

From: Blaine Ackley [mailto:blaineackley@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 1:45 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Commission Members<

My name is Blaine Ackley and I reside at 655 NW 229th Ave. Hillsboro, OR 97124.

I urge you to ban all future fossil fuel development within the city of Portland. Also, please make any expansion of existing facilities rigorous and conscious of public safety.

My point to you is that all you have to do is look at what happened at Mosier, Oregon minor train derailment to see what horrendous disaster could happen here.

I urge you to consider the health, safety and welfare of your children and grandchildren in making this decision.

Sincerely yours,

:)Blaine Ackley

From: Patricia Orlinski [mailto:bikerpat@mindspring.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 11:07 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Patricia Always. I live at 10511 W. Kingswood Circle in Sun City, AZ, 85351. I moved from Portland to spend time near my aging parents in AZ. I am writing to ask you to enact code changes to support the fossil fuel policy that was passed by Portland's City Council. Amend the proposed draft to reflect the city's fossil fuel goals: namely 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 by 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 your attention.

From: Luke Anavi [mailto:lanavi@ymail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 3:18 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Luke Anavi
Email: lanavi@ymail.com
Address: 2431 N.E. Flanders St., Portland, Oregon, 97232

From: joan_andon@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:joan_andon@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:45 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Joan Andon
2411 NW Stimpson Ln
Portland, OR 97229-8564

From: susanarthur57@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:susanarthur57@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:48 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Susan Arthur
3014 NE Schuyler St
Portland, OR 97212-5127

From: Ray Ashmun [mailto:rayashmun@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:25 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony.

Absolutely no ban on fuel movement, and lessen other restrictions.

The City should be working in every way to promote commerce, especially since the Port of Portland shipping business is evaporating.

Pipelines should be built to move oil and other petrochemicals with the resulting commercial growth.

Ray Ashmun
3018 NE 15th Ave, Ptd, OR 97212

From: Judith Beck [mailto:judith82340@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 6:39 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

I am a citizen of Portland, OR very concerned for the health and safety of all of us here!
I wholeheartedly support the resolution passed by the Portland City Council opposing the building of new oil pipelines, terminals and any other infrastructure used by the fossil fuel industry. NO Exemptions for small Ones! Any size is totally unacceptable!
We must keep fossil fuels in the ground and get going on renewable energies! No time to waste if we are going to survive on this planet!

Thank you!

Judith Beck
245 SW Lincoln St., 2216
Portland, OR 97201

Sent from my iPad

From: Jody Bleyle [mailto:bleyle@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 9:15 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Jody Bleyle

Email: bleyle@gmail.com

Address: 120 SE 53rd Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97215

From: dianaisbright@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:dianaisbright@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:44 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
DIANA BRIGHT
4146 SE Crystal Springs Blvd
Portland, OR 97202-7917

From: Charles Brod [mailto:cubrod@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 10:30 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Charles Brod
Email: cubrod@gmail.com
Address: 2728 SE Tibbetts St, Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: Comcast [mailto:brownlies@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 4:42 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

I am writing to ask the city of Portland to amend the proposed draft re: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning so that it reflects Portland's fossil fuel goals.

There should be a ban on all new fossil fuel terminals without exception. Restrictions should be strengthened on expansions of existing terminals by adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in Portland's non-conforming use review process. And, any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland should be prevented.

Portland is a model that many other communities in the US look up to. Please lead the way to a brighter future for our children and for our country by taking a stand against fossil fuel proliferation and by doing so, taking a stand for a better America.

With the greatest respect,

Rebecca Brownlie
3236 Carrington Way
Bellingham, Wa.
98226

From: Terrie Burdette [mailto:pdxterrie@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 6:35 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Terrie Burdette
Email: pdxterrie@gmail.com
Address: 6603 N Bank St, Portland, Oregon, 97203

From: Susan Buswell [mailto:tamaracktales@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 9:34 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Susan Buswell
Email: tamaracktales@aol.com
Address: 17628 SE Cook St., Milwaukie, Oregon, 97267

From: Maurine Canarsky [mailto:canarskyyomo@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 12:29 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Maurine Canarsky
1977 SE 22nd Ave.
Portland, OR 97214-4851

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Maurine Canarsky

From: mcard@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:mcard@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:38 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Monica Card
5104 SE Clinton St Apt A
Portland, OR 97206-1400

From: paularcasner@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:paularcasner@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 4:00 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

We could even become more progressive and put solar panels on every city building, and require all new construction in this city to have solar panels on the roof. We could offer discounted services for solar panels being installed on the rest of the rooms on this town, make it a work program for people who are unemployed to teach them skills, and make this is solar city. There are so many things we can model for the rest of this country and make such a large difference in our environment. We can sponsor living trees as the preference for Holiday trees and plant them all over the city. We can do a lot to make a difference here and Portland has the means to put the legislation in place locally to be an example for the whole country. And we have the will of the people here on our side. Thank you for listening. Thank you for going forward with these ideas as well.

Sincerely,
Paula Casner
3249 NE 81st Ave
Portland, OR 97213-6539

From: april@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:april@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:29 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
April Christenson
777 NW 19th Ave Apt 212
Portland, OR 97209-1392

From: jim clapp [mailto:jimclapp@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 8:54 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Sir:

Thank you for passing a historic resolution to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways”.

Please amend your proposed draft to reflect the city’s fossil fuel goals and remain steadfast in your commitment to prohibit dirty fossil fuel projects:

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 by 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 proposed expansion would negatively impact Portland, the Columbia River, the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, and four National Wildlife Refuges (Steigerwald Lake, Franz Lake, Pierce, and Ridgefield), of which I was on the management team for over 25 years.

Please assist in stopping the development of those fossil fuel infrastructures that would negatively impact these extremely valuable and non-replaceable resources.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

James R. Clapp
22500 NE 113th Street
Vancouver, WA 98682

From: Ann Clarkson [mailto:abcphdpdx@spiritone.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 5:00 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Ann Clarkson
5203 SE 38th
Portland, OR 97202

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Ann B Clarkson

From: Tom Cloud [mailto:tomclouddancer@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 1:52 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Please adopt changes to Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments 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 by 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.

Protect our waterways.

Best Wishes,
Tom Cloud
Cloud Dancer Farm
298D Cape Labelle Rd
Tonasket WA 98855 509 486 2333

From: Collin Murphy [mailto:Bleuoiseau@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 10:48 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Collin Murphy
Email: Bleuoiseau@comcast.net
Address: 3675 SE Bybee Blvd., Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: Eliot Cole [mailto:eliot.cole1@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 7:05 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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,

From: Eliot Cole

Email: eliot.cole1@gmail.com

Address: 4639 NE 30th, Portland, Oregon, 97211

From: Kyle Collins [mailto:kalecollins85@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 2:55 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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,

From: Kyle Collins

Email: kalecollins85@gmail.com

Address: 1026 Jackson St, Eugene, Oregon, 97402

September 12, 2016

Planning and Sustainability Commission
City of Portland
1900 SW 4th Ave., Ste. 7100
Portland, OR 97201

RE: Comments for PSC Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments Hearing

Dear Commissioners,

Please accept these comments from the Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council (CPBTC) regarding the Planning and Sustainability Commission's Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments Draft. CPBTC is an organization that represents 25 different crafts, including: heat and frost insulators, boilermakers, brick and stone masons, cement masons, electricians, elevator constructors, glaziers, ironworkers, laborers, linoleum and carpet layers, operating engineers, painters & tapers, plasterers, plumbers, pipe fitters and steamfitters, roofers, sheet metal workers, sprinkler fitters and teamsters.

Last fall, CPBTC testified in opposition to the City Council's anti-fossil fuels Resolution No. 37 166 because of the unintended consequences of blocking any new fossil fuel infrastructure and the impact that will have on the men and women of the CPBTC and the region's economy as a whole. This past July, we also submitted comments on the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability staff discussion draft. We are extremely disappointed with the current draft because it totally ignored CPBTC's input and double downs the impact to the existing fossil fuel infrastructure by designating them nonconforming uses.

Fossil fuels are a lot more than the gas we pump into our cars. They fuel the jets we fly, the farms that grow our food and the trucks that deliver everyday products. They fuel industrial processes and heat our homes, businesses, schools and hospitals. Our entire economy and way of life depend directly on reliable and cost-effective fuel sources. Even as we pursue alternative energy strategies, fossil fuels will remain crucially important for decades to come.

Allowing existing fossil fuel infrastructure to enhance capacity would increase our energy independence by reducing reliance on fossil fuels from potentially unstable foreign sources, including Iraq, Russia, Venezuela and other countries. Beyond enhanced energy independence, these projects would generate thousands of new jobs, millions in economic activity and additional tax revenue to fund education, health care, transportation and other valuable public services here in the region.

It's also important for the future of our region to at the fossil fuel terminals be allowed and encouraged to update and modernize their facilities to improve safety, efficiencies, and environmental impacts. These projects create family-wage jobs, generate new revenue for public services and support important public policy goals, such as lowering carbon emissions and

seismic resiliency. The proposed zoning changes will also impede the region's ability to pursue economic development projects.

Additionally, based on our review of the Commission's draft, we strongly believe that the proposal does not align with regional (Metro), state and federal policy. The draft fails to provide for the economic assessment called for by Resolution. Finally, the timeline for implementing the proposed amendments is too aggressive and does not allow for thoughtful discussion to address the many concerns.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments Draft. If you have any questions, please contact me at 503-318-7691.

Sincerely yours,

Willy Myers
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council

From: Andrew Crosby [mailto:andrewcrosby1@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 2:09 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Andrew Crosby
Email: andrewcrosby1@gmail.com
Address: 3225 SW View Place, Portland, Oregon, 97205

From: marilee dea [mailto:marileedea@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 8:24 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: marilee dea
Email: marileedea@comcast.net
Address: 4613 NE Killingsworth #2, portland , Oregon, 97218

From: Ineke Deruyter [mailto:ideruyter@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 8:40 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Ineke Deruyter
9322 N Oswego Ave
Portland, OR 97203

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Ineke Deruyter

From: Don Jacobson [mailto:donjphoto@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Don Jacobson
2545 SW Terwilliger Blvd Apt 314
Portland, OR 97201-6304

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Don Jacobson

From: David Kennedy [mailto:dkennedy@350pdx.org]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 8:51 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: David Kennedy
Email: dkennedy@350pdx.org
Address: 621 NE Sumner St, Portland, Oregon, 97211

From: drasticdreamer@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:drasticdreamer@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:38 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Sara Dolph
149 SE 134th Pl
Portland, OR 97233-1811

From: Ted Dreier [mailto:teddreier@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 8:51 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Ted Dreier
7037 SW 54th Avenue
Portland, OR 97219

September 11, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Ted Dreier

From: RICHARD EMERY [mailto:rsemery1@me.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 9:17 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Please amend the proposed draft to better reflect the city's fossil fuel goals laid out in the resolution last fall:

- 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 facilities through adding binding limits in the City's non-conforming use review process.
- Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Please ensure that Portland fulfills the promise of its historic fossil fuel resolution.

Thank you!

Richard Emery
3439 NE Sandy Blvd. #205
Portland, OR 97232

From: wax.delerium@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:wax.delerium@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:39 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Gavin Everard
5944 N Kerby Ave
Portland, OR 97217-2008

From: Kellen Ferguson [mailto:kellenf99@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 7:19 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Kellen Ferguson
3220 NE Emerson st
Portland, OR 97211

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Kellen Ferguson

From: Mary Fifield [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 6:45 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Mary Fifield
Email: strwrytr@yahoo.com
Address: 1927 SE 35th Pl, Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Kim Fortin [mailto:fortinkim@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 5:38 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Kim Fortin
Email: fortinkim@gmail.com
Address: 2023 SE Madison St., Apt. 2, Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: kaleyfrank@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:kaleyfrank@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:46 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony!

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Kaley Frank
8523 N Curtis Ave
Portland, OR 97217-6153

From: patigallagher@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:patigallagher@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:57 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Pati Gallagher
152 SE Spokane St Ste 6
Portland, OR 97202-6476

From: Becky Gardner [mailto:gbeckyl@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 12:12 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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!!!

From: Becky Gardner
Email: gbeckyl@msn.com
Address: 38703 Scrael Hill Rd NE, Albany, Oregon, 97322

From: kima garrison [mailto:kimasuegarrison@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:43 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: kima garrison
Email: kimasuegarrison@gmail.com
Address: 5112 ne 28th, portland, Oregon, 97211

From: kima garrison [mailto:kimasuegarrison@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

kima garrison
5112 ne. 28th
portland, OR 97211

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
kima garrison

From: Anandi Gefroh [mailto:anandi@anandi.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 12:23 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Anandi Gefroh
Email: anandi@anandi.com
Address: 2825 SE Hawthorne Blvd, Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Mikel Gisi [mailto:loveofthewild@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 8:59 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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,

From: Mikel Gisi

Email: loveofthewild@gmail.com

Address: 2211 E 30th St, APT B, Vancouver, Washington, 98663

From: littlerose5555@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:littlerose5555@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:44 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Please enact a full, not a partial ban and include all the provisions suggested in this letter.

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Emerald Goldman
4406 SE Taylor St
Portland, OR 97215-2456

From: Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey [mailto:egraserlindsey@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 6:54 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Elizabeth Graser-Lindsey
Email: egraserlindsey@gmail.com
Address: 21341 S. Ferguson Rd., Beavercreek, Oregon, 97004

From: Deena Grossman [mailto:deena@moonbridge.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 9:04 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland City Council and Mayor Hales:

Please 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. 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 by 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.

This is essential to protect the citizens of Portland and the environment, our land, rivers and wildlife! Thank you for listening and acting for people who care, not for fossil fuel industry profit.

Sincerely yours,

*Deena T. Grossman, voter and PPS teacher
7234 SE 17th Ave.
Portland, OR 97202
deenatgrossman@gmail.com*

From: Anne Halpin [mailto:pnwsun13@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 12:30 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Anne Halpin
Email: pnwsun13@gmail.com
Address: 320 SE Atwood Ave., Corvallis , Oregon, 97333

From: Marsha Hanchrow [mailto:machiya@centurylink.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 9:06 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Marsha Hanchrow
Email: machiya@centurylink.net
Address: 1908 SE 35th Place, Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Lorraine Heller [mailto:lorraineheller32@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 2:42 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

To whom it may concern:

The proposed draft should be amended to reflect the city of Portland's goals on fossil fuel. That is to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals large or small. We want no more train units carrying fossil fuel going through the Columbia River Gorge.
We must protect this sensitive natural area.

sincerely yours ,
Lorraine Heller
9601 NW Leahy Rd. Unit 301
Portland, Oregon 97229

From: Tom Huston [mailto:thuston@uoregon.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 4:12 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Please consider amending the proposed draft to reflect the city's fossil fuel goals:

- 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 by adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
- 3) Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank You

Tom Huston
39140 Dexter Road
Dexter, Oregon 97431

University of Oregon
Physical Education & Recreation Dept.
Facilities Coordinator
541-346-8127

From: Fred Ingram [mailto:car54@spiritone.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 3:00 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: No Union Pacific rail expansion for oil trains

Fred Ingram
4822 SE 47th Avenue
Portland, OR 97206

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Fred Ingram

From: James Anderson [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 8:30 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: James Anderson
Email: sweepingit@yahoo.com
Address: 7306 SE Main St., Portland, Oregon, 97215

From: cgjanzen@comcast.net [mailto:cgjanzen@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 9:56 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission:

It seems that original proposal to not allow new fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland was revised to allow more terminals after all, and then revised with modifications that still favor the dirty energy's agenda to expand their terminals. We need be moving forward with alternative energy, not constantly kowtowing to the dirty energy industry as they recklessly destroy our planet for bigger and bigger profits.

Therefore I 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. 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 by 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.

Please stick to your original proposal and make Portland a leader in alternative energy and put the dirty energy industry on notice that they are not welcome there.

Sincerely,
Gayle Janzen
11232 Dayton Ave N
Seattle, WA 98133

Sent from my iPad

From: jeremiah jenkins [mailto:miah66@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 1:13 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

I am writing to ask 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. 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 by 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.

Jeremiah Jenkins
3537 NE 81st ave
Portland, OR 97213

From: Rachel Jesequel [mailto:rachel_michelle@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 3:31 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Rachel Jesequel

Email: rachel_michelle@hotmail.com

Address: 13160 SW Tapadera St., Beaverton , Oregon, 97008

From: Joseph Miller [mailto:jmiller@saintmarys.edu]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 11:15 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Testimony re Proposed Fossil Fuel Infrastructure Code Changes

Planning and Sustainability Commission
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Members of the PSC,

Thanks for your July and August draft proposed code changes to implement Portland's landmark fossil fuel policy to “actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways.”

While I applaud and support the changes you have proposed, I join with many groups (Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility, Columbia Riverkeeper, 350PDX, Audubon Society of Portland, Portland Rising Tide, etc.) in requesting that additional changes be made to:

- eliminate the exception for new projects that are 5 million gallons or less,
- ban all new fossil fuel terminals, including those designed for liquefied natural gas (LNG) or gaseous fuel storage.

Sincerely,

Joseph Miller PhD
1030 SW Jefferson St., Apt. 534
Portland, Oregon 97201

Member, Environmental Health Working Group, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility
Former Member, Board of Directors, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility
Member (representing Oregon PSR), Oregon DEQ Conversion Technology Rulemaking
Advisory Committee (2012)

From: Michael Jordan [mailto:mikejord65@msn.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:38 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Michael Jordan
Email: mikejord65@msn.com
Address: 19796 Bellevue Way, W. Linn, Oregon, 97068

From: Jerry Smith [mailto:diggerrydig@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 10:04 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Jerry Smith
Email: diggerrydig@gmail.com
Address: 5041 Saxon Way, Eugene, Oregon, 97405-3596

From: Jeff White [mailto:rogue576@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 3:14 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments

Please 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. 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 by 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, Jeffrey A. and Betsy L. White, 42852 SW Dudney Avenue, Forest Grove,
OR. 97116

From: collin.kaeder@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:collin.kaeder@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:41 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
collin kaeder
8265 SW Ernst Rd
Portland, OR 97225-3851

From: Ed Kaiel [mailto:ekaiel@pcc.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 4:55 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Ed Kaiel

Email: ekaiel@pcc.edu

Address: 6311 N. Commercial Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97217

From: karenk@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:karenk@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:41 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Karen Keeney
NE 16TH Ave
Portland, OR 97211

From: Alys Kennedy [mailto:akhawke@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:41 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I am writing to request that you stop all fossil fuel transport coming into and/or through Portland. If the humans, and all other life on the planet, are to survive into the future, it is imperative that we keep all fossil fuels in the ground where they belong. The extraction, transport and use of any and all fossil fuels, including Bakken crude oil creates pollution, toxicity, and direct danger to human and other life.

Oil by rail threatens not only our communities and the health and safety of the City of Portland, it poses a dire and direct threat to the Columbia River and the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area. This risk was made very clear with the June 2016 derailment disaster in Mosier. Every train delivering oil to a facility in Portland would have to move through the Gorge, putting scenic, natural, cultural, and recreational resources at risk and endangering and/or eliminating the lives of humans and wild and aquatic life. In addition, it puts all life any where along the rail line at risk - and it adds to the already precarious climate crisis world wide!

As noted by Portland's Mayor, Charlie Hales, "If we are aggressive about carbon reduction, we can, city by city, make a difference."

Therefore, I am asking that you **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. 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 by 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 kindly for your consideration,

Alys Kennedy
2823 Birchwood Avenue
Bellingham, WA 98225

From: Thomas Keys [mailto:tkeyshike@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 2:04 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear City of Portland,

In regard to the PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony, 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 by 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.

I understand I have copy & pasted from Ryan Rittenhouse's email. I did that to echo the sentiment to please stay true to our commitments to the environment. The constant expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure has just got to stop, especially without any regulation or oversight going unchecked in relation to this industry. It's been said countless times. Fossil fuel use has NO MORE PLACE in this country or any other. It has had its time & no doubt, a use for the growth the world has enjoyed. This is our very earth at stake now. Please go full bore & enact the strongest & strictest ban on ANY fossil fuel infrastructure permitting.

Respectfully,

Thomas J. Keys
1103 SE 21st Ct
Gresham, OR 9708

503-432-3882-cell

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland

From: kilboy1@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:kilboy1@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:45 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Martin Kilbourne
8887 SW 67th Pl
Portland, OR 97223-2242

From: jlkirkland3@comcast.net [mailto:jlkirkland3@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:43 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSCFossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

My wife and I live in Hood River and recently witnessed the train disaster occurring in Mosier. We are totally against oil trains passing through the Columbia Gorge in view of the high risks associated with this type of transfer. We encourage you to deny the railroad companies the opportunities to completely ruin one of the most beautiful parts of the US and an asset for Oregon.

(We lived in Houston, Texas for many years. For those who don't believe in the damages to the environment by oil transport, they should visit the Galveston Bay area. Oh, if you do visit that area, make certain you purchase chemicals to remove the oil globs from between your toes and on your clothes.)

John L. Kirkland
Rebecca T. Kirkland

PO Box 1767
1767 12th Street
Hood River, OR
97031

From: haley.k.kirkpatrick@everyactioncustom.com
[mailto:haley.k.kirkpatrick@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:50 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Haley Kirkpatrick
6512 SE Division St Apt 1
Portland, OR 97206-1279

From: Meryle Korn [mailto:meryle.korn@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 1:29 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

As a native Portlander currently living in Washington state, I am troubled by the oil industry's continued push to open new fuel terminals of ANY size in the greater Portland area.

Oil is a filthy fossil fuel whose use has driven pollution levels to the point that our entire planet's climate has been disrupted in ways that threaten not just human life, but most life on earth. Fossil fuel profiteers must not be enabled by the building of new production facilities. And Bakken crude oil is even more dirty and explosively dangerous than other "natural" oils.

The recent film carried the meme, "If you build it, they will come." Its opposite should be put in effect here (anywhere in the Pacific Northwest) and now: If you DON'T build it, they CAN'T come!

Please prevent any increase, whether new or "upgraded" facilities, to increase fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

(Ms.) Meryle A. Korn
2821 Huron St.
Bellingham, WA 98226

(Born in Portland, OR in 1943; resident of Portland area for all but seven years of my life. Portland is my heart's home; please do not despoil it and further despoil our only planet for the sake of dirty fossil fuels.)

From: democrats@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:democrats@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:39 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Eric Lambart
7122 N Oatman Ave
Portland, OR 97217-5834

From: Wayne Lammers [mailto:wplring1@mac.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 8:47 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Wayne Lammers
Email: wplring1@mac.com
Address: 14960 SW 92nd Ave., Tigard, Oregon, 97224

From: mary lane [mailto:ryla2015@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 6:21 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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!!!

From: mary lane
Email: ryla2015@gmail.com
Address: 2009 se taylor st., portland, Oregon, 97214

From: joyce@ [mailto:harbor joyce@harbor-properties.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 8:49 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Please amend the proposed draft to reflect the city's fossil fuel goals.
Thank you,
Joyce Leggatt
173 NE Bridgeton Slip 6
Portland, OR 97211

From: Willie Levenson [mailto:willielevenson@outlook.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 5:06 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Willie Levenson
Email: willielevenson@outlook.com
Address: 2800 NE Edgehill Place, Portland, Oregon, 97212

From: Jordan Lewis [mailto:jordan@allclassical.org]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 10:57 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Jordan Lewis
Email: jordan@allclassical.org
Address: 15 NE 151st Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97230-4804

From: Laurie Fisher [mailto:lauriefisher55@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 12:59 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: No more oil trains through the Columbia Gorge

Laurie Fisher
10414 SW Bonanza Way
Tigard, OR 97224

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Laurie Fisher

From: walter_lichtenberg@everyactioncustom.com
[mailto:walter_lichtenberg@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:55 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Walter Lichtenberg
7515 SE 23RD Ave
Portland, OR 97202

From: Linda Levin [mailto:linvin@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 10:51 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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,

From: Linda Levin
Email: linvin@comcast.net
Address: 1330 SW 3rd Ave Apt 1202, Portland, Oregon, 97201

From: Clyde Alan Lockleat [mailto:gardeneral@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 12:49 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: A Good Start but needs to be stronger

Clyde Alan Lockleat
6222 SW 36th Ave
Portland, OR 97221-3307

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I appreciate the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Regards
Clyde Alan Locklear

From: Linda Magnuson [mailto:lmagnusonl@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 1:27 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

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 by 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.

Linda Magnuson
4346 NE Skidmore
Portland, OR 97218

From: Kat Majors [mailto:mouser1@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 11:46 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Kat Majors
Email: mouser1@gmail.com
Address: 10360 ne pacific street, portland, Oregon, 97220

From: Mary Mandeville [mailto:k9chiro@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 6:03 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Mary Mandeville
Email: k9chiro@aol.com
Address: 5746 NE Going Street, Portland, Oregon, 97218

From: Nicole Martin [mailto:PixiStyxNM@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 6:34 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Nicole Martin
Email: PixiStyxNM@aol.com
Address: 5704 N Omaha Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97217

From: Cass Martinez [mailto:cass@zzz.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 10:15 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Cass Martinez
Email: cass@zzz.com
Address: 8734 NW Wood, Portland, Oregon, 97231

From: Molly Brown [mailto:mollybrown@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 8:31 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Molly Brown
Email: mollybrown@gmail.com
Address: 722 Meadow Avenue, Mount Shasta, California, 96067

From: quinnmcalpine@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:quinnmcalpine@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:48 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Forrest McAlpine
1029 N Winchell St
Portland, OR 97217-1145

From: Patrick McCulley [mailto:pmcculle@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 1:49 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Patrick McCulley
Email: pmcculle@gmail.com
Address: 3816 ne 63rd ave., Portland, Oregon, 97213

From: Sharon McDonald [mailto:MsTick1@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 7:10 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Sharon McDonald
8410 SE Flavel Street
Portland, OR 97266

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I advocate for the environment because of my kids, grandkids, and great-grandkids. For me, those successive generations are not theoretical; they're already here. And I hope to leave behind a habitable planet for them, one that will sustain and support them. I know that you want the same for your loved ones. I know you want to do all you can to ensure that they are able to live in comfort on planet Earth. But in order to provide a sustainable planet, we must all make changes and must act quickly.

I'm so proud of my chosen city of residence and the leaders here who recognize the need and took action. They used the power of their position for the good of all. My wish is that all those in similar positions (across the nation and around the world) will recognize the wisdom shown by those here and follow their lead.

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.

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

- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

- 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,

Sincerely,
Sharon McDonald

From: katy mcfadden [mailto:katytmcfadden@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 9:49 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: katy mcfadden
Email: katytmcfadden@gmail.com
Address: 313 s.w maricara, portland, Oregon, 97219

From: Sharon Palumbo Meyer [mailto:sharon.palumbo@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 8:31 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Sharon Palumbo Meyer
5250 SW Landing Sq #5A
Portland, OR 97239

September 11, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Sharon Palumbo Meyer

From: Emily Meyer [mailto:emeyer1935@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 7:27 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Please 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. 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 by 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.

While I am currently a Vancouver, WA resident I lived in Portland for at least 25 years and consider the gorge a part of my life.

Thank You.

Emily Meyer
8608 NW Old Orchard Drive
Vancouver, WA 98665

From: Patricia Mizutani [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 4:22 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Patricia Mizutani
Email: pmizutan@yahoo.com
Address: 2335 NE 24th Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97212

From: Gregory Monahan [mailto:gregorymonahan29@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 7:30 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Gregory Monahan
7225 SW 13th Avenue
Portland, OR 97219

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Gregory Monahan

From: Patrick Mulcahey [mailto:renilep@me.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 5:01 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Please stand by your city's resolution to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways" and amend the proposed draft to reflect the city's fossil fuel goals:

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 by adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process.
3. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you,

patrick mulcahey
571 Skamania Landing Road
Stevenson, WA 98648

From: Hyung Nam [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 5:03 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Hyung Nam
Email: hyung_n@yahoo.com
Address: 1803 SE Washington St #2, Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Esther Nelson [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:01 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Esther Nelson
Email: ehnelson0620@yahoo.com
Address: 4 Mountain Circle, Lake Osweg, Oregon, 97035

From: John Nettleton [mailto:jpn5710@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 3:04 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

- 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 by 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.

John Nettleton
4311 SE 37th Ave. #21
Portland, OR 97202
971.207.1142

From: Davemult@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:Davemult@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:40 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
David S. Nichols
5107 NE Couch St
Portland, OR 97213-3021

From: James Nielson [mailto:james@changemachine.org]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 9:11 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Former Oil Industry Worker.

James Nielson
8125 NE Wygant St
Portland, OR 97218

September 11, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
James Nielson

From: Toni Noll [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 10:55 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

NO, to fossil fuels in Oregon! Stay Out!

From: Toni Noll
Email: toninoll@yahoo.com
Address: 9723 SW QUAIL POST ROAD, Portland, Oregon, 97219

From: Tim Norgren [mailto:t_norgren@riseup.net]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 5:44 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Tim Norgren
Email: t_norgren@riseup.net
Address: PO Box 297, Stevenson, Washington, 98648

From: Manly Norris [mailto:manly.norris@airbnb.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 7:32 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Manly Norris
111 NE 6th Ave #209
Portland, OR 97232

September 12, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Go Big or Go Home.

Manly Norris
Manly Norris

From: Kayleigh O'Hara [mailto:kayleigh.marchand@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 3:34 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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,

From: Kayleigh O'Hara

Email: kayleigh.marchand@gmail.com

Address: 5318 NE 16th Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97211

From: Sandy Polishuk [mailto:sandypolishuk@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 10:25 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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!

From: Sandy Polishuk
Email: sandypolishuk@gmail.com
Address: 1610 NE Tillamook St Apt. 3, Portland, Oregon, 97212

From: Nora Polk [mailto:nora.mattek@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 11:33 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Nora Polk
6405 SE 62nd Ave
Portland, OR 97206

September 12, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Nora Polk
Nora Polk

From: Jan Polychronis [<mailto:jp04sail@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 7:31 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Please amend the proposed fossil fuel 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. 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 by 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.

I live in the Columbia River Gorge in The Dalles. I witnessed the explosion of oil trains in Mosier earlier this summer. I do not want fossil fuels traveling through this beautiful and protected area as well as exposing residents and visitors to this terrible hazard. We need to rely more on renewable resources and I have recently seen large windmill blades traveling by train to the interior as we have for many years. Let's get solar going too and other methods. Stop supporting dangerous fossil fuels which are polluting our earth! My power is 100% wind. Thank you.

Jan Polychronis
Po box 639, the dalles, or 97058

From: frpopesj@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:frpopesj@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:47 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
L. Michael Pope, S.J.
3220 SE 43rd Ave
Portland, OR 97206-3104

From: debra poscharscky [mailto:debforevers@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:20 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

debra poscharscky
16005 east burnside street
portland, OR 97233

September 11, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
debra poscharscky

From: al3xtec@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:al3xtec@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:42 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Grady Preston II
2139 NE Halsey St
Portland, OR 97232-1522

From: Sarah Prowell [mailto:sprowel@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 3:20 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Sarah Prowell
2216 SW Sunset Blvd
Portland, OR 97239

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Sarah Prowell

From: Mary Lou Putman [mailto:mlputman@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 9:00 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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?

From: Mary Lou Putman
Email: mlputman@gmail.com
Address: 1927 n Jantzen , Portland , Oregon, 97217

From: Rick Rappapor [mailto:rick@rickrappaport.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 5:09 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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,

From: Rick Rappapor

Email: rick@rickrappaport.com

Address: 2218 N.E. Gile Terrac, Portland, Oregon, 97212

From: rick@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:rick@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:53 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I know the rest of this is one of those "canned" letters from an environmental activist group but it's as heartfelt as what I'm about to say first. I was there during the passage of that moment and seminal measure. I watched as Michael _____ promised to implement this measure into legalese that fit the gravity of the vote and the importance of the issue. Well, sort of thank you Michael but your job was not to be the judge and jury of what should and should not be part of prohibited activities. Your job was to make a City Code provision that echoed the sentiment and the words each councillor and mayor spoke as they all cast YEA votes. What you have presented almost end runs their entire effort and a smart guy like you should have known better.

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

- 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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
rick rappaport
2218 NE Gile Ter
Portland, OR 97212-1527

From: E Reid [mailto:exreid@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 1:13 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: E Reid
Email: exreid@gmail.com
Address: 4150 N. Williams Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97217

From: Zach Reuter [mailto:zpreuter08@aim.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 9:23 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Zach Reuter

Email: zpreuter08@aim.com

Address: 7141 SE Mabel Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97267

From: Diana Richardson [mailto:licketysplit777@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 4:57 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Diana Richardson
Email: licketysplit777@gmail.com
Address: 1905 SW Sunset Blvd., Portland, Oregon, 97239

From: Amy Robbins [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 6:12 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Amy Robbins
Email: arobbins1966@yahoo.com
Address: 9227 N Central St., Portland , Oregon, 97203

From: Rebecca Parker [mailto:beccasuzanne2020@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 8:18 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Rebecca Parker
Email: beccasuzanne2020@gmail.com
Address: 941 SE Bidwell St, Portland, Oregon, 97202-6319

From: bewell1122@everyactioncustom.com [mailto:bewell1122@everyactioncustom.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 3:42 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: [User Approved] PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Portland PSC Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask 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.

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

-Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 fight against climate change. With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can remain at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,
Catherine Salvesson
NE 16TH Ave
Portland, OR 97211

From: Amanda Schueler [mailto:amanda.schueler@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 10:46 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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!

From: Amanda Schueler
Email: amanda.schueler@gmail.com
Address: 4210 NE Skidmore St., Portland, Oregon, 97218

From: Maxine Schwartz [mailto:blackkatz@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 11:29 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Maxine Schwartz
8325 SE 11 th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Maxine Schwartz

From: Ian Shelley [mailto:ianjs@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 7:09 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Ian Shelley
50 SW 97th Ave
Portland, OR 97225

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Ian Shelley
Ian Shelley

From: Bethany Thomas [mailto:33bethany@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Bethany Thomas
Email: 33bethany@gmail.com
Address: 2755 NE 35th Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97212

From: Harlan Shober [mailto:harlan_shober@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 4:27 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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=Kxryv2XmqM>.

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.

From: Harlan Shober
Email: harlan_shober@msn.com
Address: 2280 SE 34th Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Beth Slikas [mailto:bethslikas@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 2:54 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Beth Slikas

Email: bethslikas@gmail.com

Address: 3515 SW 87th Ave, APT 24, Portland, Oregon, 97225

From: Helen Spector [mailto:helen94611@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 1:12 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

City of Portland: PLEASE 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. 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 by 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.

Helen Spector
9601 NW Leahy Rd #309
Portland OR 97229
503-296-7248

From: Chester Stark [mailto:billandcorrine@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 7:40 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Chester Stark
3803 SE Grant Ct.
Portland, OR 97214

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely
Chester Porter Stark

From: linda kay stevens [mailto:lindakaystevens@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 12:19 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

linda kay stevens
4829 N. Congress
Portland, OR 97217

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

thank you.
Linda Kay Stevens

From: Andrew Stone [mailto:andymstone@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 9:49 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Andrew Stone
5817 SE Lafayette
Portland, OR 97206

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I am a systems ecologist, teacher, and I vote.

State and Federal officials will not act. Change only occurs with pressure from us. We can and will contribute to this movement.

Multnomah county acknowledged marriage equality early. Even though this was overturned it contributed to the national effort to normalize a human rights discussion.

Likewise it is important for future generations that Portland RIGHT NOW takes steps to move forward he conversation and legislation / regulation of fossil fuels.

The eyes of the nation are on Portland (albeit for different reasons.) We are going to do this - with or without you.

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.

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

- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

- 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,

Sincerely,
Andrew Stone

From: Earl Switzer [mailto:eswitzer27@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 9:55 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Comment & Sustainability Commission

City of Portland

Dear Sir:

Please amend the proposed draft to reflect the city's fossil fuels goals. I would like Portland to enact a ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. The city's code changes should not allow more trains of explosive fossil fuels, such as Bakken oil.

We saw how dangerous Bakken oil can be if one remembers the oil train disaster last June in Mosier, Oregon.

Sincerely,

Earl C. Switzer
17469 SE Main St.
Portland, OR 97233

From: Diana Talcott [mailto:diana.talcott@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 6:59 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Diana Talcott
2806 SE 15th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Sincerely,
Diana Talcott

From: L Cam Taylor [mailto:adp2525@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 2:00 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

L Cam Taylor
705 SE 32nd Ave
Portland, OR 97214

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

L Cam Taylor
L Cam Taylor

From: Liz Terhaar [mailto:liz@columbiariverkeeper.org]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 10:39 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.

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

- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

- 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,

Liz Terhaar
710 13th Street
Hood River, OR 97031

From: Ellen Thayer [mailto:squeekerlynx@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 2:10 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

To whom this does concern:

I am writing to urge you to amend the proposed draft to reflect the city's fossil fuel goals which include:

- 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 by 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,

Ellen M Thayer
PO Box 710
140 SE Oak Street
White Salmon WA 98672

From: Tammie Murray [mailto:jdmstm@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 6:27 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commission:

RE: "PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony."

Please 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. 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 by 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,
Tammie L Murray
82270 Red Bluff Road
Seaside, OR 97138-5037

From: Charles Townsend [mailto:charlesntownsend@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 7:42 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Charles Townsend
623 NE Morris St.
Portland, OR 97212

September 12, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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,

Charles Townsend
Charles Townsend

From: Scott and Heidi Trinkle [mailto:dwerger@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Scott and Heidi Trinkle
Email: dwerger@gmail.com
Address: 1205 SW Cardinell Dr. unit 603, Portland, Oregon, 97201

From: Dena Turner [mailto:denaturn62@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 5:01 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Dena Turner

Email: denaturn62@gmail.com

Address: 1122 SE 60th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97215

From: Lee Underwood [mailto:lee@cstarz.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 2:11 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear City of Portland,

The recent oil train derailment and massive fire in Mosier has reinforced what we all have known for a long time—these trains going to and from Portland are moving BOMBS! Please 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. 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 by 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.

Please do not let us down!

Kind regards,

Lee Underwood
2149 Cascade Avenue
Hood River, OR
97031

From: Robin Vesey [mailto:jack-robin@spiritone.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 5:08 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Robin Vesey
Email: jack-robin@spiritone.com
Address: 16 SW Canby St, Portland, Oregon, 97219-4661

From: John Wadsworth [mailto:johnsonwadsworth@msn.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 11:49 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

John Wadsworth
9271 SW 3rd Ave
Portland, OR 97219

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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 Wadsworth
John Wadsworth

Date: 12 September 2016

To: City of Portland Planning & Sustainability Commission

Subject: Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments

Esteemed Commissioners:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on the proposed Zoning Code amendments covering Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal (BFFT) Zoning amendments submitted by the City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) on 12 August 2016, with suggested revisions per Memorandum dated 9 September 2016.

This testimony addresses Sections 2 and 3 of the 9 September 16 Memorandum which involve “Regulating existing terminal expansion” and “Additional review criteria” respectively. It also addresses the serious issue of terminal aggregation, wherein the fossil fuel industry submits a number of connected small facility proposals that individually meet size limitations but in aggregate exceed them.

- **Regulating existing terminal expansion**

The City of Portland Building and Development Services (BDS) Department reports that requiring expansion of existing terminals to undergo Non-conforming Situation Type II “would be difficult to approve.” As a result of this feedback, BPS is recommending that the original Zoning amendment proposal be revised to “*allow limited expansion of existing terminals to not exceed 10 percent of the total terminal capacity*”.

This revision to the original zoning amendment should be rejected for two reasons:

1. **Expansion of existing fossil fuel infrastructure should be difficult to approve.** The City’s Resolution #37618 was adopted for the express purpose to “*Oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways.*” The recommendation to classify BFFT as Non-conforming Uses is a correct and appropriate method of achieving the goal stated in Resolution #37618. Any revisions to the Code which would facilitate - rather than inhibit - expansion of existing fossil fuel infrastructure would stand in direct contradiction to the City Resolution. Allowing limited expansion of facilities up to 10 percent of capacity without land use review would facilitate expansions and thus should not be adopted. Funding for any additional staff and/or consultant time required by BDS to process fossil fuel expansion applications should be borne solely by the applicant.
2. **Proposed revision gives BFFT preferential treatment.** No other Use category in Nonconforming Situations is allowed to expand up to 10 percent of existing capacity without Land Use Review. The proposed revision gives unwarranted preferential treatment to a category of Uses, specifically BFFT. Furthermore, the 10 percent expansion threshold is completely arbitrary on the part of the City and has no basis in any other legally adopted

standard; it is based solely on the reluctance of BDS to see an increase in work load. Adoption of this revision could expose the City to a LUBA challenge.

- **Additional review criteria**

The review criteria for Nonconforming Situation Review included in the current version of the Zoning Code were developed to evaluate primarily changes to Residential and/or Commercial Nonconforming Uses, especially Commercial Uses in Residential Zones. As a result they address the types of compatibility issues typically presented by these types of Uses, e.g. noise and traffic. Given the severity of impact that BFFT pose to surrounding properties, the current review criteria alone are inadequate to address the serious threats presented by BFFT. Resolution #37168 includes the following findings:

- *Fossil fuels pose risks to safety, health, and livability, including mobility of people, other freight, and other commercial vehicles;*
- *Fossil fuel infrastructure poses considerable risks in the event of a major earthquake;*
- *The extraction and combustion of fossil fuels are significant sources of greenhouse gas emissions and major contributors to climate change and pollution;*
- *Crude oil, including oil derived from the Bakken shale reservoir, is known to be volatile, highly flammable and to contain elevated levels of benzene, a potent carcinogen; and*
- *Given the record of crude oil and coal or other fossil fuel transport accidents, such as Lac Megantic in 2013, the 1999 Bellingham pipeline leak or a coal train derailment, an event could have catastrophic effects if it occurred in any of Oregon's populated areas.*

Thus it is not only appropriate and necessary, but legally justified to impose stricter review criteria on applications to expand the Nonconforming Situation review criteria only for BFFT. The additional review criteria that need to be taken into consideration are: (1) impact of increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change, (2) impact of potential fire and/or explosion, and (3) impact of potential release of fossil fuels into the Columbia River and/or any tributary waterways.

The addition of these review criteria for BFFT would allow for proposed expansions that involve either facilities used for mixing of clean fuels and/or seismic upgrades to existing facilities, as net decreases in either GHG emissions and/or risk of explosion and fire in the event of an earthquake could justify approval of the request.

Lastly, BDS asserts that if additional review criteria are adopted, because “they do not have staff expertise to implement discretionary land use review criteria addressing greenhouse gas emissions or safety impacts of hazardous material storage and transportation,” BFFT “applicants would be required to hire specialized consultants to show compliance of the particular criterion.” This is both necessary and appropriate, as justified by the above listed findings from Resolution #37168. Furthermore, BDS notes that this would be inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan Policy 6.16 Regulatory Climate. The additional criteria would, however, be in compliance with the recently adopted Comprehensive Plan Policy on Fossil Fuel Distribution which “*Limit fossil fuels distribution and storage facilities to those necessary to serve the regional market.*” Given the severity of the

impacts noted above in the City's resolution, adopting Zoning code language for BFFT that aligns with the applicable Comprehensive Plan Policy for fossil fuel distribution is of greater importance than reducing the regulatory burden on the fossil fuel industry.

Proposed language to enact these additional criteria is attached as Appendix "A".

- **Terminal Aggregation**

It is important to note a trend of terminal aggregation in fossil fuel projects, of which we have some examples in the Pacific Northwest. In BC, where nearly two dozen liquefied natural gas (LNG) export projects are in the proposal stage, the annual production of several LNG proposals would be three to four times larger than the annual production of the largest existing LNG terminal in the world. The way in which the projects would achieve these production volumes is through the aggregation of several terminals of equal size, each with its own liquefaction equipment, storage and other structures. The terminals would be geographic neighbors. Through the benefits of the project umbrella they would be greenlit under the same permits with respect to land use, pipelines, etc.

While the existing Zoning code definitions for "site", "ownership", and "development" do an excellent job of precluding this practice of small facility aggregation, there does exist opportunities for the fossil fuel industry to sidestep Zoning code prohibitions. One way would be by submitting separate applications for multiple projects, each owned by an entity that is a subsidiary of a single corporation. Another would be to separate contiguous lots by a lot or lots under different Ownership, but to connect facilities on the non-contiguous lots by easements containing pipelines, access roads, &c.

The existing Zoning code definition for "Ownership" should be revised to include the following language:

Contiguous lots that are owned by multiple entities that are subsidiaries of a single corporation are considered to be a single ownership. Non-contiguous lots that are Owned by the same entity and connected via an easement granted by the Owner(s) of the lot(s) located between the non-contiguous lots are considered to be a single ownership.

This concludes my written testimony. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns. Thank you for your attention to this issue.

Cordially

Patricia J Weber
2785 NW Marshall Drive
Corvallis OR
97330
541-829-0887
trish.weber@gmail.com

APPENDIX "A"

NONCONFORMING SITUATION REVIEW – ADDITIONAL CRITERIA LANGUAGE

33.258.80 Nonconforming Situation Review

- A. Procedure.** A nonconforming situation review is processed through a Type II procedure.
- B. Approval criteria.** The request will be approved if the review body finds that the applicant has shown that all of the following approval criteria are met:
1. All requests must comply with the following review criteria:
 - ~~1.~~ a. With mitigation measures, there will be no net increase in overall detrimental impacts (over the impacts of the last legal use or development) on the surrounding area taking into account factors such as:
 - ~~a.~~ (1) The hours of operation;
 - ~~b.~~ (2) Vehicle trips to the site and impact on surrounding on-street parking;
 - ~~c.~~ (3) Noise, vibration, dust, odor, fumes, glare, and smoke;
 - ~~d.~~ (4) Potential for increased litter; and
 - ~~e.~~ (5) The amount, location, and nature of any outside displays, storage, or activities; and
 - ~~2.~~ b. If the nonconforming use is in an OS or R zone, and if any changes are proposed to the site, the appearance of the new use or development will not lessen the residential character of the OS or R zoned area. This is based on taking into account factors such as:
 - ~~a.~~ (1) Building scale, placement, and facade;
 - ~~b.~~ (2) Parking area placement;
 - ~~c.~~ (3) Buffering and the potential loss of privacy to abutting residential uses; and Lighting and signs; and
 - ~~d.~~ (4) Lighting and signs; and
 - ~~3.~~ c. If the nonconforming use is in a C, E, or I zone, and if any changes are proposed to the site, the appearance of the new use or development will not detract from the desired function and character of the zone; and
 2. Because fossil fuels pose risks to safety, health, and livability, including mobility of people, other freight, and other commercial vehicles, because the extraction and combustion of fossil fuels are significant sources of greenhouse gas emissions and major contributors to climate change and pollution, and given the record of crude oil and coal or other fossil fuel transport accidents, Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal are subject to these additional review criteria. With mitigation measures, there will be no net increase in overall detrimental impacts (over the impacts of the last legal use or development) on the surrounding area based on the following factors:

a. The effects of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change, where:

(1) GHG is defined as the following:

- carbon dioxide,
- methane,
- nitrous oxide,
- hydrofluorocarbons,
- perfluorocarbons,
- nitrogen trifluoride,
- and sulfur hexafluoride,

(2) Both direct and indirect GHG emissions are to be considered, where

- Direct GHG emissions are emissions from the Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal Use site, and
- Indirect GHG emissions are emissions that are a consequence of the activities of the Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal Use site, but occur at sources located elsewhere, and

(3) Quantification tools and methodology employed is to be per the White House Council on Environmental Quality's publication "2012 Guidance for Accounting and Reporting," as amended over time.

As the totality of climate change impacts is not attributable to any single action, but are exacerbated by a series of actions, a statement that emissions from a request involving a Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal represent only a small fraction of global emissions is essentially a statement about the nature of the climate change challenge, and is not an appropriate basis for deciding the impact of climate change impacts on the surrounding area. Moreover, these comparisons are also not an appropriate method for characterizing the potential impacts associated with a request, because this approach does not reveal anything beyond the nature of the climate change challenge itself: the fact that diverse individual sources of emissions each make a relatively small addition to global atmospheric GHG concentrations that collectively have a large impact.

(b) The effects of a fire and/or explosion at either the Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal Site or transportation equipment or infrastructure used to convey fossil fuels to or from the Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal, and

(c) The effects of a breach and release of fossil fuels from either the Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal Site or transportation equipment or infrastructure used to convey fossil fuels to or from the Bulk Fossil Fuel Terminal, into the Columbia River and/or tributary waterways.

(d) When considering the effects of (b), and (c), above, the likelihood of an event occurring should be evaluated in the context of the scale and severity of the deleterious impact on the surrounding area.

From: Steve Wheeler [mailto:swwheeler@arris.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 8:42 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: Good work

Steve Wheeler
4501 NE Wistaria Dr.
Portland, OR 97213

September 12, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Planning and Sustainability Commissioners,

Thank you for the diligence and transparency in pursuing the City's implementation of its 11/15 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

Thank you to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved. The proposed changes are much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It's great to see the city making decisions that are both environmentally responsible, and responsive to citizen input.

However, I'm concerned that the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short. It will allow 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). The City's policy was clear, but is undermined by new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil.

We still need to strengthen the regulations when it comes to expanding pre-existing terminals. It is unclear 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.

Let's make the City's policy as strong as it can be by doing the following:

- 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.
- Get rid of the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less. WHAT LOBBYIST WROTE THAT? Allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no current plans for more LNG storage in Portland.
- Let's build in strong restrictions on allowable expansions of existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.
- Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland. That's a loop hole that allows end-runs. Please!

Now more than ever, the City of Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate change awareness movement. With these important improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland will once again be on the forefront addressing a critical threat to humankind of our time.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Steve Wheeler

From: Ruby Karen Annette Wilcox [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 5:44 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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!

From: Ruby Karen Annette Wilcox
Email: rubykwilcox@yahoo.com
Address: 430 NE 16TH Avenue #433, Portland, Oregon, 97232

From: Jean Wyman [mailto:jwyman62@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 10, 2016 11:59 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Please enact bold, binding language for PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

Jean Wyman
3914 NE 75th
Portland, OR 97213

September 10, 2016

Dear Planning & Sustainability Commission,

Dear Member of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft makes real progress towards the 2015 Resolution's goal to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways." As a resident of Portland, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

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 much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is good to see the city making decisions that are not only environmentally responsible, but also responsive to citizen input.

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 or adjacent waterways." Although this draft prohibits new 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). The City's policy was clear, and new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

Additionally, while this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations when it comes to the expansion of 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.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

- 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.
- An exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less is unnecessary and could 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.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts in the City's non-conforming use review process. The

City should use this process to ensure that seismic and safety improvements are the basis for any new changes to Portland's existing bulk fossil fuel terminals.

-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. PLEASE CONTINUE TO BE AN IMPRESSIVE CITY COUNCIL, LEADING THE WAY ON CLIMATE CHANGE!

Sincerely,

Sincerely,
Jean Wyman

From: Fiona Yun [mailto:fiona.yun00@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2016 9:05 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Fiona Yun
Email: fiona.yun00@gmail.com
Address: 10046 N Oswego, Portland, Oregon, 97203

From: Angela Zehava [mailto:angela.zehava@stanfordalumni.org]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2016 2:52 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Angela Zehava
Email: angela.zehava@stanfordalumni.org
Address: 1579 SE Nehalem St., Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: lee zucker [mailto:lee.m.zucker@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2016 2:54 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Please: For the sake of Portlanders, Oregonians in general, other residents and creatures of this planet

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

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

Thank you.

Lee Zucker for the Zucker family
1966 Orchard St.
Eugene, OR 97403

From: Jan Zuckerman [mailto:zuckerez@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2016 7:39 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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.

From: Jan Zuckerman
Email: zuckerez@hotmail.com
Address: 2914 NE 18th Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97212