



AUDITOR 11/03/16 PM12:13

## About the Comments Being Delivered

350PDX solicited public comments on the discussion draft and proposed draft of the fossil fuel terminal zoning code amendments. While some of the technical comments vary, the community's ask remains the same: reduce the storage threshold to zero and pass a full ban on new fossil fuel terminals, prohibit expansions at existing facilities, and require existing terminal operators to make much needed safety improvements. Below you will find 308 comments submitted to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability on the discussion draft and 282 comments submitted to the Planning and Sustainability Commission on the proposed draft. Thank you for your careful consideration on the zoning code amendments and we encourage you to go bold and say no to all new fossil fuel infrastructure.

Building  
The Climate  
Movement

# Fossil Fuel Policy Code Comments: Proposed Draft

November 2, 2016 /

Name: Austin Rose

Email: arosepdx@gmail.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small.  
An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.  
Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits in the City's non-conforming use review process.  
Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: Teresa Reitinger

Email: t\_reitinger@yahoo.com

Comment:

The times beg for a full ban for the possible future of the planet

and the health of its children. Now is the time to take this important step in the hope that other municipalities will follow suit in the name of sanity.

---

Name: Kelly McConnell

Email: prvt@2ezgroup.com

Comment:

I want clean air and water and I'm damned tired of begging for them. I want a FULL ban on any and all new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure. Since they insist on continuing to foul our air, land, and water they leave us no choice but to ban them.

---

Name: Anthony Albert

Email: albert2910@msn.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Jynx Houston

Email: jynxcdo@gmail.com

Comment:

PORTLAND NEEDS A FULL BAN ON ALL NEW FOSSIL FUEL TERMINALS & NO EXPANSIONS ON EXISTING TERMINALS & NO INCREASE IN FOSSIL FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE.

---

Name: James Rankin

Email: jim.rankin@oregonstate.edu

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Todd Corbett

Email: htcorbett@hotmail.com

Comment:

Within the Portland area, please enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Also, please strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. And please prevent anything that leads to aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. Thanks

---

Name: Craig Heverly

Email: heverlyjc@hevanet.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much

improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”. Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments

through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Craig Heverly

---

Name: Don Jacobson

Email: donjphoto@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”. Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability

Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: kathleen shelley  
Email: kshelley@epud.net

Comment:

No more fossil fuel facilities in Portland. Eliminate those that now exist. The goal is to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.

---

Name: Michael Garland  
Email: mjgpx36@gmail.com

Comment:

I support the call for a complete ban on further development of fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Virginia Wiseman

Email: virginia.n.wiseman@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear PSC,

I really hope that you will honor the City Council's resolution and amend the draft rule to fully ban ALL new fossil fuel infrastructure – regardless of size. The time has come to make fossil fuels scarce so that we can make the transition to a clean energy economy that leaves our planet intact enough for us to live on it. Please.

Many thanks!

---

Name: Annoe McCuen

Email: mccuen7691@comcast.net

Comment:

Please do whatever is in your power to downsize the effect of fossil fuel on our environment. Thank you.

---

Name: David Bennett

Email: bapoo503@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please take any measures that reduce the presence of fossil fuels and attendant infrastructure in Portland. As everyone without a vested interest in the continuation of dependence on fossil fuels for energy knows, we need to dial down as fast as possible. If it's not too late, we're close to that time. If not in our city, where?

---

Name: Eric Schmall



Email: kahunalamaku@gmail.com

Comment:

I'm requesting that you enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, regardless of size. There is no need for exceptions. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Please strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you.

Name: David Hermanns

Email: dhermann@earthlink.net

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland". Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not

clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: Barbara Bartschi  
Email: bartschi@imagina.com

Comment:

Ban new fossil fuel terminal.

The dangerous oil trains should also be ban. We know the terminals and trains are not safe for our environment, we need immediate solutions for clean energy.

---

Name: kima garrison

Email: kimasuegarrison@gmail.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Victoria Cole

Email: cole.tori@gmail.com

Comment:

Please don't let the process water down what Portlanders spoke very, very clearly in favor of this year. Enact a full ban on fossil fuel terminals, no matter what size! We are in a crucial moment for the climate. This kind of precedent could change our future for the better. Please don't leave holes in our fossil fuel export policy. Furthermore, I believe Portland's leadership should strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Last but not least, I'd like to see Portland lead the nation by preventing any aggregate increases in fossil fuel infrastructure in the city. It's unlikely to have more than a subtle impact on existing business here, but it can set a wonderful precedent, allowing Portland to be the true leader on climate change action that we purport to be. Thank you.

---

Name: Alan Smith

Email: a23smith@yahoo.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Lisa Cohn

Email: lisaellencohn1@gmail.com

Comment:

Hi,

I'm writing to support your enacting a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, regardless of size. I don't like your proposed exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less. We need a full ban!

In addition, please strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals by adding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

I also support the city preventing any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Your proposal is almost there. Let's protect our climate and environment and enact a full ban!

---

Name: Amber Buhl

Email: ambie80b@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its

work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: Dave King

Email: landd\_2@q.com

Comment:

No new terminals of any size. And for that matter let's shut down existing terminals and make Portland 100% renewable with expanded transit like they have in Latin America. Solar & wind and massive weatherization by the city. Pay for it with our share of the money saved by cutting the 5.3 TRILLION per year subsidies to fossil fuel companies world wide.

---

Name: Gregg Kleiner

Email: kleinerg@comcast.net

Comment:

Given all the evidence of climate change taking place all around us (wildfires, flooding, rising sea levels, melting ice sheets), we simply cannot scrimp on enacting a FULL ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, no matter what the size. If we keep burning fossil fuels, the future is bleak. It's time to step up! Do NOT allow an exception for new facilities that are five million gallons or less! That doesn't work.

At the same time, we MUST strengthen restrictions on expansions at existing terminals by adding binding limits and criteria for safety and impacts from climate change in the City's non-conforming use review process.

The time is NOW. We don't have another option. Please prevent any increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. Our Planet can no longer tolerate our burning of fossil fuels. Thank you!

---

Name: Howard Shapiro

Email: howeird3@gmail.com

Comment:

If the pipeline is large enough to refill the 4,999,999 gallon storage tanks quickly the proposed limit is meaningless. there should be no new fossil fuel storage facilities allowed.

There should be no expansion of current facilities allowed.

If the PSC decided to recommend allowing any new construction I would like to see some kind of bonding language contained in the ordinance in the event of a spill.

If Portland is serious about keeping our city at the level of health and sustainability that we presently have, we cannot allow any loopholes in our codes and ordinances that high priced lawyers and planners can take advantage of because if they find them they will use them.

---

Name: Dean Sigler

Email: muchcatfur@comcast.net

Comment:

Let's not let loopholes allow the camel into the tent. We need to have a zero-tolerance policy toward new fossil fuel expansions.

---

Name: marjory bryan

Email: djinstigatah@gmail.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland

Thank you for all you do!!!

---

Name: Mary McGaughey

Email: marymcgaughey@yahoo.com

Comment:

Oregon passed the Clean Energy Act. We pledged to systematically divest from oil energy. The City Portland may not go against the will of all Oregonians. NO OIL TRANSPORT from Our Oregon!!!!

---

Name: Helen Hays

Email: hlhays@ccgmail.net

Comment:

Please enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. Additionally, strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impact in the City's non-conforming use review process. Finally, prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Helen Logan Hays

---

Name: Steve Rauworth

Email: steve.rauworth@gmail.com

Comment:

Fossil fuels, in particular ones whose transportation poses great



danger to ecosystems and human communities, even though we are still dependent on them now, are already things of the past. Using them makes our planet a worse place to live.

The only sensible action to take in light of these facts is to ban any new terminals and minimize the use and impact of existing ones. We must adjust to this reality, which will involve some discomfort, but nothing compared to the grim alternative.

---

Name: Don E. Dumond

Email: ddumond@uoregon.edu

Comment:

My comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Name: Deborah Field

Email: deblyfield@gmail.com

Comment:

We are a city committed to reducing our fossil fuel usage and therefore, making changes to our storage of fossil fuels needs to reflect our commitment. I do not want any new fossil fuel terminals or expansion of existing terminals in Portland. Listen to the citizens in Portland and reflect their voices in your decisions.

Name: Cynthia Enlow

Email: hienlow@msn.com

Comment:

City of Portland: I support amending the proposed draft to reflect the City's fossil fuel goals:

- Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
- Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Gabrielle Karras

Email: gk2829@hotmail.com

Comment:

Hello,

I live in the Woodstock neighborhood and I am very, very concerned about global climate change and fossil fuel zoning. As a progressive city, I would like to see Portland enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. I would like to see strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. I would like to prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. We need to be a leader in this issue. We live in a beautiful place and fossil fuels are the enemy of beauty. We need to invest in alternative energy and not rely on a type of energy that is destroying the planet.....By continuing to invest in fossil fuels because the money is attractive is only to delay the coming catastrophe.....

---

Name: jody guth

Email: jodyguth@gmail.com

Comment:

Why a partial ban? This is Portland. Home of enlightened thinkers who do what is right for the environment and people regardless of monied interests. (usually, mostly, hopefully....) Please, continue on the common sense path forward....a full ban with NO exceptions. Thank you.

---

Name: Neal Keefer

Email: nvkeefe@msn.com

Comment:

Dear City Council, I am writing to ask you to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. In addition, I believe you should strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Finally, please take steps to prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

Name: Joe Chasse

Email: joetruck@gmail.com

Comment:

WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN SHOWN by Union Pacific and other corporate collaborators that we can NOT trust them. Their ONLY MOTIVE is PROFITS for the shareholders, while OUR MOTIVES run deep throughout our communities and our region.

---

Name: Matthew Baird

Email: mbaird@climatetrust.org

**Comment:**

Message is simple. Please enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

There's no reason to hedge in favor of fossil fuels now that we know the full cost of burning fossil fuels. Keep them out, so we can focus on moving forward with cleaner alternatives.

---

Name: John Rau

Email: jrau2@comcast.net

**Comment:**

As an environmental scientist I think Portland should certainly consider that shipping any fossil fuels to China is shipping fuels that our children may one day need away to fund the greed of the fossil fuel industry and in return gets us air pollution. The pollution China puts into the air eventually ends up here. If they don't have cheap fuels to use they will be motivated to develop renewable energy and that will help us all deal with global climate change. A full ban on fossil fuel export is the only strategy that makes long term sense.

---

Name: Janice Vranka

Email: javranka@gmail.com

**Comment:**

Please take a stand and put into place a FULL BAN on ALL new fossil fuel terminals. Period. No exceptions. As Portland residents and active members of our community we ask you to reject any expansions on existing terminals AND increases in fossil fuel infrastructure. We want livable and safe communities now and in the future for the sake of our children and grandchildren.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

Name: Diane Jacobs

Email: [dianejacobs2@icloud.com](mailto:dianejacobs2@icloud.com)

Comment:

We need to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals, and prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. We cannot go at this slowly anymore.

---

Name: Hal Anthony

Email: [threepines@jeffnet.org](mailto:threepines@jeffnet.org)

Comment:

Portland's approach to fossil fuels needs displaced with the factual realities off sustainability, which is two things: 1) A return of natural utilities and their priceless supplies of FREE, PREREQUISITE HUMAN-NEEDED MODALITIES W/O WHICH WE PERISH; and 2) We have no choice at this time; it is sink and human chaos on fossil fuel vs. possible survival with sustainability. There are no other alternatives, but Clinton will take you to nukes and war — you will see.

---

Name: Randall Webb

Email: [lawrkw@comcast.net](mailto:lawrkw@comcast.net)

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”. Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the

terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Randall Webb

Name: Harry Kershner

Email: harrykershner@msn.com

Comment:

1. Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.
2. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
3. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: John Nettleton

Email: jpn5710@yahoo.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's

intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: karen christensen

Email: lesterladonna@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments.



I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Karen Christensen  
Portland, OR 97212

---

Name: Linda Magnuson  
Email: [lmagnusonl@gmail.com](mailto:lmagnusonl@gmail.com)

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for

safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Vincent Alvarez

Email: vincent.alvarez@burroughs.com

Comment:

WE should enact a ban on future terminals, no matter the size. Until the fossil fuel industry can prove that spills or accidents are impossible.

---

Name: Lucy Wong

Email: lucymwong@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to

the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Lucy Wong  
NE Portland Resident

---

Name: Tara Hershberger  
Email: tara.lyn.hershberger@gmail.com

Comment:

Hello! I am a teacher and artist living in Portland. I believe there is nothing more important for the city to do than to care for it's

citizens and do what is safest and smartest for the people.

Rejecting fossil fuel as a basis of our economy is vital to a livable future. Fully and effectively banning all new fossil fuel infrastructure is necessary to protect Portland and move us toward a more just and sustainable way of life.

I want you to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Pipelines can leak or explode, oil trains derail, coal dust falls off trains and barges. We don't want these in our region, or anywhere.

I urge you also to strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Do what you can to prevent any increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. To thrive in a changing climate, we must adapt to sustainable, local technologies, live simpler, and end systemic violence and racism. It is an important action to ban new fossil fuel infrastructure and expansion!

---

Name: Darvel Lloyd

Email: darvlloyd@gmail.com

Comment:

Portland must send a strong message to the fossil fuel corporations and their transporters to PHASE OUT (not ramp up!) production, storage, and transportation of the stuff that is ruining our fragile mother Earth as we know and love it! If we have to find "greener" substitutes for oil, coal, and gas for everything from energy production to plastics, so be it. The City should do all it can to encourage production and distribution of these substitutes!

---

Name: Rachel Hampton

Email: hamptonrachel2002@outlook.com

Comment:

Please improve the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments by:

-Enacting a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

-Strengthening restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

-Preventing any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank You.

---

Name: Robert Meder

Email: rdmeder@comcast.net

Comment:

Oregon GREEN!

---

Name: Karen Alexander-Brown

Email: kjalexander@hotmail.com

Comment:

Dear City of Portland,

Keep Portland the leader in combating climate change that we have always been by enacting the following:

1) Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small.

An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

2) The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

3) Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the

City's non-conforming use review process.

4) Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: Margaret Stephens

Email: mlstep@msn.com

Comment:

I am writing to urge the City of Portland do the following:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

PS: what Portland does affects the entire State of Oregon; please set the best example for the rest of our state. Thank you.

---

Name: Diana Boom

Email: diana@dboom.net

Comment:

Just that – please ban all new fossil fuel terminals. Go Portland.

---

Name: Briar Schoon

Email: briar.dayne@gmail.com

Comment:

I want to thank the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. While the current draft is much improved, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

- 1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.
- 2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.  
Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.
- 3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.
- 4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

We must transition away from fossil fuels immediately if we are to curb the worst impacts of climate change. The City of Portland has the opportunity to be a bold leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Briar Schoon

---

Name: Lilian Kong

Email: lilian.kong@outlook.com

Comment:

Dear City of Portland,

While the latest draft of the fossil fuel terminal zoning code changes is greatly improved, I believe it is not enough. I believe we should:

1. Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City’s code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

2. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
3. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Nathaniel Holder

Email: nathaniel@nholder.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland". Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

- 1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015



Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: Robert Heydenreich  
Email: bobheyden@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”. Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still

allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

I believe that we cannot put off any longer our efforts to stop global warming. If we don’t start now, soon it will be too late and

the consequences will be devastating.

Sincerely, Robert Heydenreich

---

Name: Breanna Lundvall

Email: breanna.lundvall@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear City of Portland,

As a Portlander, this ban is very important to me as well as my fellow friends and neighbors. We NEED a full ban. Any exceptions to a full ban are just plain wrong. In the world we live in today, we cannot afford to continue this behavior any longer. It is irresponsible. Please enact a full ban on ALL new fossil fuel terminals. Along with this is the need to place the strongest of restrictions of expanding existing terminals. Again, we cannot continue this behavior any longer. Let us be a leader for the rest of the country. It is what the people want!

Thank you

---

Name: satya vayu

Email: satyavayu@gmail.com

Comment:

We need to take our city's commitment to stopping climate change seriously! Please enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

In addition, please strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Finally, we must prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you,

Satya Vayu

---

Name: Jeffrey White

Email: rogue576@gmail.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: joana kirchhoff

Email: joanakirchhoff@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear City Council, Please prevent the increase of fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. The resolution passed by the Council now comes to you for implementation – don't renege on the intent of that resolution. Now it the moment to stand for the climate!

---

Name: Jared Naimark

Email: jwnaimark@gmail.com

Comment:

In order to address the climate crisis and local pollution we need Portland to be a leader in moving us completely beyond fossil fuels and towards 100% renewable energy. I urge the city to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small.

Sincerely,

Jared Naimark

---

Name: Katherine Anne Stansbury

Email: yttik1000@yahoo.com

Comment:

Amend the proposed draft to reflect the City's fossil fuel goals: \*Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

\*Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

\*Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Ben Basin

Email: ben\_basin@yahoo.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the

size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: Kelly O'Hanley  
Email: kohanley@gmail.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Andrew Butz

Email: anbunz@yahoo.com

Comment:

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission:

Please enact a full ban on any new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. We don't need an exception for new facilities of 5 million gallons or less. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Moreover, we must strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

The bottom line is, we need to prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Bernadette Rodgers

Email: bernadetterodgers350@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Mayor Hales & Portland City Council,

Portland made national and international headlines last year with the first-ever resolution calling for no new fossil fuel infrastructure projects in Portland. I was so proud of Portland that day! Now as you code that resolution into law, let's stay true to its intent and ensure that it is not watered down to allow

projects that clearly violate the intent of the resolution.

Specifically, this law should:

- Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City’s code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.
- Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thanks for all you do to serve and protect this great city, and to make sure Portland leads the way to a clean and just energy future!

Sincerely,  
Dr. Bernadette Rodgers  
PSU and PCC faculty  
350PDX Board Chair

---

Name: Farrah Chaichi  
Email: FNChaichi@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”. Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to



another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Farrah

Name: Jane Stackhouse

Email: jane@janestackhouse.com

Comment:

We are so close to putting Portland in the forefront of action against climate change. Please keep with your original vision and correct the proposed zoning rules.

1. Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary.

2. Do not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

3. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The only infrastructure work that should be done is strengthening existing storage to withstand a major earthquake.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Allen Neuringer

Email: allen.neuringer@reed.edu

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to

another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Allen Neuringer

Name: CatAshleigh Mead  
Email: cat\_list1@featherforge.com

Comment:

Please keep Portland safer from fuel spills, fires, and other contamination, and set an example of leadership for other cities by putting the brakes on the major cause of climate change through showing the industry it is unwelcome.

Please enact a FULL ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, with no exceptions, and no code changes to allow more trains of fossil fuels.

Please also strengthen restrictions on expansions at existing terminals and prevent any increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you.

---

Name: Anthony Albert  
Email: albert2910@msn.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Alan Smith  
Email: a23smith@yahoo.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Alan Smith

---

Name: Deborah Einbender  
Email: pursona@teleport.com

Comment:

Aggressive, bold action is needed NOW. We should be leaders in the movement to make sure that a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals of any size is immediately passed, with no exceptions for size. No increase in dangerous fossil fuels, like Bakken crude oil should be allowed. The city should act to strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

---

Name: Alain Millar  
Email: jakeshouseajm@comcast.net

Comment:

We need to lead the country (as we have before on environmental issues) and

1. enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City’s code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. No more Mosiers.
2. strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing

terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

3. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Aaron Schalon

Email: aaron.schalon@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Aaron Schalon

---

Name: G. Gibson

Email: [mistergibson@gmail.com](mailto:mistergibson@gmail.com)

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still



allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

G. Gibson  
mistergibson@gmail.com  
Citizen

---

Name: John Hahn-Francini  
Email: johnhf@hevanet.com

Comment:

I would like to see a full ban on all new fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. A full ban should not have exceptions for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less. The code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous, highly combustible fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. I would like to see the code strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. I would like to see the code prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Robert Spies  
Email: rspiesr@netscape.net

Comment:

The US should not be exporting fossil fuels! We'll need them ourselves when the crunch comes. The US should be working on renewable energy, and phasing out fossil fuels. Therefore new fossil fuel terminals are unnecessary.

---

Name: Eve Heidtmann  
Email: eveandden@gmail.com

Comment:

I am adding my voice in support of a ban on ALL new fossil fuel terminals and the strongest possible restrictions on the expansion at existing terminals. The age of fossil fuels is over. The sooner we put an end to fossil fuel use, the better for it will be for our children and all species.

---

Name: Joshua Berger  
Email: josh@plazm.com

Comment:

Please Please Please

Let's continue to be a leader in sustainability!

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Joanne Walters  
Email: greengirlspdx@gmail.com

Comment:

Please ban all new fossil fuel anything. Keep it in the ground and out of the rails and ships!

---

Name: P Anna Johnson  
Email: aj@mercedlake.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use

review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Linda Magnuson

Email: lmagnusonl@gmail.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Cynthia Enlow

Email: hienlow@msn.com

Comment:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

2.Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

3.Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Eric Canon

Email: canonmetals@gmail.com

**Comment:**

Ban fossil fuels terminals in Portland. No more. Turn the future toward sustainable alternatives. Do it now.

---

Name: P Horter

Email: lacengh@yahoo.com

**Comment:**

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Gisela Ray

Email: giselaray@frontier.com

**Comment:**

We know that fossil fuels have to be phased out and soon. It would be utter folly then to spend precious resources on new infrastructure for those fuels. That money must instead be diverted to renewables. That's the future and the future needs to start now. Fossil fuel companies must not be allowed to bring new terminals and other new infrastructure to Portland or Oregon for that matter. If they do they will clamor to recoup their investment by recovering and selling ever more fossil fuels.

---

Name: Rachel Lewine

Email: rachel@lewine.net

**Comment:**

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Rachel Lewine

---

Name: Rachel Lewine

Email: rachel@lewine.net

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve

safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Rachel Lewine

---

Name: Katherine Gibson  
Email: ktdid3542@gmail.com

Comment:

What is it about NO that is not understood?!

---

Name: Susan Wechsler



Email: susanwechsler@comcast.net

Comment:

Please enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, and prevent ANY aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

We cannot afford to wait for others to act.

---

Name: Darrell Kay

Email: drcskay@gmail.com

Comment:

We the people do not want any new fossil fuel terminals in this region. Nor do we want expansions of any existing facilities. Conservation and conversion to renewable fuels should be promoted. We certainly DO NOT want to encourage more oil by rail in any way. We should actively decrease this disaster in the making before it strikes again!

---

Name: virginia feldman

Email: feldmanvi@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Portland Sustainability Council:

As a physician, mother, & grandmother, I urge you to enact a full ban on fossil fuel terminals—large or small. Please remember the 2015 Resolution—to ‘actively oppose’ new fossil fuel infrastructure.

Similarly, please remove the exception for new facilities that are <5 million gallons.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

And I urge you to strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals, through adding binding limits and safety criteria in re climate impacts in the City’s use review process.

And finally, please make your language precise to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating, thus increasing fossil fuel shipments through our city.

The City of Portland can be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could be at the forefront on the most pressing concern of our time.

---

Name: Barbara Krupnik-Goldman

Email: bkgold2@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Commissioners,

The revised version of the fossil fuel proposal is much improved, however it still needs improvement in the following areas:

- 1) Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City’s code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.
- 2) Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.
- 3) Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

In order to keep global warming under 2C and have a livable future, we need to immediately transition to clean, renewable energy sources. We can’t allow new multi-decade investments in fossil fuels that lock us into a world of climate chaos. Instead, we must draw the line to stop the growth of the fossil fuel industry, protect the health and safety of our community, and transition to a 100% renewable energy economy now!

Thank-you,

---

Name: Anne Hamburg

Email: akaseyh@yahoo.com

**Comment:**

New and expanded fossil fuel terminals are not a good idea for Portland. If this does end up happening, please ensure the fossil fuel industry has and can prove it has it's own spill and fire suppression crews on duty at all times and ready to respond within a few minutes...do not waste our fire bureau resources on it. Please increase renewable and/or safe energy sources.

---

**Name:** Shawn Looney

**Email:** looneys@involved.com

**Comment:**

Please enact a full ban on ALL new fossil fuel terminals, and strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals. Portland absolutely should not increase its fossil fuel infrastructure. Burning of fossil fuels is a huge contributor of global warming. We cannot afford to continue being part of the problem. Thank you.

---

**Name:** Martin Frazier

**Email:** martinfrazier52@gmail.com

**Comment:**

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

**Name:** Nancy Pfeiler

**Email:** nancypfeiler6@gmail.com

Comment:

I do not live in Portland. I live in Salem. We need you to continue to be the model for all cities in Oregon.

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: Kate Gessert

Email: [katerg@igc.org](mailto:katerg@igc.org)

Comment:

Dear Sirs:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City’s code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you! Best, Kate Gessert

---

Name: Annie McCuen

Email: [mccuen7691@comcast.net](mailto:mccuen7691@comcast.net)

Comment:

Please do everything in your power to reduce the dangers

created by oil-fossil fuel-industries, terminals, trains, reduce, eliminate.

---

Name: Jan Madill

Email: jan@janmadill.com

Comment:

Please ban all new fossil fuel terminals. Also strengthen restrictions on existing terminals and do NOT allow any overall increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. For future generations we need to move now to renewable energy.

---

Name: Christine Yun

Email: cypdx@gmail.com

Comment:

I would like City Council to consider the following:

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Jennifer Adkins

Email: azulclarojo@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original

intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: Laura M. Ohanian

Email: lmo@efn.org

Comment:

I want to thank the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the City to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland.”

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to five million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e., rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming,’ it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 — Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or



small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 — Remove the exception for new facilities that are five million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 — Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 — Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now, more than ever, the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Laura M. Ohanian

---

Name: Neal Keefer

Email: nvkeefer@msn.com

Comment:

Please enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Please strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Please take steps to prevent any aggregate increase in fossil

fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Dave King

Email: landd\_2@q.com

Comment:

The resolution gave me hope that there would be no infrastructure built and the existing facilities would be grandfathered but not added to. That's what I expect the ordinance to provide. Please don't cave.

Climate is changing now, please don't speed it up with new carbon.

---

Name: Joseph Meyers

Email: dearsmileyjoe@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to

the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Joe Meyers

---

Name: Barbara Bartschi  
Email: bartschi@imagina.com

Comment:

Ban all fossil fuel terminals. We don't need any more pollution. We already are dealing with the mistakes of Hanford! We are running out of time – we need to think of our children's future.

Barbara Bartschi

---

Name: marjory bryan

Email: djinstigatah@gmail.com

Comment:

Please, enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Angelica Pray

Email: angelicapray@yahoo.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the

size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Angelica Pray

---

Name: Tracy Ceravolo  
Email: cyclwomn@yahoo.com

Comment:

There is no reason to expand fossil fuel infrastructure. It is a dying, outdated industry which is ruining our environment all for greed. We must invest in renewable energy infrastructure like we are at war with Climate Change! This must happen, and the sooner we start, the less painful it will be. Portland must be a leader in this message to the country and the world. No more fossil fuel infrastructure AT ALL.

---

Name: Dolores Wood

Email: pgna\_greening@yahoo.com

Comment:

Fossil fuels are proven harmful to our health and safety. I advocate for clean air, soil and water, and against increased transport of fossil fuel, and against new storage facilities for fossil fuels. I advocate for clean energy, and for restoration of polluted areas. I advocate for maintenance, and upgrading, but not expansion of existing fossil fuel facilities.

---

Name: Joy Mamoyac

Email: salmonberries@msn.com

Comment:

As a long time Oregonian who loves her state I am VERY concerned about fossil fuel terminals whether they are large or small infrastructures. There needs to be a ban in place, When you consider the fires, derailments, environmental disasters and explosions that have happened as in Mosier it is very dangerous to all Oregonians on so many levels. We need this ban to prevent future loss of life and damage to our ecosystem. It's not a matter of "if" these dangerous events will happen but "when"! We need to give careful thought when considering any expansions to existing terminals. You have the responsibility and DUE diligence to protect The state of Oregon as a whole!

---

Name: Mary McGaughey

Email: marymccaughey@yahoo.com

**Comment:**

Oregon has just voted for Clean Energy. To move forward with sustainable, non-polluting energy. We, the whole world is working to divest from dirty oil. Many nations have signed on to the 2016 Paris Climate Agreement, even China! Building terminals to transport oil to Asia will 'fly in the face' of our commitment to eliminate oil as the major energy source of the world. Backward is not where We are going!

---

Name: Fraser Rasmussen

Email: rasmussenf43@gmail.com

**Comment:**

I am requesting that by regulation the city of Portland will remain free of any new fossil fuel terminals. That city will not accept any amount of crude oil shipments to be stored or processed within its boundaries.

---

Name: Elle West

Email: appleface25@yahoo.com

**Comment:**

fossil fuels are now unnecessary and unwanted. for a fuel company to make a decision based on profit that is projected is irresponsible and NOW life threatening. WE DO NOT WANT OIL, WE WANT A FUTURE.

---

Name: Steve Elliot

Email: secondselliot@peoplepc.com

**Comment:**

Climate change is real. Staying the course is obviously unacceptable as it will only hasten the pace of global warming, causing more catastrophic storms, and loss of plant and animal species. One of the greatest causes of global warming is from the use of fossil fuels in internal combustion engines.

New infrastructure for fossil fuel extraction, transport, storage, and refining indicate a willingness to go forward to planet disaster. This is unacceptable. We must transition to other sources of energy if we are going to have a livable planet for our grandchildren's grandchildren.

---

Name: Paul Spindel

Email: pspindel@msn.com

Comment:

Hi.

I am writing you to ask that:

1. Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.
2. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
3. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

We can do better. Be leaders.

Thank you

---

Name: Natalie Reich

Email: natmobile@comcast.net

Comment:

I know there is ample evidence that continuing to frack oil and harvest coal, transport and burn these fuels is a sure road to utter disaster and we may already be past the point of no return. I know there will be earth scientists and environmentalists presenting the numbers -temperatures, atmospheric ppm, methane, CO2, etc. This is simply an emotional appeal that our city stay consistent with its stated commitment to ban ALL FOSSIL FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND T RANSPORT WITH NO LOOPHOLES OR EXCEPTIONS.



Name: Tony and Phyllis DeCristofaro

Email: pdecrist@yahoo.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous

fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Tony and Phyllis DeCristofaro

---

Name: Glenna Hayes

Email: gahportand@yahoo.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to

another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City's intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City's fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City's 2015 Resolution, "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,  
Glenna Hayes  
7254 SW 53rd Av  
Portland, OR. 97219

---

Name: Monica Mueller

Email: monica.mueller@pdx.edu

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. I encourage the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

- Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
- Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thanks in advance for considering these changes.

---

Name: Dana Brown

Email: danaconsulting@comcast.net

Comment:

Dear Mayor and City Council Members –

This is your opportunity to leave an historic legacy for future Portlanders. Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, strengthen restrictions on expansions at existing terminals and prevent any increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

There is only one way forward to a future that will be sustainable for humanity and all life on the planet. Be the leaders you hoped to be. Thank you!

---

Name: Emily Platt

Email: platte@ohsu.edu

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice movement. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

---

Name: Pennellope Allee

Email: pennellope99@yahoo.com

Comment:

I support a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. We should be urgently moving away from fossil fuel dependency, and the oil companies have the resources to do so and develop clean energy. The only thing preventing them from doing so is greed. If we make fossil fuel extraction and use less accessible and profitable, they will be forced to invest in the cleaner, safer alternatives. They will not do it willingly, therefore, it is up to us to force the redirection of effort and investment through our actions and legislation. The City of Portland has the power to change the energy/climate paradigm. Embrace this opportunity to be leaders and energy policy shapers for the betterment of our local and global environments.

---

Name: Carolyn Stuart

Email: touchmonk@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am n full agreement with all of these points!

Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City’s code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

---

Name: Colleen McNally-Murphy

Email: cmcnallymurphy@gmail.com

Comment:

To whom it may concern:

It is time for Portland to reclaim its role as a leader in green infrastructure and renewable energy. To that end, I write to urge you to:

1. Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.
2. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
3. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you very much.

---

Name: Eileen Fromer

Email: efromer@msn.com

Comment:

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland”.

Although this draft prohibits new larger bulk terminals, it still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided that the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine).

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminals as ‘non-conforming’, it still needs to strengthen the regulations on the size and type of expansion to pre-existing terminals. It is not clear from the draft if there is any binding limit to potential expansion at existing bulk fossil fuel terminals. The City’s intention with its 2015 Resolution was to ensure that changes to the City’s fossil fuel infrastructure would be used to improve safety, seismic resiliency, and the use of lower-carbon fuels.

I want the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.

2 – Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

Additionally, allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.

3 – Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City’s non-conforming use review process.

4 – Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever the City of Portland has the opportunity to