

From: Amanda Jones [mailto:amjones@esassoc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 7:29 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,

Amanda Jones
SE Morrison St
Portland, OR 97206

From: Alan Smith [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:21 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.

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: Alan Smith
Email: a23smith@yahoo.com
Address: 5908 SE 17th Street, Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: Anthony Albert [<mailto:albert2910@msn.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:15 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: Anthony Albert
Email: albert2910@msn.com
Address: 285 NW 35th St, Apt. 8, Corvallis, Oregon, 97330

From: Karen Alexander-Brown [mailto:kjalexander@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 2:32 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,
Keep Portland the leader in combating climate change that we have always been by enacting the following:

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

From: Karen Alexander-Brown
Email: kjalexander@hotmail.com
Address: 6111 SW 33rd Place, Portland, Oregon, 97239

From: Vincent Alvarez [mailto:vincent.alvarez@burroughs.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 4:32 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Vincent Alvarez
Email: vincent.alvarez@burroughs.com
Address: 12671 SE Where Else Ln., Milwaukie, Oregon, 97222

From: Hal Anthony [mailto:threepines@jeffnet.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Hal Anthony
Email: threepines@jeffnet.org
Address: 3995 Russell Rd., Grants Pass, Oregon, 97526

From: Susanna Askins [mailto:tlknkr@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 11:30 PM
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,

Susanna Askins
14640 NE Russell Ct
Portland, OR 97230

From: Alan Smith [mailto:a23smith@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 9:47 PM
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,

Alan Smith
5908 SE 17th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

From: Luke Anavi [mailto:lanavi@ymail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 4:26 PM
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,

Luke Anavi
2431 N.E. Flanders St.
Portland, OR 97232

From: Stephen & Irene Bachhuber [mailto:srbachhuber1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:33 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,

Stephen & Irene Bachhuber
3428 SE 9th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

From: Matthew Baird [mailto:mbaird@climatetrust.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 9:55 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

From: Matthew Baird
Email: mbaird@climatetrust.org
Address: 904 NE 76th Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97213

From: Barbara Bartschi [mailto:bartschi@imagina.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:55 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

Ban new fossil fuel terminal.

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

From: Barbara Bartschi
Email: bartschi@imagina.com
Address: 5117 SE Naef Rd, Milwaukie, Oregon, 97267

From: Ben Basin [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2016 8:00 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: Ben Basin

Email: ben_basin@yahoo.com

Address: 515 SE 19th Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Sonya Bastendorff & Joshua Anderson [mailto:sonya.bastendorff@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:21 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,

Sonya Bastendorff & Joshua Anderson
5325 SW Dosch Rd
Portland, OR 97239

From: David Bennett [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:15 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: David Bennett
Email: bapoo503@yahoo.com
Address: 1061 SE 57th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97215

From: Naomi Berg [mailto:naomboam@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 12:42 PM
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,

Naomi Berg
1115 SE Rex St
Portland, OR 97202

From: Joshua Berger [mailto:josh@plazm.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 9:32 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Hi friends at the sustainability commission.

I stood in city hall multiple times when the fossil fuel policy was being debated and voted on. As a longtime Portland resident and someone who has worked on sustainability issues for many years, I felt a deep sense of pride.

Now it is time to follow through on the high standards we set.

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

Thank you for your dedication and work on this issue. Let's continue to lead the nation in sustainability.

Best regards

Joshua Berger
2124 NE 41st ave
Portland OR, 97212

From: Diana Boom [mailto:diana@dboom.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 7:55 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Diana Boom
Email: diana@dboom.net
Address: PO Box 328, Lake Oswego, Oregon, 97034

From: Dr. Carole Warner [mailto:carewarner@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 7:18 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: We must have 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.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal 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.

We need to strengthen the regulations with regard to the expansion of pre-existing terminals. It is unclear from the draft whether 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, we ask the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission to consider the following:

First, 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.

Second, 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.

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

Finally, we must 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,
Osiel Bonfim, PhD
Carole Warner, ND, LAc.

Dr. Carole Warner
3633 SE 27th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

From: Jim Breithaupt [mailto:jlbefellow@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:43 PM
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,

Jim Breithaupt
1880 SW Edgewood Rd
Portland, OR 97201

From: Leanna Brooks [mailto:sketch3d@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:20 PM
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,

Leanna Brooks
317 w 4th Plain Blvd
Vancouver, WA 98660

From: marjory bryan [mailto:djinstigatah@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:55 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.

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

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland

Thank you for all you do!!!

From: marjory bryan
Email: djinstigatah@gmail.com
Address: 2232 SE Pine Street , Portland, Oregon, 97214

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian K. Smith [mailto:brian.k.smith@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 11:20 PM

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

The proposed limitations are a good first step.

Let's go even farther!

No new bulk fossil fuel terminals of any capacity.

No new gas stations.

City police stop enforcing trespassing laws against protestors interfering with fossil fuel shipments or fossil fuel extraction equipment.

No new fossil fuel vehicles in the city fleet.

More investment in walking, cycling, and public transit at the expense of autos, like the Comprehensive Plan or whatever it's called already says we are doing. (We aren't really doing it...)

I want to be able to tell my grandchildren, "Hey, at least we took the issue seriously and tried to do something, even if it was too little too late."

Sincerely,

Brian K. Smith

924 NE 65th Ave. Unit A

Portland, OR 97213

From: Amber Buhl [mailto:ambie80b@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:35 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: Amber Buhl

Email: ambie80b@gmail.com

Address: 5521 se 57th ave, Portland, Oregon, 97206

From: Heather Carver [mailto:tierrabodhi@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 7:13 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Re: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: Don't settle for less!

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. And 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 brings the proposed changes much 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 or adjacent waterways.” This draft 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.

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. The plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution was “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 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.

Thank you!
Heather Carver
4613 NE Killingsworth St, Portland, OR 97218

From: Joe Chasse [mailto:joetruck@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 9:45 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Joe Chasse
Email: joetruck@gmail.com
Address: 22313 V St., Ocean Park, Washington, 98640

From: karen christensen [mailto:lesterladonna@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 1:12 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.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Karen Christensen
Portland, OR 97212

From: karen christensen
Email: lesterladonna@gmail.com
Address: 446 NE Fargo st, Portland, Oregon, 97212

From: Cale Christi [mailto:cale.austin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:08 PM
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,

Cale Christi
5109 N Oberlin St
Portland, OR 97203

From: Rebecca Clarke [mailto:bjclark@siderial.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 1:07 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,

Rebecca Clarke
5035 N DePauw St
Portland, OR 97203

From: Lisa Cohn [mailto:lisaellencohn1@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:25 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

Hi,

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

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

I also support the city preventing any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. Your proposal is almost there. Let's protect our climate and environment and enact a full ban!

From: Lisa Cohn
Email: lisaellencohn1@gmail.com
Address: 3141 NW Greenbriar Terr, Portland, Oregon, 97210

From: Victoria Cole [mailto:cole.tori@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:17 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Victoria Cole
Email: cole.tori@gmail.com
Address: 1635 NE Couch St., Portland, Oregon, 97232

From: Todd Corbett [mailto:htcorbett@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:33 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Todd Corbett
Email: htcorbett@hotmail.com
Address: 10815 Hubbard Creek Rd, Umpqua, Oregon, 97486

From: Jonnel Covault [mailto:jonnelcovault@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 10:59 PM
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.

I am very concerned that the Beautiful and Historic Columbia River Gorge is becoming a dirty fossil fuel Export corridor. Local residents bear the costs for toxic air and water when there are spills and coal dust. It is time to invest in Renewables. There are no toxic spills with wind or solar energy! Please help us leave a livable planet for our grandchildren.

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,

Jonnel Covault
14114 SE Redwood Ave
Portland, OR 97267

From: Nicholas Curtright [mailto:Nicsmind@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 03, 2016 7:31 PM
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,

Nicholas Curtright
12345 lake city way #399
Seattle, WA 98125

From: Leslie Davis & Robert Fordham [mailto:boblespdx@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:14 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Full ban, PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I am a voter in the City of Portland and support your pursuing the implementation of the November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy.

City leaders have made a good start in making Portland an example that other cities can follow. However, allowing new fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of fossil fuels is a mistake.

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. A
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals.
- Add language to prevent smaller related “terminals” from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Portland could once again be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Leslie Davis & Robert Fordham
2016 NE 25th Ave
Portland, OR 97212

From: Tony and Phyllis DeCristofaro [mailto:pdecrist@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:14 PM
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,

Tony and Phyllis DeCristofaro
472 N Hayden Is Dr
Portland, OR 97217

-----Original Message-----

From: Lenny Dee [mailto:ldeepdx@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 7:51 AM

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Hi,

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 . Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits in the City's non-conforming use review process. Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Kind Regards,

Lenny Dee
2580 NE 31 Ave.

From: Robert Deering [mailto:robert.deering@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:56 PM
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,

Robert Deering
5528 N Moore Ave
Portland, OR 97217

From: Teresa DeLorenzo [mailto:tde@teleport.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 2:39 PM
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,

Teresa DeLorenzo
Knappa Dock Road
Astoria, OR 97103

From: Heather Dennett [mailto:heathervanhoof@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:48 PM
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,

Heather Dennett
6835 N Wall Ave
Portland, OR 97203

From: Karen Deora [mailto:karendeora@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:37 PM
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,

Karen Deora
2943 NE 9th Ave
Portland, OR 97212

From: Diane Jacobs [mailto:dianejacobs2@icloud.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 11:24 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Diane Jacobs
Email: dianejacobs2@icloud.com
Address: 2828 NE 69th Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97213

From: Don Jacobson [mailto:donjphoto@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 7:04 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: Don Jacobson
Email: donjphoto@gmail.com
Address: 2545 SW Terwilliger Blvd Apt 314, Portland, Oregon, 97201-6304

From: Dave King [mailto:landd_2@q.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:39 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Dave King
Email: landd_2@q.com
Address: 8728 N Edison, Portland, Oregon, 97203

From: Melba Dlugonski [mailto:melbajade@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 7:04 PM
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,

Melba Dlugonski
6735 SE 78th
Portland, OR 97206

From: Don E. Dumond [mailto:ddumond@uoregon.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 7:34 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

My comment:

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

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

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Respectfully submitted,

From: Don E. Dumond
Email: ddumond@uoregon.edu
Address: 1744 Moss St., Eugene, Oregon, 97403

From: Carolyn Eckel [mailto:tlew4002@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 9:00 PM
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,

Carolyn Eckel
PO Box 33707
Portland, OR 97292

From: Cynthia Enlow [mailto:hienlow@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 7:47 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

From: Cynthia Enlow

Email: hienlow@msn.com

Address: 1460 NW Ashley Dr, Albany, Oregon, 97321-1176

From: Dianne Ensign [mailto:roughskinnednewt@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 11:44 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,

Dianne Ensign
11600 SW Lancaster Rd
Portland, OR 97219

From: Shannon Ferguson [mailto:shannonmferguson@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 10:21 PM
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,

Shannon Ferguson
7910 N Fiske Ave
Portland, OR 97203

From: Deborah Field [mailto:deblyfield@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 7:41 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Deborah Field
Email: deblyfield@gmail.com
Address: 3437 NE 48th, Portland, Oregon, 97213

From: Deva Fleming [mailto:Msdeva@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 5:51 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,

We must stand together to protect our future!

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,

Deva Fleming
6420 NE 42nd Ave
Portland, OR 97218

From: James Fuller [mailto:thornking@live.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 11:32 PM
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,

James Fuller
3670 W Bellewood Pl
Tucson, AZ 85741

From: Michael Garland [mailto:mjgpx36@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:08 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Michael Garland
Email: mjgpx36@gmail.com
Address: 2125 SE 35th Place, Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Kima Garrison [mailto:kimasuegarrison@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:01 PM
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,

Kima Garrison
5112 NE 28th Ave
Portland, OR 97211

From: Erinne Goodell [mailto:erinne.larissa@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 2:24 PM
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,

Erinne Goodell
3241 NE Holman St
Portland, OR 97211

From: Kaitlin Grammer [mailto:grammerk@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 7:39 PM
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,

Kaitlin Grammer
2104 NE 55th Ave
Portland, OR 97213

From: Gisela Ray [mailto:giselaray@frontier.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 7:26 PM
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,

As we know that fossil fuels have to be phased out it seems terribly counterproductive to add any new infrastructure for them. Let's use any new investment on renewables instead and help our planet fight climate change!

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,

Gisela Ray
85 SE 16th Court
Gresham, OR 97080

From: Dawn Griffin [mailto:dm_griffin@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:19 PM
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,

Dawn Griffin
1347 NE 47th Ave
Portland, OR 97213

From: Robert Grossman [mailto:rbgrossman@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 5:40 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Robert Grossman
3224 NE 17th Ave
Portland 97212

I do not support a ban on fossil fuel terminals that still allows new facilities to store as much as 5 million gallons of fuel. It is not necessary to allow such a terminal in the city since the facts are overwhelmingly clear that such terminals are a grave risk to the health and well being of Portland residents. I question the rationale behind such a proposal and know that when I voted for each member of the city council, no one ran on a platform that included such proposals.

Portland needs to strengthen restrictions on expansions at existing terminals through binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impacts as part of the city's non-conforming use review process. Climate change is real and our city needs to do more to reduce carbon emissions. Tighter limits would be a step in the right direction.

Finally, the city needs to prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland. Renewables are the future and it makes no sense to bring on more capacity for an energy source that is destroying our climate and that we need to phase out.

Thanks, Bob Grossman

From: Angela Gusa [mailto:agusa@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:29 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,

Angela Gusa
2625 NE 41st Ave
Portland, OR 97212

From: jody guth [mailto:jodyguth@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 8:54 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: jody guth
Email: jodyguth@gmail.com
Address: 2308 ne rodney ave, portland, Oregon, 97212

From: Michael & Deborah Hall [mailto:micahall1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:14 PM
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,

Michael & Deborah Hall
16 Churchill Downs
Lake Oswego, OR 97035

From: Rachel Hampton [mailto:hamptonrachel2002@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 7:09 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

Please improve the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments by:

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

Thank You.

From: Rachel Hampton
Email: hamptonrachel2002@outlook.com
Address: 7200 SE Woodstock Blvd. #28, Portland, Oregon, 97206

From: Rachael Hawkey [mailto:ranchrachel@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:23 PM
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,

Rachael Hawkey
4839 N Kerby Ave
Portland, OR 97217

From: Douglas Hayner [mailto:pdxdoug@q.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:02 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,

Douglas Hayner
5825 NE Emerson St
Portland, OR 97218

From: Helen Hays [mailto:hlhays@ccgmail.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 6:22 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

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. Additionally, strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits as well as criteria for safety and climate impact in the City's non-conforming use review process. Finally, prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you for your consideration,
Helen Logan Hays

From: Helen Hays
Email: hlhays@ccgmail.net
Address: 18553 S Ferguson Rd, Oregon City, Oregon, 97045

From: David Hermanns [mailto:dhermann@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:51 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: David Hermanns

Email: dhermann@earthlink.net

Address: 9442 N Tioga Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97203

From: Tara Hershberger [mailto:tara.lyn.hershberger@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 5:07 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

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

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

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

From: Tara Hershberger
Email: tara.lyn.hershberger@gmail.com
Address: 8830 NE Hancock St., Portland, Oregon, 97220

From: Craig Heverly [mailto:heverlyjc@hevanet.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:54 PM
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,

Craig Heverly
3712 SE 9th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

From: Craig Heverly [mailto:heverlyjc@hevanet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:55 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,

Craig Heverly

From: Craig Heverly

Email: heverlyjc@hevanet.com

Address: 3712 SE 9th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: Michael Hevron [mailto:maehah@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:38 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Ban fossil fuel terminals

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for the transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. Your actively opposing expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways is just what we need.

The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability has incorporated public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments, though not completely in line with the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

But the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal is still less than the 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.”

The current draft still allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons. 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 City’s 2015 Resolution.

Also, this proposal 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:

* Ban ALL new fossil fuel terminals.

- Do NOT except "small" facilities under 5 million gallons. Do NOT allow new LNG storage in NW Natural didn't ask for it and expansion would be in a sensitive area.

-Add binding limits and safety and climate criteria on expansions allowed at existing terminals . The Be sure that seismic and safety improvements are included in any 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,

Michael Hevron
217 NW Prescott Pl
Beaverton, OR 97006

From: Robert Heydenreich [mailto:bobheyden@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 10:40 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.

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

Sincerely, Robert Heydenreich

From: Robert Heydenreich

Email: bobheyden@gmail.com

Address: 6204 SE 40th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: Barbara Hilyer [mailto:s.barbara.hilyer@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:16 PM
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,

Barbara Hilyer
2790 SW Carolina St
Portland, OR 97239

From: Nathaniel Holder [mailto:nathaniel@nholder.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 7:16 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,

From: Nathaniel Holder

Email: nathaniel@nholder.com

Address: 1722 SE 58th Avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97215

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry Hon [mailto:larryhon55@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2016 8:20 AM

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: Fossil fuel terminal zoning amendments

I agree with the zoning amendment to prohibit bulk fossil fuel terminals in all zones and the full wording of the amendment.

Larry Hon
2806 SE 15th Ave
Portland, Oregon 97202
970-618-0129

From: Tom Hopkins [mailto:appgol@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 11:17 PM

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony.

I think it is important that Portland take a leading role in limiting fossil fuel extraction, transportation and consumption. I urge the PSC to follow the City recommendation and

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

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

3. Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits in the City's non-conforming use review process.

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

Thank you

Thomas Hopkins
19698 SE Cottonwood St.
Milwaukie, Oregon 97267

appgol@gmail.com

From: P Horter [mailto:lacengh@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:21 PM
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,

I am writing to you about a subject that I think is very important: enacting a full ban on all fossil fuel terminals and infrastructure, and completely outlawing the expansion of all existing fossil fuel facilities.

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,

P Horter
17827 NW Sauvie Is.Rd.
Portland, OR 97231

From: Jynx Houston [mailto:jynxcdo@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:19 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Jynx Houston
Email: jynxcdo@gmail.com
Address: 7605 SE Lincoln St., Portland, Oregon, 97215

From: George Jacobs [mailto:aranobilis@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:27 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: Full Ban!

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

While I would be inclined to thank you for the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy...I remember all too well your ridiculous vote on the Pembina Terminal when public testimony at several hearings ran 80%-20% AGAINST such a facility.

So, given that City Hall has already taken the brunt of the political flack on this one....it would be not only appreciated, but appropriate...for the Commission to follow suit.

Given the fact that the Federal government makes no secret of its desire to tunr the greater Portland Area, as well as the Columbia River Basin...into a fossil fuel export hub, the citiznes of Oregon as well as Washington must rely on their Local and Municipal Leaders and Councils to stand up and protect our Health, Safety, and Welfare.

The Portland Metro area is too large a population zone, and too important an ecosystem....to risk for the sake of some Corporations which will not really be providing a large number of permanent jobs for Oregonians.

Regards,

George Jacobs
Portland

George Jacobs
3104 SE Morrison St
Portland, OR 97214

From: David Jacquemin [mailto:dave.jacquemin@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:23 PM
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,

David Jacquemin
473 SE 46TH DRIVE
Gresham, OR 97080

From: Dan Jaffee [mailto:dsjaffee@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 9:24 AM

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: Support a Total Ban on new Fossil Fuel Terminals

Dear Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

The City's draft of the Fossil Fuel Policy makes 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." While the current draft is much improved, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015, which called for the city to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways."

Although this new 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). New fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels such as liquefied natural gas (LNG) or crude oil will undermine the promise and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen the regulations regarding the expansion of pre-existing terminals. It is not clear whether 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 urge that the City of Portland and the Planning and Sustainability Commission do the following:

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. 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 dangerous new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary, because 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 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.
4. Add language to prevent smaller related "terminals" from clustering and aggregating to increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

The City of Portland has a rare opportunity to be recognized as 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 in the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Sincerely,

Daniel Jaffee
4723 NE 14th Ave.
Portland, OR 97211

From: Noah Jenkins [mailto:njohnj@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:16 PM
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. 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,

Noah Jenkins
8025 SE 60th Ave
Portland, OR 97206

From: Sandy Joos [mailto:joosgalefamily@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 10:14 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,

I first want to 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.

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

- 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.
- Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less. This 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 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.

Thank you for your efforts on this urgent matter.

Sandra Joos
4259 SW Patrick Pl
Portland, OR 97239
503-274-8803

From: Jack West [mailto:jpwest@teleport.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:19 PM
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,

Jack West
3914 SE Licynta Ln
Milwaukie, OR 97222

From: Jeffrey White [mailto:rogue576@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 04, 2016 10:14 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: Jeffrey White
Email: rogue576@gmail.com
Address: 42852 SW Dudley Avenue, Forest Grove, Oregon, 97116-8523

From: Eric Kaiser [mailto:ericjohnkaiser@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 7:21 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,

Eric Kaiser
3587 NE Stanton St
Portland, OR 97212

From: Gabrielle Karras [mailto:gk2829@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 8:10 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

Hello,

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

From: Gabrielle Karras
Email: gk2829@hotmail.com
Address: 4210 SE Bybee Blvd, Portland, Oregon, 97206

From: Neal Keefer [mailto:nvkeefe@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 9:13 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

Thank you for considering my comments.

From: Neal Keefer
Email: nvkeefe@msn.com
Address: 4025 NE Couch St, Portland, Oregon, 97232

From: Ed Kerns [mailto:edkerns@aracnet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:51 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,

Ed Kerns
2335 SE Pine St
Portland, OR 97214

From: Harry Kershner [mailto:harrykershner@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 12:13 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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: Harry Kershner
Email: harrykershner@msn.com
Address: 9322 N Oswego Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97203

From: Thomas Keys [mailto:tkeyshike@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:13 PM
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,

Thomas Keys
1103 SE 21st Ct
Gresham, OR 97080

From: kima garrison [mailto:kimasuegarrison@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:13 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: kima garrison
Email: kimasuegarrison@gmail.com
Address: 5112 ne 28th, portland, Oregon, 97211

From: joana kirchhoff [mailto:joanakirchhoff@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 04, 2016 2:28 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: joana kirchhoff
Email: joanakirchhoff@gmail.com
Address: 3414 NE 73rd, Portland, Oregon, 97213

From: Kristin Lee [mailto:Kplee@centurylink.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:22 PM
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,

Kristin Lee
5803 SW garden home rd
Portland, OR 97219

From: Gregg Kleiner [mailto:kleinerg@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:04 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

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

From: Gregg Kleiner
Email: kleinerg@comcast.net
Address: 940 SE Alexander Avenue, Corvallis, Oregon, 97333

From: Lilian Kong [mailto:lilian.kong@outlook.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 6:02 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,

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

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

From: Lilian Kong
Email: lilian.kong@outlook.com
Address: 5609 SE 54th Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97206

From: David Kreisman [mailto:dkreisman@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 9:37 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban Now!

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:

- 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 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.

Regards

David Kreisman

15066 SE Robinette Ct
Portland, OR 97267

From: Barbara Krupnik-Goldman [mailto:bkgold2@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:45 PM
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,

Barbara Krupnik-Goldman

Barbara Krupnik-Goldman
2940 NE 35th Ave
Portland, OR 97216

From: Ruba Leech [mailto:ruba_t@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 3:10 PM
To: Kountz, Steve <Steve.Kountz@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Let's Revive Portland's Fossil Fuel Ban!

Dear Mr. Kountz and Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:

In its effort to develop code changes to implement the City's historic November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy, I am encouraging the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to return to the initial intent and plain language of the resolution. The resolution stated the City's intent to "actively oppose expansion of infrastructure whose primary purpose is transporting or storing fossil fuels in or through Portland or adjacent waterways."

In short, I am asking the City to enact a ban of new fossil fuel infrastructure - in particular oil, gas, and coal terminals in Portland.

Unfortunately, the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments discussion draft falls far short of the 2015 Fossil Fuel Resolution that the City Council passed last year. Where the resolution was bold, visionary, and historic, this discussion draft is short-sighted and prioritizes the fossil fuel industry over the health and safety of Portlanders.

Please revise proposed code changes to include:

- A ban on new bulk fossil fuel terminals
- Strong limits on expansions at existing facilities
- Provisions to improve the safety and resilience of existing terminals

Presently, the discussion draft allows new bulk terminals to be built, setting limits that would significantly increase fossil fuel projects in the City, including 21 million gallons of new crude oil storage and a new LNG tank the size of NW Natural's existing facility in NW Portland. New LNG tanks and petroleum storage (enough to hold 7 unit trains worth of oil) would double down on precisely the kind of fossil fuel projects that the City Council intended to ban in November 2015. Please revise the proposed code changes to ban new bulk fossil fuel terminals.

The proposed code changes would also allow existing facilities to expand, which will grow our carbon footprint past the point of being able to meet our local and state carbon reduction goals. Proposed code The City of Portland needs to hold these industries accountable for improving their safety without promising them more room to grow. We need to shrink fossil fuel use, not grow it! Please revise proposed code changes to set limits on existing bulk fossil fuel terminals, and add provisions to encourage existing facilities to improve their safety and resilience in a large seismic event.

As one of thousands who supported the City's Fossil Fuel Policy, I urge you to develop a new, strengthened draft before the Planning and Sustainability's Commission's hearing in September.

Sincerely,

Ruba Leech
1128 NE Emerson St
Portland, OR 97211

From: Tom Lichatowich [mailto:tjlichat@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 7:41 PM
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,

Tom Lichatowich
4625 NE 38th Ave
Portland, OR 97211

From: Rose Lindsey [mailto:lyleandrosie@spiritone.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 7:49 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,
Rose Lindsey

Rose Lindsey
3265 SE Madison
Portland, OR 97214

From: Darvel Lloyd [mailto:darvlloyd@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 6:03 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Darvel Lloyd
Email: darvlloyd@gmail.com
Address: 54 SE 74th Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97215

From: Breanna Lundvall [mailto:breanna.lundvall@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 4:31 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,

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

Thank you

From: Breanna Lundvall
Email: breanna.lundvall@gmail.com
Address: 433 NE Graham St. Apt. 4, Portland, Oregon, 97212

From: Lucy Wong [mailto:lucymwong@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 5:04 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,
Lucy Wong
NE Portland Resident

From: Lucy Wong
Email: lucymwong@gmail.com
Address: 621 NE Sumner St., Portland, Oregon, 97211

From: Erin Madden [mailto:erin.madden@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:30 PM
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,

Erin Madden
3756 SE Lafayette Ct
Portland, OR 97202

From: Linda Magnuson [mailto:lmagnuson1@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 3:15 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.

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: Linda Magnuson
Email: lmagnuson1@gmail.com
Address: 4346 NE Skidmore, Portland, Oregon, 97218

From: Michael Andersen [mailto:mike.andersen@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 1:44 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: support of restrictive fossil fuel zoning proposal

Portland's economy is dangerously overinvested in fossil fuels. A carbon cap or tax is on the way sooner or later, very possibly approved by state voters within several elections; permitting further local investment in the fossil fuel economy will only embed various parts of the local economy more deeply in business relationships, loans and business plans that will and must become inviable as the carbon price ratchets upward.

Every further investment in fossil fuels digs this future economic hole deeper. Portland should stop digging -- no new bulk fossil fuel terminals, no new gas stations, and no city interference with people who use direct action to block fossil fuel trade.

Failing that, the proposed regulations are an acceptable half measure.

Fossil fuel money is stupid money. We don't need it and we don't want it.

Michael Andersen
924 NE 65th Ave Unit B
Portland, OR 97213

From: Kelly McConnell [mailto:prvt@2ezgroup.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:05 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Kelly McConnell
Email: prvt@2ezgroup.com
Address: 11375 SW Erste, Tigard, Oregon, 97223

From: Annoe McCuen [mailto:mccuen7691@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:14 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Annoe McCuen
Email: mccuen7691@comcast.net
Address: 1825 Fairmount Ave S, Salem, Oregon, 97302

From: Matt Mcdell [mailto:mattmcdell@live.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 10:27 PM
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,

Matt Mcdell
3125 SE Yamhill St
Portland, OR 97214

From: Mary Ellen McFadden [mailto:ellenmcf@pacifier.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:39 PM
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,

Mary Ellen McFadden
2357 N.E. 151st Ave.
Portland, OR 97230

From: Teresa McFarland [mailto:terefarlan@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:12 PM
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,

Teresa McFarland
10740 SW 11th Dr
Portland, OR 97219

From: Mary McGaughey [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 2:12 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Mary McGaughey
Email: marymcgaughey@yahoo.com
Address: 381 NE Village Squire Av Unit 2, Gresham, Oregon, 97030

From: Jon McNeill [mailto:jon.mcneill@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 12:08 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

To Whom It May Concern at the City of Portland,

Thank you for what you've already done in the fossil fuel zoning debate. Portland City Council has already passed a resolution with the stronger language that I support, and I urge you to strengthen the proposal to **enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small**. No exceptions. Additionally, please **strengthen the restrictions on expansions for existing terminals** through binding limits during the use review process. Finally, please **prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland**.

We can lead by example in this situation and help keep Portland a leader in the US climate justice movement.

Thank you for reading and listening!

Sincerely,
Jon McNeill
4929 N Commercial Ave
Portland, OR 97217

From: Robert Meder [mailto:rdmeder@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 1:27 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

Oregon GREEN!

From: Robert Meder
Email: rdmeder@comcast.net
Address: 4828 se 30th Ave., #141, Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: Joseph Merrick [mailto:jwmherbert@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 2:57 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: please ban 100% of new infrastructure

To the esteemed members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

Thank you for your dedicated efforts and transparency with you are pursuing the implementation of 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 since 1986, I am proud to see City leaders working to make Portland an example that other cities can follow.

Thank you also to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for your work in incorporating public input on the 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 its citizens' input.

This being said:

I am of the firm conviction that 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, e.g. rail to marine).

The City's policy was clear...

... and I am of the firm conviction that new fossil fuel facilities -- which 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.

Furthermore:

While this proposal will mark any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to:

* strengthen regulations around ///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, unconditional ban on all new fossil fuel terminals -- large or small....
... especially given that 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, by 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 that would
increase fossil fuel shipments through Portland.

Now more than ever, Portland has the opportunity to be a leader in the U.S. climate justice
movement.

By a very simple, few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland can
continue to be on the forefront addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Joseph Merrick
2216 SE 58th Ave
Portland, OR 97215

From: Bill Michtom [mailto:wdmichtom@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 11:43 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

While the new draft has important improvements, it still misses the most important change:
Ending *all* use of fossil fuels.

Our world is already at extreme risk of irreversible climate change. Thus we must do more than limit the size of new fossil fuel terminals. Having an exception for new facilities that are five million gallons or less pretends that there is room for compromise. There isn't!

Please change the draft to recognize the emergency conditions we are in.

Thank you.

--

“The real activity of power is not making people conform to what they don't want, the real activity of power is making them want it.”

Bill Michtom
731 SW Salmon St, #505
Portland, OR, 97205

From: Walt Mintkeski [mailto:mintkeski@juno.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 04, 2016 3:44 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Members of the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission,

As a Portland resident, I am pleased by the diligent effort and transparency with which the City is pursuing the implementation of its November, 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. The City's draft policy 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." I thank the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability for its work in incorporating public input on its initial draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments. The current draft is much improved, bringing the proposed changes much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

However, I think that the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported in November, 2015. 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 Resolution.

While this proposal will designate any bulk terminal as 'non-conforming', it still needs to strengthen regulations with respect to 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 possible, 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. 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 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.

Thank you for considering my comments,
Walter Mintkeski
6815 SE 31st Ave, Portland, OR 97202

From: Michelle Mintmier [mailto:mmintmier@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 5:24 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Please amend the proposed draft for fossil fuel zoning to better reflect the city's goals laid out in the resolution last fall. Here in the Pacific Northwest, we take pride in our nationwide leadership on environmental issues. Fossil fuel zoning is part of a larger legacy we can write.

We want the ban to be as strong as possible. I am a member and highly active volunteer at Portland Audubon and echo their sentiments to make the ban better via these three aspects:

- 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.

I look forward to all of us making this ban a success.
Thank you in advance,

Michelle Mintmier
3655 SW 144th Ave
Beaverton, OR 97005

From: Amanda G Moore [mailto:thingus4@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 6:50 PM
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,

Amanda G Moore
7314 N Williams Avenue
Portland, OR 97217

From: Matthew Smith [mailto:matthew.smith.c@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 9:21 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,

Because of my deep love for our children and the Earth, I 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,

Matthew Smith
8524 NE Thompson St
Portland, OR 97220

From: Brad Nahill [mailto:turtleactivist@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 04, 2016 8:08 PM
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,

Brad Nahill
7227 SW Linette Way
Beaverton, OR 97007

From: Jared Naimark [mailto:jwnaimark@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2016 11:57 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

Sincerely,
Jared Naimark

From: Jared Naimark
Email: jwnaimark@gmail.com
Address: 1710 SW Harbor Way #205, Portland, Oregon, 97201

From: Nancy Anderson [mailto:nkanderson5@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:49 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,

Nancy Anderson
330 SE 75th Ave
Portland, OR 97215

From: John Nettleton [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 12:28 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: John Nettleton

Email: jpn5710@yahoo.com

Address: 4311 SE 37th Ave. #21, Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: John Nettleton [mailto:jpn5710@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 8:03 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,

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

From: John Nettleton [mailto:jpn5710@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 11:07 PM
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,

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

From: David Nichols [mailto:Davemult@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:53 PM
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,

David Nichols
5107 NE Couch Street
Portland, OR 97213

From: John Nicol [mailto:jnicolpdx@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 11:34 PM
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,

John Nicol
2331 North Terry Street
Portland, OR 97217

From: Jason Nolin [mailto:jason.nolin@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 2:34 PM
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,

Jason Nolin
5745 NE Church St
Portland, OR 97218

From: Kelly O'Hanley [mailto:kohanley@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 8:17 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.

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: Kelly O'Hanley
Email: kohanley@gmail.com
Address: 6134 NE Alameda St, Portland, Oregon, 97213

From: gail ohara [<mailto:gail@chickfactor.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:36 PM
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,

gail ohara
4523 NE Hoyt Street
Portland OR 97213

From: Maureen O'Neal [mailto:momoneal77@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:31 PM
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,

Maureen O'Neal
9100 s.w. 80th ave.
portland, OR 97223

From: Robin Patten [mailto:aweeble25@netscape.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 5:14 PM
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,

Robin Patten
4301 S Bryant Ave #131
Oklahoma City, OK 73115

From: Nora Polk [mailto:nora.mattek@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:03 PM
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,

Nora Polk
6405 SE 62nd Ave
Portland, OR 97206

From: Brian Posewitz [mailto:brianposewitz@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 4:43 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear PSC,

I support the general concept of the proposed new fossil fuel infrastructure policy: make it more difficult, expensive or impossible to build new fossil fuel facilities. Climate change is a crisis. We need to take bold, decisive action, even if it seems severe. Along with other things (including reduction in the food we get from animal agriculture), we need to stop enabling the production and use of fossil fuels. The proposed new policy seems like a step in the right direction.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Regards,

Brian Posewitz
8508 SE 11th Ave.
Portland, OR 97202
503-432-8249
brianposewitz@comcast.net

From: David Powell [mailto:powell440@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 8:07 PM
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,

David Powell
4117 N Haight Ave
Portland, OR 97217

From: Sarah Prowell [mailto:sprowell@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 11:24 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,

Sarah Prowell
2216 SW Sunset Blvd
Portland, OR 97239

From: James Rankin [mailto:jim.rankin@oregonstate.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:26 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: James Rankin
Email: jim.rankin@oregonstate.edu
Address: 111 NW 11th, Corvallis, Oregon, 97330

From: John Rau [mailto:jrau2@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 9:57 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: John Rau
Email: jrau2@comcast.net
Address: 2944 SW 55th Drive, Portland, Oregon, 97221

From: Steve Rauworth [mailto:steve.rauworth@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 7:11 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

Fossil fuels, in particular ones whose transportation poses great danger to ecosystems and human communities, even though we are still dependent on them now, are already things of the past. Using them makes our planet a worse place to live.

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

From: Steve Rauworth
Email: steve.rauworth@gmail.com
Address: 532 SE 15th Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97214

From: Rick Ray [mailto:tribalrump@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 9:56 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

RE: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning

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

Richard Ray
408 NW 12th Ave. #410
Portland OR 97209

From: David Regan [mailto:dregan02@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:41 PM
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,

David Regan
623 SW Park Ave #703
Portland, OR 97205

From: Teresa Reitinger [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 5:51 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

The times beg for a full ban for the possible future of the planet and the health of its children. Now is the time to take this important step in the hope that other municipalities will follow suit in the name of sanity.

From: Teresa Reitinger
Email: t_reitinger@yahoo.com
Address: 3724 SE 35th Pl Apt F, Portland , Oregon, 97202

From: Eileen Rence [mailto:eileenesther@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 9:09 PM
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,

Eileen Rence
4407 SE Yamhill St.
Portland, OR 97215

From: Diana Richardson [mailto:licketysplit777@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:12 PM
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,

Diana Richardson
1905 SW Sunset Blvd
Portland, OR 97239

From: Berkleee Robins [mailto:berkrobins@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:12 PM
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,

Berklee Robins
14071 Chatham Court
Lake Oswego, OR 97035

From: Brent Rocks [mailto:brent_rocks@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:31 PM
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,

Brent Rocks
1518 SW Upper Hall st
Portland, OR 97201

From: Rhonda Sabala & Michael Newsom [mailto:manewsom@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:25 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

Thank you for pursuing the implementation of its November 2015 Fossil Fuel Policy. As a resident of Portland, I ask the City to enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Sabala & Michael Newsom
1015 NE Dean St
Portland, OR 97211

From: Kristi Schaefer [mailto:wondersmooch@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 11:19 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,

Kristi Schaefer
2032 NE Liberty St
Portland, OR 97211

From: Melissa Scherling [mailto:indiethos@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:57 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,

Melissa Scherling
3250 NE 73rd Ave
Portland, OR 97213

From: Eric Schmall [mailto:kahunalamaku@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:44 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

Thank you.

From: Eric Schmall
Email: kahunalamaku@gmail.com
Address: 16611 SE East View Ct, Portland, Oregon, 97405

From: Briar Schoon [mailto:briar.dayne@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 10:12 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

- 1 - Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small. After all, this was the plain language of the City’s 2015 Resolution, “to actively oppose” new fossil fuel infrastructure.
- 2 - Remove the exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less which would allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels like Bakken crude oil.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,
Briar Schoon

From: Briar Schoon
Email: briar.dayne@gmail.com
Address: 1516 NE Hancock St. Unit 104, Portland , Oregon, 97212

From: Michael Schumann [mailto:mikethemouthpiece@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:11 PM
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,

Michael Schumann
2833 NE 49th Ave
Portland, OR 97213

From: Hall, Stacie [mailto:stacie.hall@intel.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 7:31 PM

To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>

Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

I am writing to request that you amend the proposed PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning draft to better reflect the city's fossil fuel goals laid out in the resolution from last fall. I recommend that the City of Portland amend the proposal to reflect the city's fossil fuel goals laid out in the resolution for the following 3 points:

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

Sincerely,

Stacie Hall

927 Clearbrook Dr.

Oregon City, OR 97045

503-557-1697

From: Howard Shapiro [mailto:howeird3@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:38 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

There should be no expansion of current facilities allowed.

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

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

From: Howard Shapiro
Email: howeird3@gmail.com
Address: 7426 SE 21st Ave., Portland, Oregon, 97202

From: kathleen shelley [mailto:kshelley@epud.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 7:59 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: kathleen shelley
Email: kshelley@epud.net
Address: 46525 McKenzie Hwy, Vida , Oregon, 97488

From: Dean Sigler [mailto:muchcatfur@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:43 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Dean Sigler
Email: muchcatfur@comcast.net
Address: 18845, Southwest Vista Street, Aloha, Oregon, 97003-2907

From: Katherine Anne Stansbury [mailto:wordpress@350pdx.org]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

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

From: Katherine Anne Stansbury
Email: yttik1000@yahoo.com
Address: 5519 SW Multnomah Blvd., Portland, Oregon, 97219

From: Katherine Anne Stansbury [mailto:yttik1000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2016 3:04 PM
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,

Katherine Anne Stansbury
5519 SW Multnomah Blvd.
Portland, OR 97219

From: Janiece Staton [mailto:ms.jdstaton@frontier.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 4:32 PM
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,

Janiece Staton
817 SW 171st Avenue
Beaverton, OR 97006

From: Taylor St Clair [mailto:thstclair@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:37 PM
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,

Taylor St Clair
7325 N Denver Ave
Portland, OR 97217

From: Margaret Stephens [mailto:mlstep@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2016 7:44 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

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

Prevent any aggregate increase in fossil fuel infrastructure in Portland.

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

From: Margaret Stephens
Email: mlstep@msn.com
Address: 1830 23rd St NE, Salem, Oregon, 97301

From: Wade Stoddard [mailto:wadestoddard@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:11 PM
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,

Wade Stoddard
4105 N Massachusetts Ave
Portland, OR 97217

From: Karen Stolzberg [mailto:kstolzberg@juno.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 10:52 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Re: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I'm very excited about your efforts implementing the new 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." This is something I have been thinking about and working towards for many years.

The current draft from the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability regarding the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments is much improved, bringing the proposed changes much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution. It is encouraging that the city is responsive to citizen input.

However, the current Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments proposal still falls short of the bold and visionary resolution that Portland supported. It 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. New fossil fuel facilities that can store 5 million gallons of dangerous fossil fuels undermines the promise of the City's 2015 Resolution.

I would also recommend that the regulations regarding the expansion of pre-existing terminals make it clear that there are definitive limits 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:

- 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.

- Eliminate an exception for new facilities that are 5 million gallons or less. This is unnecessary and could allow more unit trains of dangerous fossil fuels. Allowing new LNG storage in Portland is unnecessary: NW Natural has no plans for more LNG storage in Portland.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions allowed at existing terminals through adding binding limits 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.

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

Karen Stolzberg
9315 SW 37th Av.
Portland, OR 97219
503-244-7960

From: Jeff Stookey [mailto:jstookey108@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 6:11 PM
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,

Jeff Stookey
3656 NE Wasco St
Portland, OR 97232

From: Casey Sundermann [mailto:csund5@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 9:03 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,

Casey Sundermann
5847 NE 31st Ave
Portland, OR 97211

From: Diana Talcott [mailto:diana.talcott@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 7:25 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,

Diana Talcott
2806 SE 15th Ave
Portland, OR 97202

From: Liz Terhaar [mailto:liz@columbiariverkeeper.org]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 4:29 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a Full Ban!

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,

Liz Terhaar
111 3rd St
Hood River, OR 97031

From: Teresa McFarland [mailto:terefarlan@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 1:37 PM
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,

Teresa McFarland
10740 SW 11th Dr
Portland, OR 97219

From: Betsy Toll [mailto:betsy.toll@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:22 PM
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,

As a resident of Portland, I am proud and relieved that the City is committed to doing the right thing for current and future generations.

The current draft of the Fossil Fuel Terminal Zoning Amendments is much improved, bringing the proposed changes much closer to the original intent of the 2015 Resolution.

Still, the current proposal falls short of the bold and inspired resolution that Portland supported in the fall of 2015. The most recent draft allows new terminals up to 5 million gallons, provided the terminal cannot shift fossil fuels from one transportation mode to another (i.e. rail to marine). The idea of allowing new facilities that can store 5 million gallons of liquefied natural gas (LNG) and crude oil flatly undermines the intention and impact of the City's 2015 Resolution.

To make the City's policy as strong as it can be, I urge you to consider the following:

- Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals, large or small - "to actively oppose" new fossil fuel infrastructure, as the City promised.
- The exception for new facilities 5 million gallons or less has to go.
- Another Mosier, or Lac Megantic, in the heart of Portland would be catastrophic.
- Strengthen restrictions on expansions 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 strong 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. NOW is the time!

With just a few more improvements to the Fossil Fuel Zoning Amendments, Portland could reclaim its place at the forefront of addressing the most pressing concern of our time.

Sincerely,

Betsy Toll
3841 SE 51 Ave.
Portland, OR 97206

From: Julia Tomes [<mailto:julia.tomes@gmail.com>] **On Behalf Of** Julia Tomes
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 9:44 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Re: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Dear Members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission,

I want to thank you for the continued 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 parent of two children and 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:

- 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 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,

Julia Tomes

1736 SE Taggart St.
Portland, Or 97202

From: Charles Townsend [mailto:charlesntownsend@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:04 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,

Charles Townsend
623 NE Morris
Portland, OR 97212

From: Mary; Vorachek [mailto:maryvorachek@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 6:09 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony

Amend the proposed draft to reflect fossil fuel goals that close all loopholes and enacts a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals:

1. Enact a full ban on all new fossil fuel terminals without exceptions of any size.
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.

Mary A. Vorachek

680 16th St. NE

Salem OR 97301

From: Janice Vranka [mailto:javranka@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 10:50 AM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

From: Janice Vranka
Email: javranka@gmail.com
Address: 9103 SW 23rd Drive, Portland, Oregon, 97219

From: Randall Webb [mailto:lawrkw@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 11:53 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,

Randall Webb

From: Randall Webb

Email: lawrkw@comcast.net

Address: 2328 NW Glisan St. , Portland, Oregon, 97210

From: Dr. George Weiss Amann [mailto:georgeweis@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:13 PM
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,

Dr. George Weiss Amann
2132 NE 13th Ave
Portland, OR 97212

From: Mark Wheeler [mailto:mark@rootsrealty.com]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2016 5:18 PM
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,

Mark Wheeler
628 SE 58th
Portland, OR 97215

From: Virginia Wiseman [mailto:virginia.n.wiseman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:09 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

Dear PSC,

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

Many thanks!

From: Virginia Wiseman
Email: virginia.n.wiseman@gmail.com
Address: 5516 NE Mallory Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97211

From: satya vayu [mailto:satyavayu@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2016 5:04 PM
To: Planning and Sustainability Commission <psc@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: PSC Fossil Fuel Zoning Testimony: I want a full ban!

Testimony:

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

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

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

Thank you,
Satya Vayu

From: satya vayu
Email: satyavayu@gmail.com
Address: 6608 SE 81st Ave, Portland, Oregon, 97206