

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,
Eileen Fromer

Name: Daniel Senic
Email: euromerican@msn.com

Comment:

I am writing to voice my opposition to any expansion of fossil fuel transport through my beloved city.

I moved to Portland in 2009 not because of job opportunities but because of Portland's reputation as a leader in all environmental issues. This is important to me because I am a person of faith and as such am called to environmental stewardship. Our miracle planet, it's vegetation, oceans, atmosphere, climate, humans and animals are all part of God's creation and are thus good and sacred.

Corporate greed for profit threatens all that is perfect in it's originally created state and our Rose City should not give into temptation and intimidation and thereby aid in the destruction of creation. This city, country, and world has more than enough acres of parking lots and rooftops for solar panels and plenty of wind to go around to spin countless wind turbines. Not to mention other renewables. I ask my city to stand on the side of righteousness and I want 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. 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: Daniel Senic

Email: euromerican@msn.com

Comment:

I am writing to voice my opposition to any expansion of fossil fuel transport through my beloved city.

I moved to Portland in 2009 not because of job opportunities but because of Portland's reputation as a leader in all environmental issues. This is important to me because I am a person of faith and as such am called to environmental stewardship. Our miracle planet, it's vegetation, oceans, atmosphere, climate, humans and animals are all part of God's creation and are thus good and sacred.

Corporate greed for profit threatens all that is perfect in it's originally created state and our Rose City should not give into temptation and intimidation and thereby aid in the destruction of creation. This city, country, and world has more than enough acres of parking lots and rooftops for solar panels and plenty of wind to go around to spin countless wind turbines. Not to mention other renewables. I ask my city to stand on the side of righteousness and I want 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. 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: Ineke Deruyter

Email: ideruyter@hotmail.com

Comment:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please 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.

Thank you very much, Ineke Deruyter

Name: Sheila Golden

Email: goldensheila6@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,

Sheila Golden

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: 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,

John Nettleton

Name: Sharon Labreck

Email: sharonlabreck@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,

Sharon Labreck

Name: Jason Fiske

Email: jasondanielfiske@gmail.com

Comment:

Let Portland live up to its potential by taking this "risk" and pioneering the standards for other American cities.

Name: Stephen Bachhuber

Email: srbachhuber1@gmail.com

Comment:

To BPS,

In regard to the possible ban on fossil fuel terminals, keep it strong.

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: Mona McNeil

Email: monarandy@monarandy.com

Comment:

Please protect our Oregon/Washington environment and people.
Ban all new fossil fuel terminals.

Name: Maya Jarrad

Email: maya@350pdx.org

Comment:

Congratulations to all of you at the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for your 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, and to truly protecting Portland and its residents from further health, safety, and climate risks.

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: Susan Millhauser

Email: susanm@spiretech.com

Comment:

Thank you for the hard work done to date to develop the draft Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. I am writing today to encourage the addition of further restrictions on size and expansion of existing terminals to better meet the intent of the original City Council resolution, 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 encourage the City and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small, as clearly stated in the 2015 resolution.

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 is the time to tighten up these amendments to ensure Portland's people and the natural environment are protected from fossil fuel transport and the location and expansion of terminals within our community. 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.

Thank you for your consideration!

Name: Judy Romano

Email: judy92809@gmail.com

Comment:

We want 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.

Name: Susan Haywood
Email: susansaphone2@yahoo.com

Comment:

We must have a full ban all new fossil fuel terminals of any size. There must be no exceptions; we must not allow any more trains fossil fuels, especially Bakken crude, through our city (and hopefully the state).

As it is now, trains dragging oil tanks run frighteningly close to Max tracks and our freeways. We cannot afford to increase the risk of explosions that would harm so many people.

In addition, we should prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. We are on the confluence of two rivers and risk pollution that can move far and wide via their waters. It was wise to pull out of the Pembina project last year. Let's shrink our risks and not allow ourselves to be used by big corporations to export their foul products.

We need to strengthen restrictions on any and all expansions at existing terminals by adding binding limits and criteria for safety and climate impacts in Portland's non-conforming use review process. In fact, it would be great to reduce terminals now in existence for our own safety.

Name: Mark Grossman
Email: grossman_mark@yahoo.com

Comment:

My family lived in Oregon for years and value its environmental

health. We ask for a full ban on new fossil fuel terminals of an size. Existing terminals should not be expanded. Fossil fuels are destroying the atmosphere and the oceans – let's not contribute to this any further.

Name: satya vayu

Email: satyavayu@gmail.com

Comment:

I appreciate that the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability incorporated 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 strong 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 urge the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to 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. The exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less needs to be removed as it 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.

Also, restrictions need to be strengthened 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 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,

Satya Vayu

Name: Barbara Manildi

Email: bmanildi@earthlink.net

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: Denise Busch

Email: standleydm@involved.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: Cecelia Hurley

Email: diablaella@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear City of Portland,

Please consider this ban. I am a tax payer and natime Portlander. 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.

These are the things I would like you to cinsider while making these important and impact full decisions.

Kind Regards,
Cecelia Hurley
7465 N Huron
PORTLAND OR
97203

Name: William Whitaker
Email: wwhitak@boisestate.edu

Comment:

I am an Oregon grandfather concerned about leaving a heritage of a habitable world for grandchildren everywhere. We must keep carbon in the ground.

I urge 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.

It is essential 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.

We must prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: David Kreisman
Email: dkreisman@hotmail.com

Comment:

It is extremely important that Portland NOT weaken this precedent setting policy! For future generations and the livability our planet I strongly urge the Portland City Council 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.

Sincerely
David Kreisman

Name: Mary Rose
Email: zambonirose@gmail.com

Comment:

It is time for us to boldly step into the change that needs to happen now. Portland has a chance right now to lead the way in the transition toward renewable energy. We cannot do so if we don't take the leap of banning new oil infrastructure. Please refine the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments to make this change possible.

I stand with many other Portlanders who 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.

Sincerely,
Mary Rose

Name: Michael Mitton

Email: mmitton@nvgbell.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,

Michael and Marilyn Mitton

Name: Therese L

Email: harvestofpeace@yahoo.com

Comment:

I am writing to urge a full ban on new fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. While I actually live in Washington, I follow issues of fossil fuel infrastructure and transportation in our region very closely. Since moving to Washington 3 years ago, I have done nothing in my community but fight the greedy oil companies that want to destroy my neighborhood. I feel like I am just treading water, trying to keep the place I love from falling into the wrong hands. Meanwhile, other important issues such as unemployment, homelessness, habitat restoration etc. go unresolved. Please, put an end to these constant fossil fuel projects so we can get back to work on other important issues! Thank you.

Name: Devin Kelly

Email: devin.scott.kelly@gmail.com

Comment:

Portland does not need new fossil fuel terminals. The cycle must

be broken by restricting the implementation of new terminals and expand renewable energy.

Name: Craig Heverly

Email: heverlyjc@hevanet.com

Comment:

"No" means "No". Make it clean. Make it simple. No fossil fuel infrastructure. Period.

Thank you for your work.

Name: Lynda Byers

Email: lebyers484@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: Mirabai Peart

Email: mirabaipeart@gmail.com

Comment:

I want to say 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 appreciate that 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.

More than anything, the city's responsibility is to ensure a liveable climate for our future generations. All signs and studies are showing that climate change is moving on us faster than we want to acknowledge. If Portland can pass a true strong resolution on this then we will be taking one step in the right direction as a city, towards a reasonable future, and towards taking full responsibility to help reduce the severity of this global crisis.

This visionary resolution of 2015 called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland".

Although the current 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. We really need to do this, for now, and for all future generations. Let's make a resolution that Portland can be proud of.

Sincerely,
Mirabai Peart

Name: Ryan Francesconi

Email: hello@are-f.com

Comment:

Hello!

Let's be a world example and get this right. Full ban on fossil Fuel transport!!

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.

Name: Diana Richardson

Email: licketysplit777@gmail.com

Comment:

I will not take up time and space to delineate all the reasons for insisting upon a FULL BAN on all new fossil fuel, large and small, I insist upon removing any exceptions to proposed new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less.

You must strengthen restrictions on existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as safety measures and criteria for climate impacts.

Lastly, you need to add language to smaller, “related” terminals from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

I express these instructions as a Citizen Protector of the Earth and Water under my stewardship as a citizen of Cascadia and of the geopolitical territories in which I reside.

Name: Robin Vesey

Email: jack-robin@spiritone.com

Comment:

No new fossil fuel terminals should be allowed or built in Portland, nor in any part of Oregon. The city should enact laws to forbid the transport of fossil fuels via rail or roads here, due to

their dangers and impacts on our climate.

Name: Rick Rappapor

Email: rick@rickrappaport.com

Comment:

Hello, I realize that most of this comment is part of a sample letter written by others who have put in much more time and energy researching the published staff report and recommendations. I know it sounds like rubber stamping someone else's thoughts but why not? It says what I want to say better and more knowledgeably than me fumbling around and making factual or quasi legal errors.

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: Kim Fortin
Email: fortinkim@gmail.com

Comment:

It’s time 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.

Name: Ruby Karen Annette Wilcox

Email: rubykwilcox@yahoo.com

Comment:

My name is Ruby Karen A Wilcox and I live in Portland. I support a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals in my city. Please please protect our environment! Please protect our home. Our Planet suffers from our addiction to fossil fuels, which come at such a brutal cost to our water, our people, our future. Please support other means of generating energy and fuels. It is time!

Name: Mary Mandeville

Email: k9chiro@aol.com

Comment:

Thank you for incorporating public comments on the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendment. I'd like to say that I am in support of a FULL BAN.

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,
Mary Mandeville

Name: mary lane
Email: ryla2015@gmail.com

Comment:

City of Portland leaders:

Portland needs a FULL BAN on ALL new fossil fuel terminals, large or SMALL!

Please do the job you were elected to do: keep our environment and people safe and do what Portlanders want you to do!!!

Name: Nicole Martin
Email: PixiStyxNM@aol.com

Comment:

Tell the City of Portland we want 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.

Name: Terrie Burdette

Email: pdxterrie@gmail.com

Comment:

As an East St John's resident I live in view of a busy rail line and often think about the danger of oil transporting train cars moving through my neighborhood. Besides the potential for human injury or death is the threat of environmental damage to nearby Smith and Bybee Lakes. We are a PNW city and should be leading the way by example to fully ban ALL new fossil fuel terminals of ANY size.

Name: Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey

Email: egraserlindsey@gmail.com

Comment:

Let's leave our children with a future. Let's do the right thing and turn from fossil fuels.

Name: Eliot Cole

Email: eliot.cole1@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: Mikel Gisi

Email: loveofthewild@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: Fiona Yun

Email: fiona.yun00@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: Marsha Hanchrow

Email: machiya@centurylink.net

Comment:

It's not that I don't care about the price of gas, I do. I want its price to include to include all its costs. Those would be, among many others, the far more expensive processes necessary to get the remaining less accessible oil out of the ground, the money that should be reimbursed to FEMA for the cost of every "natural" disaster caused or exacerbated by drilling or oil transport, the cost of every improvement to stormwater systems needed because too much land is covered by impermeable roadway, the cost of almost every action/war in the Middle East, and more that I'm not up to arguing on a tiny phone.

I have a car; I drive it on occasion. It is not entitled to cheap gas, nor am I, nor is anyone.

Please do not allow any more oil terminals in Portland.

Name: Sandy Polishuk

Email: sandypolishuk@gmail.com

Comment:

I very much appreciate the opportunity to have input to your committee before you submit your report to City Council and I thank you for the improvements you have made to the initial draft. However, I think the current proposal still needs more improvement to be in accord with the original intent of the resolution passed last Fall.

The point was no expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure. This means no new terminals and no expansion of the current ones! Seems pretty clear and simple to me.

I also think it's very important that all the current fossil fuel storage be seismically improved. We all know the 'big one' is coming eventually, and it could be sooner rather than later. We must protect our city and river from fuel spills that will cause contamination and possible explosions and fires.

We need to be sure that there is no increase in trains carrying oil. Ideally, we should stop them all. They are a danger to our health and safety!

Name: Rebecca Parker

Email: beccasuzanne2020@gmail.com

Comment:

I would like a full ban on all fossil fuel terminals- NO exceptions. And no expansions on existing terminals- add binding limits. NO increased infrastructure!

The money could be better spent for health care or schools.

We need criteria for safety and climate impacts. Lets stop the short sightedness.

For any existing terminals, I'd like to see taxes placed to help cover the expensive chronic health costs of the crude oil.

Name: Jody Bleyle

Email: bleyle@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,
Jody Bleyle

Name: Susan Buswell
Email: tamaracktales@aol.com

Comment:

It truly is time to start downsizing the fossil fuel industry until it no longer exists...not add to it. The dangers of contamination to our rather pristine environment in the Pacific Northwest are too great to list and you are already aware of them. Please stop the

expansion of terminals, downsize the existing ones with intent to close. Thank you for your interest in our environmental health.

Name: Jerry Smith

Email: digjerrydig@gmail.com

Comment:

Fossil fuel companies profit from poisoning the planet. They must be stop. Their bomb trains and explosive pipelines are a severe danger and have to be stopped.

Name: Amanda Schueler

Email: amanda.schueler@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Mayor and Commissioners,

I urge you to ban all fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. Here are the specifics of my request:

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.

I want Portland to continue to be a leader in protecting our precious planet. Fossil fuels must stay in the ground if we hope to slow and reverse the cataclysmic effects of climate change. I urge you to be a Protector!

Name: Collin Murphy

Email: Bleuoiseau@comcast.net

Comment:

Please, NO, and I mean NO such facilities belong in Portland or anywhere, for that matter!

Name: Linda Levin

Email: linvin@comcast.net

Comment:

As a resident of Portland I urge you to adhere to the visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015. 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 – Actively oppose new infrastructure by enacting a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small.

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.

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 by adding binding limits and include 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.

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

Sincerely,

Name: Scott and Heidi Trinkle

Email: dwerger@gmail.com

Comment:

It is time to enact a full ban on ALL new fossil fuel terminals in or around the city of Portland. An exception for facilities that allow five million or fewer gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as the Bakken crude oil must never be allowed.

By using the City's non-conforming review process, it is time to strengthen restrictions on the expansion of existing terminals with binding limits as well as with the strongest safety and climate impacts criteria possible. We know the damage that the mining for and burning of fossil fuels creates to people, for our communities (especially the poorest in the direct impact zones) and for the planet as a whole. It is, therefore, a must that the fossil fuel infrastructure for the city of Portland be limited to what already exists with a future goal of downsizing it and then putting Portland (along with the state of Oregon) on a path to 100% renewables in the coming decades.

We chose to retire from the US Army in what we saw as the environmentally progressive city of Portland, OR. We hope the Planning and Sustainability Commission continues along this path of sanity and sustainability for every residents' well being and it begins with a full BAN on fossil fuel terminals.

Name: Kat Majors

Email: mouser1@gmail.com

Comment:

Please, put the people and our health before Corporate profits.

Name: Anne Halpin

Email: pnwsun13@gmail.com

Comment:

We all live downstream, and we say NO, NO, and NO to:

-Any new fossil fuel terminals!

-Expansions allowed at existing terminals!

-Additional fossil fuel infrastructure!

Even those of us who technically live upstream from Portland recognize that when it comes to the question of fossil fuels and their impact on the earth and on future generations, we all live downstream. Now is the time to shift away from fossil fuel dependence and toward more sustainable energy systems. Oregon can lead the way toward a more healthy and sustainable future! And the rest of Oregon looks to Portland to be at the forefront! Please say NO, NO, and NO when it comes to bringing more dirty and dangerous fossil fuels into Portland's ports! Thank you.

Name: Beth Slikas

Email: bethslikas@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,
Beth Slikas

Name: Kyle Collins
Email: kalecollins85@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: Luke Anavi

Email: lanavi@ymail.com

Comment:

Please enact a full and binding ban on all new fossil fuel infrastructure projects anywhere in the city limits of Portland. This is important for both symbolic and practical reasons and will once again make Portland a leader in the movement to address the climate change crisis. Thank you for considering my comment.

Name: Ed Kaiel

Email: ekaiel@pcc.edu

Comment:

I agree with this analysis and requests from 350 PDX. Stand up for the common good of the planet and all it's inhabitants.

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,

Ed and Linda Kaiel

Name: Molly Brown

Email: mollybrown@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you for your courageous stances and resolution on behalf of life and Earth. Please keep going, setting an example for the rest of the nation.

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: Mary Lou Putman

Email: mlputman@gmail.com

Comment:

Remove land use exemptions for oil re-refiners and oil recyclers i.e. APES and ORRICO. It is far dirtier than crude oil refining and They should not be here! Washington wouldn't let them process— why does Oregon?

Name: Michael Jordan

Email: mikejord65@msn.com

Comment:

Dear City of Portland,

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: kima garrison

Email: kimasuegarrison@gmail.com

Comment:

It's time for Portland to take a bold stand against fossil fuel companies, and let them go the way of the dinosaur!

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: Cass Martinez

Email: cass@zzz.com

Comment:

I will be in the audience on September 13, 2016 at 1900 SW 4th, to listen to the people of Portland insist on follow-through on the City's policy of no new fossil fuel storage or transport.

Destructive change due to fossil fuel use is evident and on the rise. I am willing to do my part to use less, and I want city government to do its part also. i thank the mayor and commissioners for their earnest efforts with this policy.

Name: Toni Noll

Email: toninoll@yahoo.com

Comment:

NO, to fossil fuels in Oregon! Stay Out!

Name: Patrick McCulley

Email: pmcculle@gmail.com

Comment:

I don't think that this should be a hard decision. The fossil fuel industry might provide a few jobs. But real investment in renewable energy could provide more and sustain more jobs. Favoring the fossil fuel industry, an industry that knowingly promotes ignorance of anthropogenic climate change, is tantamount to promoting destruction of the human species. Its not a hard decision. Divest from all fossil fuel infrastructure now so that our descendents can have a viable future.

Name: Kayleigh O'Hara

Email: kayleigh.marchand@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: Hyung Nam

Email: hyung_n@yahoo.com

Comment:

I urge 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.

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: Willie Levenson

Email: willielevenson@outlook.com

Comment:

In regards to the above subject please:

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: Amy Robbins

Email: arobbins1966@yahoo.com

Comment:

City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

It is time for Portland look forward. We know fossil fuels are not part of a healthy future. The Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments

need to be strengthened. No more fossil fuel terminals of any size and no fossil fuel infrastructure of any kind should be built. The old should be phased out. There is no better town to lead the way to renewable energy than Portland. We can do this.

What are we waiting for?

Sincerely,

Amy Robbins

Name: Mary Fifield

Email: strwrytr@yahoo.com

Comment:

It is imperative that commissioners set a standard for leadership on moving our economy off of fossil fuels as soon as possible. I urge you to ban all new fossil fuel terminals, regardless of size, strengthen restrictions on expansions of existing terminals to account for safety and climate hazards, and limit the aggregate fossil fuel structure to its current capacity. We cannot afford to be incentivizing this kind of energy activity at a time when we face such dire consequences from climate disruption. A decision to restrict fossil fuel infrastructure is a sound long-term business and public health decision.

Name: Esther Nelson

Email: ehnelson0620@yahoo.com

Comment:

Please pass with amendments. Would be so right, so Portland.

Name: Jan Zuckerman

Email: zuckerez@hotmail.com

Comment:

Thank you very much for the work you have done to to listen to the public and make changes to your original draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. There is still work to be done to "actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure. A FULL

ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small does exactly that- opposes new fossil fuel infrastructure. Allowing facilities under 5 million gallons makes no sense, in fact, it waters down the resolution and sends a message to our children that we believe the fossil fuel industry still has a right to poison their atmosphere a little bit and that continuing on a path of relying on CO2 producing energy is good for their future. Also, any more infrastructure, no matter how small, will increase the oil transportation into our city, which right now, is at dangerous levels.

In addition, we must have binding limits on future expansion of existing terminals and make safety and climate impacts on our city a priority in the non-conforming use review process.

This is our opportunity, as a city, to set an example for the rest of the world, by being bold and brave. Please make the improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments that send the right message to our children that their lives are worth protecting and that we are ready and excited about moving in an energy direction that demonstrates this.

Thank you.

Name: marilee dea

Email: marileedea@comcast.net

Comment:

The Cully Association of Neighbors represents the most diverse neighborhood in Oregon, it is dedicated to working cooperatively to build a safe and livable neighborhood. The UP tracks run through Cully and are adjacent to schools parks and homes and business, recently UP increased the number of unit oil trains running through Cully, especially at night- we request an immediate moratorium on these potentially dangerous trains and terminals that support the shipment of more Fossil Fuels. The ban on all new fossil fuel infrastructure was applauded by Cully, changing the intention and to increase of facilities allowing 5,000,000 more gallons goes in opposition of what the city of Portland passed and what Cully Association of Neighbors desires and intended.

Name: James Anderson

Email: sweepingit@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: Wayne Lammers

Email: wplring1@mac.com

Comment:

The Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments need to follow the original intent of the 2015 Resolution, which was to "actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure. That means it should include a full ban on new fossil fuel terminals, without an exception for smaller terminals. Existing terminals must not be allowed to expand, and must be subject to review for safety and climate impacts. The Amendments should also include language that prevents existing fossil fuel facilities of any kind, whether officially designated as "terminals" or not, from being leveraged in any way to increase shipments through the Portland area. To "actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure means all of these things. It does not mean to allow the infrastructure to grow in smaller increments or in previously unanticipated ways. The climate crises means that we must be putting the brakes on fossil fuel use as rapidly as we can, not further abetting or even accelerating it.

Name: Zach Reuter

Email: zpreuter08@aim.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,
Zach Reuter

Name: Anandi Gefroh
Email: anandi@anandi.com

Comment:

We need to break our addiction to fossil fuels. Portland citizens and it's council can and should lead the nation in groundbreaking policies that will help us to develop new and sustainable energy resources, not polluting and dangerous ones.

Name: Andrew Crosby
Email: andrewcrosby1@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Members of the Portland City Council –

Last November, you adopted a Fossil Fuel resolution that placed Portland in the vanguard of leadership toward a future that is not dominated by carbon combustion. It was a bold and historic action. Such actions are essential if we are to have any livable future at all. It is appropriate that Portland, along with other nodes of leadership like Vermont and California, set the tone for the rest of the nation.

Now it is time for you to show integrity by adopting regulations

that fully implement the clear intent of your resolution. At this critical time in the fight against impending climate chaos, any waffling on your part is unacceptable.

My testimony is simple. Please adopt strong regulations/ordinances WITHOUT loopholes and compromises.

Specifically –

(1) Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small with NO exception for smaller facilities (less than 5 million gallons).

(2) Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals by adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. Strong requirements for seismic upgrades should be required for any expansions and/or modifications of existing terminals.

(3) Prohibit any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you for considering my testimony.

Andrew Crosby

Name: Rachel Jesequel

Email: rachel_michelle@hotmail.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,

Rachel Jesequel

Name: Dena Turner

Email: denaturn62@gmail.com

Comment:

To City of Portland:

I would like to encourage the City of Portland to do the following in order to ban fossil fuel infrastructure and to protect our City and our planet earth from further degradation due to dirty energy and climate change:

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: Tim Norgren

Email: t_norgren@riseup.net

Comment:

Hi folks,

MY name's Tim Norgren, and I'm a member of the building trades through Laborer's local 737. I know from a few YEARS of conversations with others in the trades that I speak for many other workers in the Laborers, Carpenters, iron workers, pipefitters, and operating engineers unions (as well as a few staffers) who are afraid (or too busy with kids, work, etc.) to testify openly, when I ask you to pursue nothing less than a complete ban on new or expanded fossil fuel infrastructure, regardless of the size or whether some infrastructure already exists! This should include LNG! Northwest Natural has no current plans to expand its storage capacity and if we're to

transition away from a fuel that leaks so much methane it's effectively worse than coal, then there's no need to think they ever will.

I remember when earthquakes in Oklahoma were unheard of. Now thanks to fracking there are increasing levels of quakes including two this year which were over five on the richter scale! We want jobs we can feel good about; not jobs that insure more children and families like our own will be hurt in earthquakes, exposed to poisonous water, or fooled into eating crops irrigated by such water, as has been the case in California and elsewhere! To add to the risks any new or expanded infrastructure would increase volatile tanker traffic through the region as well, and that is clearly not something any of us want. Mosier was more than enough warning, and the city council has already banned such an increase.

Please insure that these bans will be tangibly effective by including binding limits and criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.

Thank you. Sincerely, Tim Norgren

Name: katy mcfadden

Email: katytmcfadden@gmail.com

Comment:

Let us help keep it in the ground. This means no major transport, no export terminals, no anything to do with continuing the fossil fuel industry. Our task is to dismantle fossil dependence and rebuild with renewables.

Name: Harlan Shober

Email: harlan_shober@msn.com

Comment:

It took political courage and cost political capital to get to this point. Don't go weak on us now. Finish the job.

Watch this: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kxryv2XrnqM>.

Imagine how foolish timid action taken now will look in 15 years.

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.

Name: David Kennedy

Email: dkennedy@350pdx.org

Comment:

I was so proud of my city in the fall when city council passed the resolution banning all new fossil fuel infrastructure. I originally moved to Portland because it was known as a leader on climate issues, and it has mostly lived up to that. This resolution was a major step in the right direction, and showed the kind of environmental leadership that I've come to love about this city.

I appreciate the work that the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability has done during the process of shifting the resolution toward policy. The most current draft represents significant progress from the first version. That being said, I feel that there is still more work to be done:

1) There should NOT be an exception for facilities under 5 million gallons. First of all, that is still a huge amount of fossil

fuels. Secondly, The resolution originally stated that we would “actively oppose” fossil fuel infrastructure, not allow loopholes for more of those facilities to pop up, as long as they’re smaller.

2) There should be stronger language to prevent expansion of existing terminals. The lack of such language would represent another loophole by which fossil fuel infrastructure could grow within our city.

Portland has long been a leader in climate action. I love that about my city. Please continue to take bold action by making this policy binding and strong.

Thank you,
David Kennedy

Name: Charles Brod
Email: cubrod@gmail.com

Comment:

Please amend the draft resolution so that no construction of large or small fossil fuel facilities may be undertaken in Portland; restrict expansion of existing facilities; and prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in the city of Portland.

Name: Jordan Lewis
Email: jordan@allclassical.org

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: Becky Gardner

Email: gbeckyl@msn.com

Comment:

No new fossil fuel anything anywhere in Oregon! As a native Oregonian I feel our beautiful state should lead the way in eliminating all fossil fuel businesses and encourage other states to follow our example. Show the nation and the world that we care about the future of our children, grandchildren, and the future of the planet! Oregon rocks!!!

Name: E Reid

Email: exreid@gmail.com

Comment:

This is no time to hedge your bets; you can't be timid in the face of global crisis. Please just:

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.

Do this, and your great-grandchildren will thank you.

Name: Angela Zehava

Email: angela.zehava@stanfordalumni.org

Comment:

Dear City of Portland:

Thank you for your attention to this very important matter. If you haven't read Naomi Klein's book, *This Changes Everything*, I want to tell you the most important statement in the entire book. She says that the energy companies who want to produce this dirty energy and send it to Asia are heavily leveraged, and meanwhile the Saudis are keeping energy prices low and China is turning toward solar and other renewables in a big way. What this means is that if we can hold the line on West Coast fossil fuel terminals for just two years, that business model will DIE. It will no longer be feasible, and the U.S. government will have no choice but to turn toward renewables. We CAN win this. We need you.

Name: Bethany Thomas

Email: 33bethany@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Commissioners,

As you consider the proposed draft of the code changes, I ask that you choose to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals and infrastructure in Portland. The risks to both human and environmental health and safety are too high, too costly. Please position Portland as a continued leader in progressive environmental policies. We can lead the way! Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

Bethany Shetterly Thomas

Name: Patricia Mizutani

Email: pmizutan@yahoo.com

Comment:

To: Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Re: Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments

The City of Portland has the opportunity to take a historical stand

by enacting a full ban on new fossil fuel terminals.

Human use of fossil fuels is causing global climate change. Due to rising temperatures, there are more severe weather systems, infectious disease are spreading beyond their usual latitudes, and rising temperatures are threatening our water supplies and food production. For those of us with chronic conditions such as emphysema and heart disease, rising temperatures are compromising our well being and will make our day-to-day existence more and more intolerable. All of us want a world which is safe and secure for ourselves, our children, and generations far into the future. For this to happen, we must act now to stop the expansion of fossil fuel use.

We as a city need to do our part in these ways:

- Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. 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. We do not need new LNG storage in Portland.
- 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.
- Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Thank you for allowing we the public to voice our concerns.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia Mizutani, MD

Name: Dana Weintraub
Email: mrdanaweintraub@gmail.com

Comment:

I just have one comment I'd like to make:

KEEP IT IN THE GROUND!

Short, and to the point.

Name: Danny Thiemann
Email: dgt211@gmail.com

Comment:

Hello, My name is Danny thiemann. I am a poverty law attorney in the Hillsboro area, but I live and vote in portland. My clients tell me that warmer summers cause them greater heat stress as they work outside, where temperatures in the sun can reach 15 degrees warmer than the temperature listed in the newspaper for that day. Warmer summers also cause parents who move around for work to pull their children out of school earlier than planned as unseasonably temperatures change job start dates that no longer coincide with the school year. These warmer summers are linked to Oregons warmer climate and I recommend you enact a fossil fuel infrastructure policy that is as strong as possible to reduce impact of climate change on poorest workers. Oregon, unlike California, does not have heat stress protections. Please strengthen restrictions on fossil fuel infrastructure.

Thank you!!

Name: Fiona Yun
Email: fiona.yun00@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: Sabolch Horvat

Email: sabolch.horvat@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.

While this proposal is much needed, I believe that the standards could be even stronger. Climate change has impacted our habitat greatly already and to avoid further disruptions it would be best if no new fossil fuel terminals were allowed regardless of size.

Thank you for listening,
Sabolch

Name: G. Gibson

Email: 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: Daniel Wasil

Email: wdan18@gmail.com

Comment:

Please do not put my children at risk. Do what you know is the right thing: ban all new fossil fuel terminals.

Name: Jennifer Gerlach

Email: gerlachfamily@comcast.net

Comment:

I strongly urge the City of Portland to 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: Mark Darienzo

Email: markdari@pacifier.com

Comment:

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.

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: Lynn Youngbar

Email: lynn@lynnyoungbar.com

Comment:

Dear Portland City Council Members,
Please fulfill the policy promise you made last year to not allow new fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. It was a bold move that sent an important message to the entire country. You must honor that policy through the city code. We do not need an exception for facilities of 5 million gallons or less. Any expansions allowed at existing terminals must happen only for local demand and include criteria for safety and climate impacts in the non-conforming use review process.
Thank you, Lynn Youngbar

Name: Noah Linschoten

Email: 89nlinschoten@gmail.com

Comment:

We do not need another dead end, unsustainable fuel. Instead of finding where to put this, we need to find another sustainable option entirely.

Name: Sascha Krader

Email: hungrytiger@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I was drawn into Portland City politics by the proposed Pembina terminal. I thought it seemed terribly short-sighted and anti-Portland-values to put a new fossil fuel terminal in the city. I still think that, and I believe the City Commissioners agree.

The code as currently written does not ban fossil fuel terminals, however. Please strengthen the code so it forbids all new fossil terminals, and forbids expansion of the current existing terminals.

I think that doing that will be in the spirit of what the commissioners voted for last year.

Thank you,

Name: Craig Perry

Email: theangrytoy@hotmail.com

Comment:

I support the following measures.

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: Eliza Lindsay

Email: guileless@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear City of Portland's Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for considering zoning code changes to address issues of fossil fuels. This is so very important.

Please adopt the following changes to the proposed fossil fuel policy code:

1 – Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. The City's code changes should not allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil. To do this we need to ban all new fossil fuel terminals.

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.

The future health of Portland and the world depends on the taking strong action now to address climate change. Let's join the global movement, step up, and step forward for all alive now and those to come.

Sincerely,

Eliza Lindsay

Name: Joseph Stenger

Email: joseph.stenger@gmail.com

Comment:

Please revise the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendment to remove exceptions for facilities under 5 million gallons. At this time of huge earthquake risk, new facilities of any size are overly dangerous to public health. In addition, I urge inclusion of language to prevent clustering and aggregating smaller terminals to circumvent size restrictions.

Our City should set the example on this crucial issue.

On behalf of my grandchildren, thanks!

Name: Debby Garman

Email: debbygarman@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.

And now 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.

I encourage you to take these steps to be champion leaders in taking care of your responsibilities to protect current and future citizens of this region.

Sincerely,

Debby Garman

Name: Andrea LePain

Email: aclepain@gmail.com

Comment:

Please ban ALL new fossil fuel infrastructure.

Portland already has a large fossil fuel handling and storage area.

The city’s reputation as “green” apparently doesn’t take this in to account. (Perhaps this should be publicized more.)

Portland is not only contributing in a significant way to climate change but also endangering the lives of all citizens in North Portland, along with the health of two rivers, with the present

infrastructure.

Your time would be better spent making sure that the tank farms and tracks already in place are prepared for disasters (i.e. earthquake, fire, sabotage). From where I live and stand directly across from this storage area, and from Hwy 30, it's plain to see that we are woefully unprepared.

Please do the right thing, both for our city and the planet.

Name: Rev. Mary Sue Evers

Email: pastor@chucc.org

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,
Rev. Mary Sue Evers
Cedar Hills United Church of Christ,
Portland, OR

Name: Daniel Yuhas
Email: daniel.yuhas@gmail.com

Comment:

I want to give my support to the following:

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

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.

best,

Name: Patricia Zoline

Email: ashlandmagic@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear PSC,

I applaud the creation of a fossil fuel ban and together with 350PDX would suggest the following amendments to the current draft code:

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

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.

sincerely,

Name: Kathryn Behrendt

Email: kbehrendt@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.

Name: Akash Singh

Email: sakash18@yahoo.com

Comment:

Portland hails itself as a green leader in a fossil fuel dependent economy. It would be the height of fatalistic hypocrisy to allow new fossil fuel infrastructure to be built and further entrench our dependence on fossil fuels when the first thing we need to accomplish is to be able to move away from them. A full ban and further restrictions are the only options to decrease our fossil fuel dependency, give a boost to a green economy, and mitigate the disastrous effects of climate change.

Name: Mary Murphy

Email: mkatem4@yahoo.com

Comment:

As a forth generation Portlander and MPH student in Environmental Systems and Human health, I strongly support the city of Portland taking the following actions:

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 for acting on behalf of us and future generations.

Name: Jordan Karr-Morse

Email: jordan@softboxfilms.com

Comment:

This is a great opportunity for Portland to take a bold stance on a

critical global issue. We need to enact a full ban on fossil fuel infrastructure. Let's make Brand Portland mean something!

Name: Linda Hayden

Email: linda.hayden3@gmail.com

Comment:

Please, listen to the people, the people who have entrusted you with our health and safety which is intrinsically connected with the health and well being of our planet. Enact a FULL BAN on all new fossil fuel terminals, Large or Small....How can we move on to clean and green if we keep getting mixed up with the dirty stuff....NO MORE FOSSIL Fuel infrastructures please!

Name: Claudia Montagne

Email: claudia.montagne@gmail.com

Comment:

The impacts of climate change on not only Portland but the world, and their disproportionate impacts on countries and individuals least responsible for these negative impacts tell me that climate justice is the issue of our times. Use of fossil fuels is at the root of this crisis. Our future, and the futures of the next generations is at stake. I have been watching our climate change for over 15 years now; it is real, it is accelerating. Portland and Oregon can take a leading progressive role in the change that is needed. I urge the commission to do its part by adopting this new code and strengthening it by banning all new fossil fuel terminals.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. Claudia Montagne

Name: nia hansen

Email: niabhansen@gmail.com

Comment:

I believe we're beyond the tipping point to control climate

change; we have existing terminals for fossil fuels...an argument can and has been made to reduce/curtail the use of this type of fuel that is so detrimental, even fatal to our children and our planet. The bigger issue is this...reduce, curtail the use of fossil fuels; short of that, we need to make it difficult to provide containment of these fuels. Please consider banning all terminals; ALL Terminal, large and small. At the very least, increase safety issues surrounding the terminals, and decrease climate control impacts.

Name: Robert Breaks

Email: bobthenatureguy@gmail.com

Comment:

I stand in solidarity with the Dakota and Navajo tribes in protesting the Dakota oil pipeline through four states in the midwest of America. In their spirit, I agree that the city of Portland needs to ban all new fossil fuel terminals and/or the expansion of existing ones. The city's code should not allow any unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels from passing through Portland. In addition, I favor no expansion of existing fossil fuel terminals or any increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: Robert Breaks

Email: bobthenatureguy@gmail.com

Comment:

I stand in solidarity with the Dakota and Navajo tribes in protesting the Dakota oil pipeline through four states in the midwest of America. In their spirit, I agree that the city of Portland needs to ban all new fossil fuel terminals and/or the expansion of existing ones. The city's code should not allow any unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels from passing through Portland. In addition, I favor no expansion of existing fossil fuel terminals or any increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: Robert Breaks

Email: bobthenatureguy@gmail.com

Comment:

I stand in solidarity with the Dakota and Navajo tribes in protesting the Dakota oil pipeline through four states in the midwest of America. In their spirit, I agree that the city of Portland needs to ban all new fossil fuel terminals and/or the expansion of existing ones. The city's code should not allow any unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels from passing through Portland. In addition, I favor no expansion of existing fossil fuel terminals or any increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: Susan Economon

Email: seconomon@gmail.com

Comment:

Please act to ensure our future as a community as well as a model for our global partners. Vote to ban all new fossil fuel terminals and restrict expansion at existing terminals.

Name: Joanne Delmonico

Email: joannedelmonico@gmail.com

Comment:

I want a full ban on transporting and storage of fossil fuels in and around Portland and adjacent waterways.

Please protect our environment including waterways, air, and soil and protect our residents! Do the right thing!!

No increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland!!

Name: Tori Cole

Email: colet@seiu503.org

Comment:

My name is Tori Cole, and I am a union organizer for SEIU 503 and an

environmental activist. Like others who have followed this process, I've seen

Portlanders demand meaningful action from their city on climate, and I hope that

their conviction—which drove City Council to pass this as a resolution—informs

the code changes made today. We need to reject the building of any new fossil fuel

infrastructure in our city. Our climate movement sorely needs local leadership, and

Portland should fulfill its rumored destiny as a climate leader today. Local action

does matter.

Taking this action today will be the first drop in the bucket, step one of what we

need to achieve a just transition away from fossil fuels and to 100% renewable

energy by 2050, as reports from Greenpeace and others tell us we must. It's time

for all of us to make deliberate choices in favor of our future. This year, SEIU

503's membership passed a resolution to prioritize acting against climate change,

and on Saturday the board voted unanimously to support solidarity with Standing

Rock Sioux Tribe in their fight against the Dakota Access Pipeline. The time for

us to stand together in this fight is long overdue.

Even those highest in the financial sector recognize that the era of fossil fuels is

coming to a close, and that investments in the oil and gas

industry are now risky

and ill advised. To realize a successful transition to renewables, governments from

local to federal must commit to invest in renewable infrastructure, and to create

decent work opportunities and economic empowerment for workers who cannot be

left behind in the oncoming economic restructuring. We must not allow ourselves

to be divided into 'labor' and 'environmentalist' camps—the real choice is not

jobs or environment. It is both, or neither.

So I urge you to take bold action, and listen to what the people are asking for.

Vote in favor of our future, and reject any increase to fossil fuel infrastructure at

the city level. No exceptions. And let's talk about how we are going to work

together to ensure that the people who got the worst deal in the old economy will

be the first in line to benefit in the new economy.

Name: Harriet Cooke

Email: holisticcooke@aol.com

Comment:

Urgent! no new fossil fuel terminals. We need to be brainstorming how to live more simply so that others and future generations can live. Until the CO2 numbers come down to livable and sustainable levels, No New terminals! No city code changes to allow more unit trains. We need to learn how to live with less oil and more local community. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure. Lets be the inspiration for

the rest of the country!!!

Name: Christine Kosonen

Email: cealila@yahoo.com

Comment:

Portland, Protecting our future, of our water and our children!
Invest in clean energy infrastructure. Do not permit another piece of fossil fuel industry to be built in our city & region. I urge you to develop careful monitoring of existing fossil oil infrastructure and hold the vision that it will be disassembled piece by piece and replaced with technologies that do not damage our most precious and irreplaceable resources= clean water, earth, and air!!!

Name: Marty Bankhead

Email: marty.b@comcast.net

Comment:

Ladies & Gentlemen;

Thank you for your initial active opposition to new fossil fuel terminals. I urge you to ban any and all fossil fuel terminals. Stand strong against commercial interests that would like to use Portland for short-term gain, regardless of consequence. The proposed day of your final vote is Veteran's Day. WWI soldiers gave their lives for the vision of a better world, as have Veterans of every war since. Please stand strong for that vision. Please stand strong for the future, keeping Portland an inspirational model of sustainability. Ban all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small, and ban expansion of existing facilities.

Thank you from a family who moved to Portland 30 years ago to improve life for our children.

Name: Deva Sunya

Email: dragon@350pdx.org

Comment:

Time is short for addressing climate change. A recent study by NOAA says that we may see a 3 meter sea level rise by 2050-2060. That is much sooner than the IPCC report which is now much out of date. This amount of sea level rise will create hundreds of millions of climate refugees. There is much other evidence indicating the severity of our collective circumstances. At this point, the situation is so severe, that concerns over a companies profits are of no meaning. It is like the point in a disaster movie when everyone finally realizes that catastrophe has struck. Business as usual then comes to an end. We are already at that point. The usual considerations must be set aside and extraordinary measures taken. This is exactly what the science is telling us.

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.

Sincerely,
Deva
Deva

Name: Camilo Marquez

Email: camilomarquezmd@juno.com

Comment:

More than the vitally important need to protect the Portland environment from the risk of a spill or other disaster is the necessity to by any means possible keep all remaining fossil fuel reserves in the ground if we are to keep global temperature from reaching the point of no return for habitability of the planet.

Name: Mary Ann Dougherty

Email: dougherty_86@msn.com

Comment:

Portland City Council,

Please end all new fossil fuel terminals in Portland. We can't afford more spills along the beautiful Columbia River. The time is critical to end our fossil fuel dependence.

Name: Anais Tuepker

Email: anaistuepker@yahoo.com

Comment:

Dear City Council,

I was so proud of our city when, last year, we showed our commitment to a clean energy future and passed the ban on new fossil fuel infrastructure. Portland is my home, and part of why I love it so much is because every day I see evidence that we are a community dedicated to social and environmental justice. We are willing to embrace the need to change our ways and move off of unsustainable fossil fuels.

Now the time has come to enact that ban, and our actions need to be as strong as our words. Every day we delay taking strong action, we create more difficult and complex climate challenges for all those who come after us. That is why I urge you to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuels. Allowing an exemption for smaller new facilities undermines the power of the ban both practically and symbolically. Similarly, if we do not strengthen limits on

existing facilities, we will not only allow continued disastrous impacts on the climate, we send the message that solving this problem can be done slowly, step by step.

We are long past the time for slow and steady change. We need to be bold. Those of us living now are already seeing the impacts of climate change through more extreme weather, increased temperatures affecting crops and loss of biodiversity, and the many social effects of destabilized societies. All those who come after us will have to live with the results of the choices we make today. Let's make the strongest, bravest choices we can, to end fossil fuel dependence now, with no new fossil fuel terminals and no expansions to a dying industry.

Thank you for your leadership.

Name: Megan Horst

Email: horstmegana@gmail.com

Comment:

I am a concerned and active citizen in NE Portland, and climate change is in the top 3 issues of importance to me. Thank you to BPS for its work so far on the fossil fuel policy code.

BUT, we need stronger code changes, including:

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: Becky Hawkins

Email: hawkins.becky@gmail.com

Comment:

Like many Portlanders, I moved here in order to participate in a progressive city, and be able to enjoy the spectacular nature nearby. When I return home to my native Pittsburgh, I drive past billboard after billboard advertising “clean oil,” “clean coal,” and “safe fracking.” Then I check the news and see another spill, another leak, another community devastated by the fossil fuel industry. And every time, the oil and gas companies are full of excuses as to why it’s not their fault. It was the soil, the weather, a pipe, a well. It’s always billed as a surprise, an unforeseeable circumstance. But pollution is not a surprise; it’s a consequence of the fossil fuel industry. Don’t allow any legal loopholes to endanger Portland’s wildlife or its citizens.

Name: Mason Hiatt

Email: masonhiatt@gmail.com

Comment:

Considering that Portland City Council has issued a statement against the DAPL in North Dakota, which I applaud, the exact same arguments apply to why it is important to ban new terminals here in Portland. Doing anything else would be hypocritical and work against any claims the city might have to being on the forefront of environmental justice.

Name: barbara brower

Email: browerb@pdx.edu

Comment:

We know now without a doubt that climate is warming and fossil fuels are to blame. Why would a city like Portland want to do anything other than stand its ground on this issue? How can we continue to be part of a process that dooms life on Earth as we know it? There are plenty of other options to keep the economy ticking over—and there are no jobs on a dead planet.

Name: Barbara and Frank Roberts

Email: bjroberts7@hotmail.com

Comment:

Dear Commission Members,

I would like to suggest changes to your draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments:

1. Do not make an exception for new storage facilities under 5 million gallons. The rules should apply to all terminals.
2. Existing terminals should become a non-conforming use and therefore any expansion of a terminal would have to go through a non-conforming use process.
3. The non-conforming use review process should be strengthened by adding climate impacts and safety criteria.
4. Total fossil fuel infrastructure increases should not be allowed. Don't allow the industry to build many small facilities that in total will be above the current infrastructure.

Name: Susan Braverman

Email: susan@susanbraverman.com

Comment:

Please, please don't lose this opportunity to ban an and all fossil fuel terminals and to prohibit oil trains from running through Portland. It is so important that we focus on other sources of energy instead of perpetuating the dangers of fossil fuels and the degradation of the earth as a result. As a resident of NW Portland, whose children and grandchildren also live here in NW, we are aware of the danger every day as we listen to the trains and drive past the storage facilities along Rt. 30. Knowing they are there, and being conscious about preparing for a possible Cascadia Fault major earthquake, I am pleading with you to not bring any more Bakken fuel or trains transporting it anywhere near Portland! Thank you!

Name: Sarah Burns

Email: scaryraisins@yahoo.com

Comment:

To the City of Portland we want 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. Thank you!

Name: Mark Braverman
Email: markbraverman48@gmail.com

Comment:

I fully support Resolution No. 37168. It is absolutely and urgently the right thing to do at the right time, for reasons of safety, public health, and the longterm sustainability of our communities, cities, and the planet as a whole. Let Portland take the lead!

Name: Barbara Quinn
Email: barbaraqnn718@gmail.com

Comment:

Place a ban on all new fossil fuel terminals and other infrastructure. More Unit trains carrying fossil fuels like Bakken crude should be prohibited in the new code. Also ban expansion of existing terminals.

Name: Tyler Wagner
Email: twagner@sipdx.org

Comment:

As the St. Ignatius Fellow at St. Ignatius Church in Southeast Portland, I have been ignited by Pope Francis' call in his encyclical Laudato Si to care for creation and to understand that

we have a moral obligation to protect our planet for all beings, including people on this planet today and in future generations.

With that moral call, I call on the City of Portland 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.

Name: Elizabeth Milner

Email: milnere22@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,
Elizabeth Milner

Name: Turner Masland
Email: turner.masland@gmail.com

Comment:

Bakken crude oil may seem like a quick solution to our energy problems, but in reality they only create more dangerous consequences for our community and our planet in the long run.

Portland is known for being a city with sustainability at it's core. We need to strengthen our resolve to protecting this planet and all of the life forms found on it. We need to think about our future generations. We need 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. We need 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. We need to Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: Cecilia Youngs

Email: cecilia.youngs@gmail.com

Comment:

Please enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, with no exceptions. The code changes should not allow more unit trains or dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

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

Please prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fel infrastructure in Portland.

Name: Jacob Braverman

Email: jacobbraverman@gmail.com

Comment:

Thank you for considering what I have to say. As I'm sure PSC is coming to see, there is widespread popular opposition to continued investment in fossil fuel development, and this is because as an entire nation we are waking up to the reality of climate change, and we are afraid about the real possibility of not leaving a viable world for our children to inhabit. By 2050, when I am 63, the world's sea levels will have risen an average

of no less than 9 ft above their current levels. Seeing the world respond to the current refugee crisis, I cannot imagine what will have transpired by the time many of the world's coastal cities are underwater. And we are already locked into this. The best we can hope for now is to mitigate even more catastrophic changes, and this is absolutely necessary, because it is entirely possible for us to raise the average global temperature well beyond what it has ever been while supporting life as we know it. This is what is at stake as you decide whether to set a bold and courageous precedent that will be felt around the country, and hence around the world. On the other side are people who act against not just my interest and yours, and your childrens', but inexplicably against their own. The time for accepting this has ended, by necessity, and you are in the rare and privileged position of actually playing a part in ending it. This is the moment of you to be heroic or cowardly; you have the heartfelt prayers of millions around the world behind you.

Thank you again.
Jacob Braverman

Name: Kathy Austen
Email: augsten@efn.org

Comment:

Dear Portland City Council,

I am another signer of this letter composed by 350PDX. Portland must fulfill the intent of our 2015 Resolution to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels."

— Kathy Austen

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: Deborah Wiley

Email: da.wiley1@gmail.com

Comment:

please – no more fossil fuel infrastructure in PDX! We can evolve into a community that says no to this and instead supports all the great alternatives available

Name: Sarah Iannarone

Email: ss.iannarone@gmail.com

Comment:

Dear Commissioner:

Portland is seen around the world as a “sustainable city” a leader in green building, green energy, and green transportation. Please, let’s ensure perception and reality align.

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 prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Finally, let’s shore up our vulnerable fuel infrastructure prior to undertaking an expensive clean-up of the Harbor Superfund Site.

Thank you for your dedicated service to our city.

Name: Anne Corbett

Email: corbett.anne@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,
Annie Corbett

Name: Craig Heverly
Email: heverlyjc@hevanet.com

Comment:

In recent revelations of sexual misconduct on college campuses, a strong mantra has emerged: “No means no.” Please apply that to the ban on fossil fuel infrastructure. When the City Council passed it’s courageous, visionary, and historic ban, I don’t think it meant a “little” hanky-panky is OK. Or that a slight pat on the butt is allowable. I think they meant what they said. “No means no.” Period. Amen. Thank you for your hard and careful service.

Name: Helen Hays
Email: hlhays@ccgmail.net

Comment:

The City of Portland 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.

Portland 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, any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland should be prevented.

Name: Sandra Siegner

Email: ssiegner3@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,

Message *

Share this entry



188142

Council Clerk Note:
There is no page 177 in the original filing.