.

Elizabeth Shepard
6426 Zangle Rd NE
Olympia, WA 98506

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Philip Conrad
7424 NE Abies Drive
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Anne Schreibe
14623 8th Ave S W
Burien, WA 98166

206-241-4457

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

In the past few years, I have traveled the Northern Tier on the Empire Builder and did a fair amount of sitting on the sidelines as the freight trains rumbled past. I will admit that naively

it never occurred to me that many of these trains were oils tankers. It is horrifying the damage that they could have done to my life, the lives of the other people on this fully loaded train, as well as the environmental degradation that would have occurred had their been an accident. Consider not allowing these trains to roll until new, and safe tankers are put in place; AND, then we will be back to speak about shorter trains that do not delay human beings at RR crossings.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Cheryl Banks
5438 - 18th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98106

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

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

206-440-3079

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Seth Ballhorn
3044 NW 56th St.
Seattle, WA 98107

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Elizabeth Dawson
PO Box 562
Port Hadlock, WA 98339

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

No trains, no pipelines, NO Filthy Oil!! Spend the money on healthy, non-polluting power!
Quit contaminating our world!

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Polly Tarpley
848 NW Bracken Ct.
Poulsbo, WA 98370

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

William Mead
2419 NW 65th St
Seattle, WA 98117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mike Conlan
6421 139th Place NE, #52
Redmond, WA 98052

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lin Provost
3707 42nd Ave S
Seattle, WA 98144

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

judith coheh
1608 E. Republican st
seattle, WA 98112

206 333 4444

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

john taylor
227 S. 10th St.
Shelton , WA 98584

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Robert Mueller
7247 NE 171st LN
Kenmore, WA 98028

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lindell Haggin
15418 N. Little Spokane Dr.
Spokane, WA 99208

509 466-4118

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Adina Parsley
20420 Marine Drive, Apt P2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sammy Low
20420 Marine Drive, Apt P2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based

on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Amy Mower
PO Box 2004
Maple Falls, WA 98266

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jeannie Park
2601 NW 57th St
Seattle, WA 98107

2067064872

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Susan Blake
8023 S 113th St
Seattle, WA 98178

206-772-2492

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rudolph Andrade
146 Starlight Way
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

g g

3

orting, WA 98360

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

bea wilson
1033 9th s
edmonds, WA 98020

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

bea wilson
1033 9th s
edmonds, WA 98020

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

[Privacy request: please do not publish my name and address in any public record.]

The environment is my top priority.

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk.

More oil trains and oil tankers increase the risk of an oil spill. In 2013, more oil was carried by trains than ever before and more was spilled in just last year than in the last four decades. These disasters endanger the fishing and shellfish industries, tourism and put at risk the livelihoods of families dependent upon marine resources.

The proposed terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts as you scope the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sara Bhakti
521 7th Ave
Kirkland, WA 98033

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

diane crummett
12 dogwood st so
p.o. box 1047
soap lake, WA 98851

5092467048

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy White
13311 E Forrest Ave
Spokane Valley, WA 99216

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

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

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Suzanne Hamer
17227 NE 195th St
Woodinville, WA 98072

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kay Reinhardt
PO Box 784
PO Box 1305
Mt. Vernon, WA 98273

360-757-3234

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Katherine Reed
9230 61st Ave W
Mukilteo, WA 98275

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I live and work in South King neighborhoods right alongside the train tracks transporting this oil. I have seen the amount of oil containers increase drastically over the past year and since witnessing the various accidents involving trains and fuel recently, I am very concerned about our safety. It's my understanding that the amount of fuel is only going to increase. I'd like to know what is being done to ensure the safety of our community.

My place of work is in Georgetown, just three blocks from Airport Way. We live in Allentown, Tukwila, just five blocks from the tracks. My commute is down Airport Way every day, so I see these trains, one tanker after another, sometimes stretching 3-4 miles long at a time. From what I read, there has been very little improved safety protocols (such as what would happen if there was some kind of spill or explosion), nor studies of the impact of all the emissions or effects on air quality will have on us.

I also read that these tankers are the same as the ones that exploded in Canada and that Tesco has promised new and improved models. I'm curious as to when we can expect to see this replacement happen. More importantly, I'd like to know what the State and King County (along with other counties) regulations are coming into play or being developed to protect us and our environment.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains,

and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.

- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,
India Nagy

India Nagy
4206 S 122nd St
Tukwila, WA 98168

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

John Dart
15619 138th PI SE
Renton, WA 98058

(425) 271-7493

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

With oil train explosions about every 1-2 months, and no plan or remedy in sight, with the NTSB warning us to keep these trains away from population centers, why would anybody think this is OK?

How many bombs per day should we carry through town? What's your number? 1? 2? 3 bombs per day?

The spills happen so regularly and go unnoticed, unreported by the news, unless something catches on fire. Our children won't survive this mess we're making.

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael Foster
3808 Carr Place N
Seattle, WA 98103

2069993477

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Cheryl Biale
7711 Greenridge St. SW
Olympia, WA 98512

3607547727

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

david robinson
pob 151
curlew, WA 99118

509 7794967

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kirstin Gruver
6805 92nd St Ct NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98332

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Shary B
1950 Alaskan Way
Seattle, WA 98101

2068566620

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gina Pantier
37632 26th Dr S
Federal Way, WA 98003

2535179931

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pamela Engler
7022 - 21st Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98115

206-526-5984

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

kathleen wahl
818 19th ave
seattle, WA 98122

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Charles Bronson
9522 86th Ave NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98332

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Susan Burnett
5563 29th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98105

2065259491

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ray charlotte Kanemori
9733 112th Ave. NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Hal Glidden
419 Briar Rd
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Meighan Doherty
1724 Front St
Seattle, WA 98264

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Marian Krewson
16200 NE 14th Ct
Bellevue, WA 98008

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Paine
3007 Rucker ave.
#356
Everett, WA 98201

425-388-5580

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kay Paine
3007 Rucker Ave.
#356
Everett, WA 98201

425-388-5580

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Janette Cunningham
14315 103RD AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98034

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Juliet VanEenwyk
4440 Frontier Dr SE
Olympia, WA 98501

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects. Please listen and act!

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

s e fox
p o box 2154
Silverdale, WA 98383

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Amy Heyneman
10579 NE Manor Lane
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Shelley Tea
5108 S. Dawson St.#5
#5
Seattle, WA 98118

206-284-7758

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jean Pauley
414 Malden Ave. E
Seattle , WA 98112

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Barbara McKee
8824 Boulder Ave
Vancouver, WA 98664

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. They will elevate rail and marine traffic congestion, increase the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters, harm existing businesses and delay emergency responders. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest and put our communities, public health, and environment at risk. I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Virginia Davis
17721 NE 156th St.
Woodinville, WA 98072

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sharon Fetter
PO Box 521
Puyallup, WA 98371

253 848-2148

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sandy Petrarca
323 N 83rd St
Seattle, WA 98103

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Katherine Iosif
1134 Finnegan Way Apt 202
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Building crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest. It would not only increase rail and marine traffic congestion, but more importantly it would increase the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters. I am also very concerned about explosions and devastating fires all along the train routes! We have to consider the harm to existing businesses and delay of emergency responders. All these impacts would put our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

Please, include these impacts in the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Megan Davis
2409 Westlake Dr SE
Lacey, WA 98503

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Samantha Rich
13710 Burke Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

206 6607655

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nori Zukerman
PO Box 727
Maple Falls, WA 98266

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I am a former resident of Elma and McCleary and am very familiar with all the beautiful areas within Grays Harbor County. I have fond childhood memories of enjoying the many wonderful natural resources such as swimming, fishing, and the beaches.

I must say I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact this community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gary Murrow
5524 Johnson Point RD NE
Olympia, WA 98516

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mary Sue Walker
12508 North Park Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Elizabeth Taylor
721 N 138th St
Seattle, WA 98133

2063491856

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

It is imperative to stop the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. The government needs to protect the health and welfare of its people: it is not an arm of the oil industry. Get the oil industry off our backs.

Since these proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk it is your job - you work for us, the people - to stop it. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mary Proctor
8800 Grand Ave NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. We cannot ignore the risks in preference for the economic benefits that these projects purport to provide. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Tim Berntal
6060 2nd Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98107

2067833088

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rhiannon Fox
9537 48th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

IT IS TIME TO START GETTING OFF OUR OIL ADDICTION.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

DAVID WILLIAMS
45 HOLLYBERRY RD
COUPEVILLE, WA 98239

425-922-6718

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

gary pierson
126 I ST.SE
auburn, WA 98002

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Laurette Culbert
5123 2nd Ave. NW
Seattle, WA 98107

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Phil Lair
1955 Forest Ave.
Richland, WA 99354

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rebecca Rose
20119 113th St SE
Snohomish, WA 98290

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Carolyn Marshall
7850 80th Pl. SE
Mercer Island, WA 98040

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change, let alone allowing exploding tank cars on the railroad.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mike Betz
2630 Franklin
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I, like many who live in the Pacific NW, strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Manuela Winter
9627 34th Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98126

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kathryn Schetzer
923 Liberty St.
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Andrew Martin
15028 245th Ave SE
Issaquah, WA 98027

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Joseph and Diane Williams
3880 Stikes Drive SE
Lacey, WA 98503

360-491-4865

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

jonathan stein
19617 risto rd
battle ground, WA 98604

360 904-3593

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mary Ferm
5062 New Sweden Rd NE
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

2068421304

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Cheryl McAtee
18924 NE 4th Plain
Vancouver, WA 98682

3609448766

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Barbara Rosenkotter
201 Crest Drive
Box 136
Deer Harbor, WA 98243

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gena DiLabio
3124 Dakota Dr
Mt. Vernon, WA 98274

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Conor Corkrum
2230 Yale Ave E Unit D
Unit D
Seattle, WA 98102

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Antoinette Soffes
21323 2nd Ave SE
Bothell, WA 98021

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

David Sovey
1225 E Sunset Dr
Ste #369
Bellingham, WA 98226

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Anne Lawson
1701 74th Street SE
Everett, WA 98203

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lee Ann Greaves
13810 E 41st Ave
Spokane, WA 99206

5099223664

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Linda Thompsen
18425 NE 95th St. #201
Redmond, WA 98052

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

evonne laforge
17421 Spirit Lane SE
yelm, WA 98597

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mary Eith
25011 129 PL SE
Kent, WA 98030

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nic Curtright
12345 lake city #399
Seattle, WA 98125

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Martin Valeri
8625 Ravenna Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Seema Ardakan-Allen
4422 1st Ave NW
Seattle, WA 98107

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Katherine Nelson
9445 S 232nd st
Kent, WA 98031

206-941-3917

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mark Hughes
2334 Thorndyke ave w apt 202
seattle, WA 98199

206-285-3707

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

David Lee
20116 2nd. ave. N.E.
Poulsbo, WA 98370

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

dave popoff
2510 alexis road
colville, WA 99114

250 359 7315

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pam Borso
P O Box 154
2940 Arnie Rd
Custer, WA 98240

3603199004

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Portia Sabin
20312 NE 259th St.
Battle Ground, WA 98604

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I believe that the risk of rail car explosions is high when they carry crude oil. I believe that the risk of oil spills is high when tankers carry crude through our beautiful and navigationally treacherous waters. For these reasons, I urge you to be prudent when evaluating the long term risk to people, our fisheries, our tourism and the environment presented by proposed crude transport through the pacific northwest.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based

on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kathryn Oseen-Senda
1711 E Olive way
Seattle, WA 98102

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I am an active SCUBA diver whose primary stomping grounds include Puget Sound. These waters and their inhabitants have enough challenges without increased threat of oil spills.

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael Snow
1111 13th St
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sarah Iannelli
1120 W Mansfield Ave
Spokane, WA 99205

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rosemarie Bisiar
1505 S Barker Rd
Greenacres, WA 99016

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rosemarie Bisiar
1505 S Barker Rd
Greenacres, WA 99016

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

David Harrington
1304 E 29th St.
Vancouver, WA 98663

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ken Wiedmer
3805 s Dearborn
Spokane, WA 99223

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Daniel McLeod
5095 Bittrich-Antler Rd.
Deer Park, WA 99006

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lawrence Schuchart
6204 N. Morton
Spokane, WA 99208

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

There isn't sufficient rail space for the current amount of rail traffic. Amtrak is consistently 30-60 minutes late, and trains sit on the tracks for hours in the gorge waiting for clearance. They block access roads to residences, impede traffic flow and prevent emergency vehicles access to urgent situations.

Trains going to Grays Harbor must first traverse the Columbia Gorge and Vancouver areas which are already overloaded with rail traffic.

Tell BNSF to build more rail space, THEN reapply.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.

- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pat Freiberg
8327 NE 54th St
Vancouver, WA 98662

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses, delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Terry Eaton
10824 NE 172nd Ave
Brush Prairie, WA 98606

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk.

More importantly, we need to do everything in our power to keep the fossil fuels that exist in the ground and not in the water or air. Developing these facilities will only make that easier, meaning that any action toward slowing fossil fuel consumption will be that much more difficult.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Patrick Van Inwegen
607 W. Cleveland Ave
Spokane, WA 99205

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

john ritter
109 montello ave
hood river, OR 97031

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

David Scheer
2715 Cody Circle...#102
#102
Bellingham, WA 98225

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jim Hickey
601 1st st.
Cheney, WA 99004

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

DONALD IDDINS
435 SNOWBERRY LANE
SANDPOINT, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Randi Lui
740 Larch Street
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact the Idaho Panhandle, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mike Warnock
2183 Chukar Lane
Clarkston, WA 99403

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sue Bowser
2203 E Lakeside Av.
Coeur d' Alene, ID 83814

208 659-2392

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include the impacts of increase rail traffic into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Audrey Gates
1523 Nicholas Way
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy Dooley
319 Hunt LANE
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Karen Forsythe
207 Cedar
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

As a citizen of Sandpoint, Idaho I am opposed to the possibility of trains carrying oil traveling through our small town and it's beautiful waterways. Already we are seeing an increase in trains and pollution in our waters from coal. Please help to change the tide of increasing pollution and environmental hazards. We need your help to say no to practices that continue to destroy our beautiful land and endanger us all.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you so much for being in a position to make a difference on our planet. And thank you for your consideration of these comments.

patricia factor
40 Kullyspell Dr.
Hope, ID 83836

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Linda Larson
607 S Division Ave
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jonathan Grimm
1375 Jacobson rd
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mark Wey
27513 NE Hathaway Rd
Camas, WA 98607

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Although I am not a resident of Washington, the trains used for transport will travel through my small community in North Idaho: Sandpoint. These trains will travel along the pristine Lake and river Pend Oreille. I have great concern for the impact to the local ecology and the community.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of

crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Veronica Larenas
812 N Monroe Ave
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

victoria fuller
dufort rd.
sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy (Nan) Hogan
3315 Tahoma Pl. W. #1
University Place, WA 98466

(253) 476 8040

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

cynthia mason
PO Box 179
Hope, ID 83836

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

If we want to avoid catastrophic global warming, we need to leave about 80% of the known oil, coal, and gas reserves in the ground. Shipping oil away from the United States will result in increased carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere no matter where it is used. It's way past time to get serious about converting to renewable energy sources.

STOP THE OIL TRAINS!

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Melvin Mackey
24430 Old Mill Road SW
Vashon, WA 98070

(206) 463-3468

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I adamantly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact Spokane, my home city, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by significantly increasing the potential of oil spills all along it's path. Elevated rail use means more traffic congestion with the potential to harm businesses and delaying emergency responders.

My greatest concern is the willingness of corporations to put our communities, public health, and environment at risk all along it's path. The transport of crude oil to and from terminals damages aquatic ecosystems and endanger fishing grounds. Then there is the issue of accelerated climate change. Why are we investing in obsolete technology when "our beds are burning"?

Please weight carefully these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kamori Cattadoris
2592 Conklin Meadows Rd
Newport, WA 99156

5099815202

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our Washington and other states that the trains will travel through like Idaho. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region including pass through states like Idaho that the trains will cross.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries would have on inland waterways in pass through states.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from North Dakota to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from North Dakota to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Scott Dunn
1507 Northshore Drive
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lynn Pearson
PO Box 1008
Athol, ID 83801

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I live in Raymond, on the Willapa Harbor. My husband is a commercial fisherman. That is our only income. If a holding tank at the port of Grays Harbor or a spill from one of the tankers happens. Our entire seafood industry down here would be decimated as well. Our community would cease to exist if we lose that industry.

My parents live in Montesano where the CBR trains would be passing through. Their town would be ruined if they had a spill or explosion. We are seeing, with the three derailments over a two week period, that safety is not a high priority. We can't have these oil trains and more holding tanks at the port.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rozena Williams
702 Ballentine St
Raymond, WA 98577

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

My community is located adjacent to Lake Pend O'reille in northern Idaho, across which all these proposed train transports will occur. I do not welcome this activity for all the unanswered concerns mentioned in this letter. The risks far outweigh the benefits of these proposals.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of

crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dawn Jenkins
908 B Alder St.
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

john holup
534 n eisenhower
moscow, ID 83843

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Below is a pre-printed email which I wholeheartedly agree with. However, in addition to their statements I would like to say that I live in Clark Fork, Idaho and trains come through our town frequently. I know 2 people who have been killed by trains. Every day I drive the 25 miles to Sandpoint I see at least one train both coming & going. In the last several months I have noticed a definite increase in train numbers. I am a Level I Trauma Hospital ICU RN. I see first hand the result of precious minutes being wasted getting patients to hospitals. In our local area we have numerous at grade crossings. With an increase in train traffic we will (are) experiencing a significant delay in emergency response times. This severely impacts our community.

I urge you to reduce rather than increase the number of trains. I have not even touched on the environmental impact of the increased train traffic, nor that of the oil being hauled/extracted. This, too, is of great concern to me. Thank you and I do agree with all written below.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish

beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.

- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mary Franzel
214 E. Mountain View Rd.
Clark Fork, ID 83811

208-266-0494

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Although I am not a Washington resident, I am concerned about and opposed to the proposed Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor. These proposed terminals, if built, would have significant impacts not only for the local community but for the larger (global) community as well.

The proposed terminals would have significant impacts on Grays Harbor and surrounding communities - especially were spills to occur. And spills do occur - over and over again. Oil and water - and sealife - don't mix.

Furthermore, our collective energy future needs to be based on renewable, sustainable resources - not on dirty fossil fuels which will hasten climate crisis issues and lead to dirty air and water quality.

The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish

beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.

- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Cheryl Costigan
PO Box 905
Spirit Lake, ID 83869

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Arlene Eubanks
58 Breckenridge Dr
Hoquiam, WA 98550

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

elaine french
po box 9320
ketchum, ID 83340

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Arlene Eubanks
58 Breckenridge Dr
Hoqiam, WA 98550

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Arlene Eubanks
58 Breckenridge Dr
Hoquiam, WA 98550

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Karen McWay
701 W 14th Ave #201
Spokane, WA 99204

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rob Tannehill
701 W 14th Ave #201
Spokane, WA 99204

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

The land is WAY too beautiful to risk something going wrong and a lot of people depend on fresh water that travels through an aquifer that starts up in that area. PLEASE don't risk the beautiful treasure that is North Idaho and the lives of many Idaho and Washington State residents!

Angela Blood
8607 E. Sinto
Spokane Valley, WA 99212

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Every day, coal cars traveling past my front door spew 650 pounds of coal dust on our landscape. 40 to 50 % of this settles directly onto the Columbia River...significantly raising mercury levels in an already compromised rearing environment. One oil train derailment and we can kiss our beautiful Gorge good bye.

How can you stand dumbly by while our national heritage is raped by Big Coal and Big Oil?

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Samuel Dunlap
49861 SR 14
Stevenosn, WA 98648

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Suzanne Ravet
1549 Florence St.
Enumclaw, WA 98022

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Phil Longden
PO Box 179
Hope, ID 83836

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

GARY Ballantyne
910 W Bolan Ave
spokane, WA 99224

509-315-8896

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

William Young
4421 E. Oregon Street
Bellingham
Bellingham, WA 98226

360-353-4192

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community and on the waterways of Washington and Idaho. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects, evaluated cumulatively and considered across the region.
- Increased vessel traffic and increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills. Increased train traffic along the region's rail lines means higher risk of oil spills along the region's rivers and lakes and within many communities. The EIS should consider these increased risks, and evaluate the economic impacts of a spill, both in the marine environment and in the freshwater environment, as well as to numerous local economies.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to travel the same routes. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required for such spills. Bakken crude oil is known to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts from more trains -- this will include traffic backups impacting accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities all along the rail routes through Washington and Idaho.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities along the transportation routes in Washington and Idaho. Impacts will include increased train traffic, air emissions from train diesel engines, and emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of the project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, rivers, and lakes; wetlands; fishing areas and shellfish beds; and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – beginning in the oil source areas, along the transport routes, and including destinations for crude oil shipped out from Grays Harbor. Impacts include threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents, and specific impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands. Equally important is how spills and accidents will be prevented; and how, in the case of an accident, oil will be cleaned up and environmental impacts will be mitigated.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gordon Dicus
541 N Blaine St
Moscow, ID 83843

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The proposed terminals for Westway and Imperium will obviously be of concern concerning the direct risks of oil spills and the air pollution incidental to the transportation and storage of oil.

I'm writing to express my concern that your evaluation of the project impacts something less obvious, but also clearly impactful to the communities through which the trains must pass.

I think the projects' Environmental Impact Statements should include an evaluation of the enormous increase in train traffic all along the transpiration corridor. I think this will result in more than inconvenience, that it will slow emergency response times and be of enough general disruption to impact businesses and educational institutions.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this proposal.

John Lee
3580 Overlook Dr.
Langley, WA 98260

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kyle Waller
12021 140th St ct e
Puyallup, WA 98374

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City Opium

These proposed oil transports will impact Spokane in a negative way. I live by the tracks and there are already numerous trains that impede traffic and can potentially prevent emergency services from reaching citizens in dire need. Please consider the impact of your choices on others. Money and profit should never be above people's well being.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Erin Greene
1322 N. Madelia Street
Spokane, WA 99202

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

These proposals bring serious risks to Washington's communities, economy, and environment. Bakken crude oil is highly volatile, the train cars being used are old and unsafe, and a safe way to transport it has yet to be found – as many recent accidents across North America have shown.

There are currently 7 ungated railroad crossings in the Spokane Valley, and the increase in both oil and coal shipments is affecting these crossings.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Bart Rayniak
PO Box 783
Otis Orchards, WA 99027

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael Beasley
E.4023 Fairview Ave.
Spokane, WA 99217

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Allycia Godbee
6412 Gentile Ln Ne
Bremerton, WA 98311

(253) 946-9300

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Willie Edwards
1619 S 73rd Street
Tacoma, WA 98408

253-474-6832

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

I also ask you to consider this, which is more important, the money made from oil, or the life sustaining environment it puts in harms way by shipping it by rail, or by water? It is time for a Re-Think on our energy policies before we turn the world into a ghetto.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Alli Larkin
21937 7th Ave So
Des Moines, WA 98198

206 878-1203

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

nancy Miller
12316 28th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

206-417-3641

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

WTF g.o.p. GREEDY bastards ,care nothing about PEOPLE (including their families and Grandchildren) ! care NOTHING about Gods EARTH ! thet only care about MONEY ! THIS HAS TO CHANGE ! BEFOR THEY KILL U.S.ALL!

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dave ee Schiesl
40 spur rd
tonasket, WA 98855

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

trish maharam
2356 nw blue ridge drive
seattle, WA 98177

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

marcy horner
624 courtside
h206
olympia, WA 98502

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Manicke
432 W 9 th Ave
Colville, WA 99114

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Amy McKendry
15809 63rd Ave NE
Kenmore, WA 98028

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lawrence Schuchart
6204 N. Morton
Spokane, WA 99208

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Maxine Dunkelman
5418 Lemon RD NE
Olympia, WA 98506

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Christi Norman
14331 344th Ave NE
Duvall, WA 98019

425-788-7164

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Ben Rall
3215 West Heroy Avenue
@hotleadenema
Spokane, WA 99205

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Laura Broyhill
PO Box 3271
Kirkland, WA 98033

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Heather Burke
2009 9th Street
Anacortes, WA 98221

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

George Guenther
17th
Seattle, WA 98115

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear DEQ,

I live in Anacortes overlooking the Tesoro and Shell refineries, and drive WA-20 beside trains of Bakken crude. In Mt Vernon, highly-flammable tanker cars are routinely parked a block from downtown, along the main street; long trains of such cars park alongside blocks of condos just West of I-5.

These trains are hazardous, and I urge you to deny the construction of the Grays Harbor terminals. Tanker cars are not crash-safe; Bakken and Tar Sands crudes have high levels of explosive volatiles; the last 12 months alone have brought a series of disastrous crashes. It's risky to run such cars along the Columbia river and through towns. They will further stall the overloaded rail network. All to export crude oil.

Please consider the risks to our towns, aquatic ecosystems, and global climate -- and deny the applications.

Roddy Erickson
3902 V Ave
Anacortes, WA 98221

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kitty Klitzke
35 W Main Ave. Suite 350
Spokane, WA 99201

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael von Sacher-Masoch
PO Box 5273
Everett, WA 98206

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Judith Bahl
5016 U Street
Washougal, WA 98671

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

We strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

We urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We await your reply.F

Frank and Janet Loudin
P. O. Box 1017
Eastsound, WA 98245

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Reitz
2233 Rimrock Ct SW
Olympia, WA 98512

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kerry Grant
646 Madison Ave. N.
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Robert Fiser
14366 109th ave ne
kirkland, WA 98034

4254872698

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gwendolyn Walsh
18000 Bear Creek Farm Rd NE
Woodinville, WA 98077

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mary Keeler
1102 NW 83rd Street
seattle, WA 98117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Angela Smith
126 SW 148th St, Ste C100-422
Ste C100-422
Seattle, WA 98166

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Robert Shapiro
17045 Llama Lane
Bow
Bow, WA 98232

3607574212

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jens Hansen
30 Lake Louise Drive
Bellingham, WA 98229

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I am a citizen of Washington State and I am submitting this comment to express my concern regarding the serious increase of oil train traffic that will occur if these terminals were constructed in Grays Harbor.

This greatly increased rail traffic proposes a threat to communities along the rail route should there be a derailment as has happened in other communities. It will also cause traffic congestion resulting in first responder delays as well as inconvenience for citizens stopped at crossings.

Oil spills will have the danger of catching on fire and/or contaminating terrestrial and marine resources. I am also concerned that transportation of this oil is contributing significant pollution and green house gas emissions as will the eventual consumer use of this fossil fuel oil adding to the global warming concerns.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Chris Howard
734 University
Walla Walla , WA 99362

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I am from Aberdeen and I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds which are so important to Harbor families and accelerate climate change.

As you know, Aberdeen floods at high tide some years already, and accelerating climate change would be especially detrimental to Harborites. As for the jobs that the oil would bring - I sincerely believe that with creativity, Hoquiam and Aberdeen could seize the natural beauty, proximity to the beaches, and ingenuity of the people to create jobs.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Roxanne Hood Lyons

Roxanne Lyons
7618 SW 259th
Vashon, WA 98070

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

k alexandra
4311ginnett
anacortes, WA 98221

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Melissa Eriksen
316 N 76th St
Seattle, WA 98103

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rusty West
1622 NE Perkins Way
Shoreline, WA 98155

206-909-3664

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Craig Swanson
16220 SE 28th PL
Bellevue, WA 98008

4257476987

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dolores Darst
343cedar park
Port Angeles, WA 98362

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy Renn
1801 12th ave. S.
Seattle, WA 98144

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

John Lambert
13008 276th Way NE
Duvall, WA 98019

206-255-4326

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pam Shea
117 nw 59 th st
Seattle, WA 98107

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

How are you going to prevent an accident? Even one explosive accident could incinerate your neighbors. Can you be prepared to effectively clean up a spill?

My grandmother attended Hoquiam High School in 1914. The house she lived in is still there. My mother has lots of memories of playing on the hill behind the Polson's when her family visited. I hope you consider that there are those of us with deep roots in Washington State who are seriously concerned about this terminal proposal.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Dorothy Landeen
12118 NE 66th St
Kirkland, WA 98033

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kari Wilson
14116 N Creek Dr
Mill Creek, WA 98012

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Washington can be a leader in the environmental movement for sustainable, clean renewable energy. That is where our investment should be, not in terminals for energy products that exacerbate global warming.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Penny Peters
12203 Maplewood Ave
Edmonds, WA 98026

4257439340

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Karen Chestney
659 SR 532
Camano Island, WA 98282

1-360-629-8131

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Andrew Kennaly
156 Shiras Dr
Sandpoint, ID 83864

2083045488

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Shawna Kennaly
156 Shiras Dr
Sandpoint, ID 83864

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Richard Johnson
PO Box 3138
Bellingham, WA 98227

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Madya Panfilio
P O Box 2552
Vancouver, WA 98668

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. I am greatly concerned about the dangers of oil spills, harm to public health, and the impacts of oil use on climate change. Please study these impacts as part of your official environmental impact study for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Edward Whitesell
816 Plymouth St., SW
816
Olympia, WA 98502

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rusty West
1622 NE Perkins Way
Shoreline, WA 98155

206-909-3664

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Don Thomsen
1106 S Woodfern
Spokane, WA 99202

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Polly Tarpley
848 NW Bracken Ct.
Poulsbo, WA 98370

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Robert Bachman
102 Panorama Pl
Friday Harbor, WA 98250

360 370 5908

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Anna Porter
19126 Soundview Dr NW
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Melissa Eriksen
316 N 76th St
Seattle, WA 98103

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jens Hansen
30 Lake Louise Drive
Bellingham, WA 98229

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I vehemently oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sandra Alto
19012 90th Pl. NE
Bothell, WA 98011

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Brandie Deal
301 225th St SW
Bothell, WA 98021

425-821-9717

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Cynthia Ridgeway
20103 Beach Dr.
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Laura Goldberg
9225 N Cedarvale
Arlington, WA 98223

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

We have to move toward alternative energy. Time for a tax on carbon. See citizensclimatelobby.org.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Martha Bishop
1867 Miracle Mile Dr. E.
Port Orchard, WA 98366

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology & City of Hoquiam,

I attended the open hearing on the coal trains last year. I was quoted in this article
http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2019899522_coalhearing14m.html

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Janice Tufte
2609-Broadway Ave E #8
Seattle, WA 98102

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

John Dart
15619 138th PI SE
Renton, WA 98058

(425) 271-7493

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jan Rexroth
Ken Lake Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98512

253-468-1571

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mr. Shelley Dahlgren, PhD
4449 242nd Ave. S. E..
Issaquah, WA 98029

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

dave popoff
2510 alexis road
colville, WA 99114

250 359 7315

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Alexandra Kaufman
2219 E McGraw
Seattle, WA 98112

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

christy anderson
28407 w long lake
ford, WA 99013

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

david porter
19126 Soundview DR NW
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Suzanne Hamer
17227 NE 195th St
Woodinville, WA 98072

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pamela Engler
7022 - 21st Avenue NE
Seattle, WA 98115

206-526-5984

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Michael von Sacher-Masoch
PO Box 5273
Everett, WA 98206

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Barb Scavezze
Amhurst
Olympia, WA 98501

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

This oil is being shipped to developing countries where there is little if any environmental safe guards for the environment or its citizens. The air pollution from the uncontrolled processing of oil and coal by these international businesses looking to duck the processing regulations/expenses here at home is being shipped back over seas to the USA. WE must take this into account in the permitting process of these exports now days.

It is also not in the long term interests of the USA to ship these unprocessed natural resources over seas. We need to hold on to our "extra" energy producing resources for the long term where in just a few decades the world will be in short supply of this resource. We (USA citizens and corporations) will then be in the "Drives seat" and the jobs, manufacturing and environmental safeguards will be in our control, not some tax dodging, polluting, robber baron businessmen that only care about their profits today....and not about anything to do with tomorrow.

We must look to the future and consider the realities of today in our permitting processes, not just making a quick buck and supplying a few short term jobs when we can do so much more with the resource in the future.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

John Willett
Kitsap Forest and Bay Coalition, Co-Founder
Sports Safety and Education Association, Pres.
Tall Ship Adventuress, Past Board Member
Evergreen Agenda (open space planning), Co-Founder
WA.S. H2O Water Planning Pilot Program, Past Science Committee Chair.
WA.S. Alternative Agriculture Conv. Past Planning Comm.

john willett
20505 NE Pond View Lane

poulsbo, WA 98370

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Patricia Hilleary
E.13105 Boone Ave.
Spokane Valley, WA 99216

509-922-9036

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

fareeda khojandi
2101 sw sunset blvd
renton, WA 98057

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gina Schneider
1311 Taft Rd.
Freeland, WA 98249

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Matthew Anderson
13522 Densmore Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Rick Rosenberry
10745 Durland Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98125

206-417-2820

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

marilyn evenson
16016 29th ave ct-e
tacoma, WA 98445

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Kate McClure
217 E St. SW
Auburn, WA 98001

253-804-4408

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Chuck Gustafson
895 Chuckanut Ridge Drive
Bow, WA 98232

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sammy Low
20420 Marine Drive, Apt P2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk.

These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, threaten aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include the cradle-to-grave impacts of the entire development and operations for both the Westway and the Imperium projects into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement. This should include, but is not limited to assessing the local, regional and global public health, economic, and environmental impacts of extracting the crude oil at the drill sites, transporting the oil through hundreds of communities to the terminals, transferring the crude oil to holding tanks from rail cars, transferring the crude oil shipping vessels in Grays Harbor, shipping the crude oil to various refineries, the impacts of the refining process, transporting the product to market, and ultimately burning the final product.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Maddie Foutch
905 20th Ave
B
Seattle, WA 98122

2062502311

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Tyler Pugh
11307 N. Normandie ST.
Spokane, WA 99218

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Adina Parsley
20420 Marine Drive, Apt P2
Ferndale
Stanwood, WA 98292

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact Grays Harbor, my community in Seattle, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change. As a volunteer naturalist with the Seattle Aquarium, I see the effects of shipping toxic industrially extracted resources in the Puget Sound ecosystem and know these dangers extend to wherever oil is transported.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Yours truly,

Alice Dubiel
2811 NW 93rd Street
Seattle, WA 98117

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I was driving by Belt, Mt., in November 1976, the morning that a runaway tanker train rammed into downtown and caused a huge fire, killing two people and devastating the commercial area.

The public might have more faith in the construction of crude oil terminals and job creation in Grays Harbor if they felt they could trust the willingness and ability of oil and transport companies -- and government agencies -- to make such shipping by rail tanker car safer, and invest in amelioration of the effects on local people.

Without redress, we'll see more congestion of rail and marine traffic; increased potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; crossing blockage harm to businesses and delayed emergency responders; and our communities, public health and environment risked. Fumes and spillage from these terminals and transport of crude oil to and from, will damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds and accelerate climate change.

Please include these impacts in the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and Imperium projects.

John Pearson
20215 HollyHills Dr NE
Bothell, WA 98011

425-218-9677

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

Thank-you for the opportunity to comment on the potential impacts and mitigations for the Westway and Imperium Terminal Proposals in Grays Harbor.

I live in the San Juan Islands in the Salish Sea. Our economy is dependent on the natural beauty of our islands and on the marine mammals, birds, and fish of the Salish Sea. Southern Resident Killer Whales are especially valued by island residents and visitors. These charismatic marine mammals are federally listed as endangered. Although the Southern Resident Killer Whales spend much of the summer around the San Juan and Canadian Gulf Islands, recent studies by NOAA show that Southern Resident Killer Whales follow migrating salmon along the outer coast of Washington, Oregon, and Northern California during the rest of the year. This tagging project showed that K pod spent a significant amount of time near Grays Harbor:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8ApK0SYothA>

Grays Harbor is the transition zone from salt to fresh water for salmon heading to the Humptulips, Satsop, and Wynoochee rivers. These rivers all empty into Grays Harbor and are known big salmon rivers.

A significant spill of Bakken crude or diluted Tar Sands Bitumen into Grays Harbor or its environs would impact the salmon runs and therefore the food supply and survival of Southern Resident Killer Whales.

Since the Bakken crude arriving at Grays Harbor would travel by rail tank cars along the Columbia River, rail accidents could pollute this major salmon migration waterway as well. Tar Sands diluted bitumen may also travel this route.

Therefore, I request the following requirements and mitigations be attached to any permit that expands the shipment of Bakken crude or Tar Sands diluted bitumen from Grays Harbor:

Require all rail tank cars to be of the latest and most impact-resistant design so that derailment or other accidents will be less likely to result in tank car rupture.

In Grays Harbor require both laden and un-laden oil tankers to use tug escorts, pilots with specific knowledge of Grays Harbor marine hazards, and enhanced navigation aides. Even "unladen" tankers can carry hundreds of thousands of gallons of bunker fuel to propel their ship's engines.

Bakken crude and diluted Tar Sands bitumen are new commodities that behave differently than conventional crude oils.

Before any new project that would result in expanded shipping of these new fossil fuel

mixtures is permitted in Washington State, the behavior of diluted bitumen and Bakken crude must be studied in marine, brackish, and fresh waters, including waters that carry sediment.

Before any new project that would result in expanded shipping of these new fossil fuel mixtures is permitted in Washington State, we must study how best to respond to spills of diluted bitumen and Bakken crude. Toxic components that will affect spill responders must be considered in any effective spill response plans.

Before any new project that would result in expanded shipping of these new fossil fuel mixtures is permitted in Washington State, coordinated spill response drills that incorporate the most effective retrieval of spills of Bakken crude and diluted Tar Sands Bitumen should be carried out.

Operations that transfer Bakken crude or Tar Sands diluted bitumen from rail tank cars to intermediate storage tanks and then to oil tankers are potential sources of spills onto land or into the waters of Grays Harbor. Even smaller spills will have cumulative impacts over time. Therefore, all transfer operations should require placement of containment booms before transfer begins.

I have borrowed the following comments from Peter Goldmark's comments for the Millennium Bulk Terminals proposal because they also are appropriate for the Grays Harbor proposals and would affect salmon species.

"The EIS should analyze the potential of dock construction or operations (including future maintenance, repair, and replacement) to disturb any contaminated sediments and how this will be mitigated.

The EIS should include a detailed analysis of the potential alteration of physical and geomorphological processes in the nearshore zone, focused on sediment transport and riverine processes, fluvial erosion, and deposition, particularly with respect to initial and ongoing dredging requirements. The analysis should include spatially explicit mapping of sediment characteristics, riverine and beach geomorphology, bathymetry, and stability.

The EIS should analyze adverse impacts of waves and prop scour generated by large vessels docking at the facility and tugs assisting with docking on sediment transport, bank erosion, and attached aquatic vegetation. How will the change in hydrodynamics from the in-water structures affect scour in the intertidal and shallow subtidal environments not only at the aquatic lease area but also up and down drift of the site? How will waves, currents, and propeller wash change the sediment characteristics and hydrodynamic environment? How will riverine vegetation and habitat for freshwater invertebrates be affected by changes in wave energy, sediment transport, or substrate? What is the likelihood that the project will require shoreline armoring in the future, due to operations, climate change, sea level rise, or other reasons, and how will impacts be mitigated?

DNR has responsibility for obtaining, maintaining and distributing information and technical assistance regarding geologic hazards under the Geological Survey Act, Chapter 43.92, Revised Code of Washington (RCW). In addition to the objectives stated in Chapter

43.92.020 RCW, the geological survey must conduct and maintain an assessment of seismic, landslide, and tsunami hazards in Washington. This assessment must include the identification and mapping of volcanic, seismic, landslide, and tsunami hazards, an estimation of potential consequences, and the likelihood of occurrence. DNR recommends you analyze the potential for geologic hazards at the site using the following methodology:

- a) Identify both shallow and deep-seated landslide hazards using DNR's GIS Statewide Landslide database and then create a site-specific geologic map. In areas with no existing landslide inventory, create a shallow landslide database using historic aerial imagery and other spatial data in a GIS.
- b) Evaluate riverbank sloughing and subaqueous landslide hazards using bathymetry or similar DEMdata.

Attachment - Millennium Bulk Tenninals EIS Co-Lead Agencies November 18,2013

- c) Identify potentially unstable slopes using DNR's Shalstab model or other comparable slope stability modeling program in a GIS.
- d) Identify slope hazards associated with slope modification or vegetation removal at construction areas.
- e) Evaluate earthquake hazards including earthquake-induced ground failures. The proposed project is in a moderate to high liquefaction area and should be thoroughly investigated
- f) If dredging for port access, identify potential hazards to adjacent beaches and bluffs from loss of subaqueous buttressing, and
- g) Identify tsunami inundation hazards from landslides, local faults, a Cascadia subduction zone event, or through subaqueous or terrestrial landslides. Explicitly address increased risk of inundation resulting from climate change and sea level rise.

The EIS should include a detailed baseline study of the area's biological resources and analyze potential impacts, including, but not limited to: benthic habitats; shellfish resources (such as native freshwater mussels); littoral vegetation; migration and spawning corridors and behavior for multiple species including salmonid species; marine mammals; waterfowl and migratory shorebird communities including nesting, rearing, resting, and feeding habitats along the river banks and islands, as well as and upland species including endangered or threatened species.”

Thank-you again for this opportunity to comment.

Janet Alderton
491 Harborview Lane
P.O. Box 352
Deer Harbor, WA 98243
360-376-3905

Janet Alderton
491 Harborview Lane
PO Box 352
Deer Harbor, WA 98243

360-376-3905

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

James Mulcare
1110 Benjamin St
Clarkston, WA 99403

509-758-3934

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Elinor Gannon
2125 1st Avenue, #2701
Seattle, WA 98121

6612019146

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Elinor Gannon
2125 1st Avenue, #2701
Seattle, WA 98121

6612019146

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, accelerate climate change, and keep me awake more at night by adding more noisy train traffic along the Columbia River.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy Lovejoy
12 S. Lincoln Street
Kennewick, WA 99336

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. Elevated rail and marine traffic congestion; increases the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harms existing businesses and delays emergency responders; and puts our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

Please include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Mary Wallon
8 West Armour Street
Seattle, WA 98119

206 285-1348

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I am very concerned about the increasing amount of oil and coal that is continuing to go through our state. The Bakken oil trains continue to explode because that oil is more flammable than other forms of oil. It's very frustrating that the state of WA which wants to be a leader in the clean energy movement, is fast becoming the toxic, dirty energy gateway to Asia. The dirty energy industry is doubling down on getting the last of the dirty energy out of the ground and the US govt. is doubling down on trying to become the number one exporter of dirty energy. I hate that more and more oil/coal trains are going through our neighborhoods and we have no plans in place if they derail or explode. Putting in more terminals will only increase the risk of dangerous accidents that could kill people and destroy our environment. Climate change is destroying our environment and allowing the exportation of dirty energy is putting the nail in the coffin.

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil

spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.

- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Gayle Janzen
11232 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

206 362-9278

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spills and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Nancy White
13311 E Forrest Ave
Spokane Valley, WA 99216

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Emily Lubahn
5338 Wolf Rd
Erie, PA 16505

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jerry Liebermann
1214 16th Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

206-328-0137

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Pamela Worner
14119 82nd PL NE
Kirkland , WA 98034

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change. They would also endanger migratory birds.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Virgene Link
P.O.Box 543
Anacortes, WA 98221

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Catherine Russell
3321 Cherry Blossom Dr NE
Olympia, WA 98506

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, endanger migratory birds and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Virgene Link
P.O.Box 543
Anacortes, WA 98221

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Laura Dicus
20056 Woden Ct NE
Poulsbo, WA 98370

360-697-1712

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Lorraine Hartmann
10627 Durland Ave NE
SEATTLE, WA 98125

206-367-1518

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

janet chalupnik
540 dayuton st.
#201
edmonds, WA 98020

425-776-5544

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

The Westway and Imperium terminal proposals in Grays Harbor will have significant impacts on my community, our waterways, and the future of our state. The Environmental Impact Statement for these projects should include an evaluation of:

- Cumulative impact of the proposed projects in Grays Harbor, and other similar oil and fossil fuel transport projects across the region. The evaluation should include the increased risks related to all these projects and the impacts they would have, cumulatively, on our region.
- Risks of oil spills in our marine environment – increased vessel traffic and associated increased amounts of oil traveling through waterways mean a higher risk of oil spills, especially given the lack of tug escorts available to tankers. The EIS should also consider what the economic impacts of a spill, including to the shellfish, fishing, and tourism industries, would have on Grays Harbor and the state.
- Risks from crude oil. Putting in place this infrastructure would allow Bakken crude oil and oil from the Canadian Tar Sands to come to Grays Harbor. The EIS should include an evaluation of the risks, resources needed to prevent spills, and response required related to these different oils. Bakken crude oil has been shown to be more explosive, putting our communities and first responders at greater risks. Tar sands sink and make cleanup of any spills much more difficult and expensive.
- Community impacts, particularly the impacts of more trains causing traffic backups that will impact accessibility between homes, businesses, emergency resources, and communities on both sides of the rail tracks from Spokane to Grays Harbor.
- Public health. The EIS should include the health risks to communities from Spokane to Grays Harbor from increased train traffic, air emissions from the diesel used in the trains, and the emissions from storage tanks and transfer of the oil to oil tankers. Evaluation should include a separate Health Impact Assessment, an objective evaluation of the potential health impacts of a project.
- Environmental impacts, including threats to streams, wetlands, fishing areas, shellfish beds, and migratory bird habitats. These threats should be evaluated along the entire transport route of the crude oil – from possible areas where the crude oil is sourced to Grays Harbor to where the crude oil goes from Grays Harbor. This includes threat of oil spills, air emissions, accidents, and the infrastructure updates required to transport the crude oil on the environmental resources.
- Climate impacts related to the greenhouse gas emissions from the fracking, transporting – both by rail and marine vessels – as well as the refining and burning of this crude oil.

Of particular importance is the threat of oil spills and other accidents and the impact based on the type of crude oil – Bakken or Canadian Tar Sands – and how, based on the type of crude oil, a spill and accident would be prevented, and, in the case of an accident, cleaned up.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Shelley Tea
5108 S. Dawson St.#5
#5
Seattle, WA 98118

206-284-7758

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

The fossil fuel industry and the global community in general need more examples of groups of citizens standing up to say No to the continued exploitation of fossil fuel reserves for the sake of short-term profit. We need to have our eyes focused further into the future than the immediate profit of selling and burning these resources. Rejecting this proposal could be one voice among many in that fight. Please say NO.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Jesse Paulsen
1841 23rd Ave E
Seattle, WA 98112

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

These oil trains would be traveling through areas subject to land slides and on track that is not in the best shape to support transport of such dangerous and toxic commodity as oil. The tracks in the Northwest and the Pacific Coast specifically are already used to capacity and the addition of more oil trains only invites disaster for spills, derailments and collisions.

They would also be traveling through pristine landscapes that, God forbid, would be heavily damaged if not destroyed by a derailment. In addition please take into account how difficult these substances are to clean up after a spill as has been evidenced in spills over the last several years.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Steven Lynch
12740 30th Ave NE #613
Seattle, WA 98125

Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology
Brian Shay, City of Hoquiam

Dear Department of Ecology and City of Hoquiam,

I strongly oppose the construction of crude oil terminals in Grays Harbor. These proposals would negatively impact my community, Grays Harbor, and the greater Pacific Northwest by elevating rail and marine traffic congestion; increasing the potential of oil spills in fresh and marine waters; harming existing businesses and delaying emergency responders; and putting our communities, public health, and environment at risk. These terminals, and the transport of crude oil to and from these terminals, would damage aquatic ecosystems, endanger fishing grounds, and accelerate climate change.

I urge you to include these impacts into the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement for both the Westway and the Imperium projects.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

David Heywood
1208 Arcadia St. NW
Olympia, WA 98502

360 867-1155